



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Strategic & Long Term Issues Committee

Meeting Summary

January 22, 2001
Hilton Oceanfront Resort
Hilton Head Island, SC

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Strategic and Long Term Issues (S<I) Committee met on Monday, January 22, 6:30 p.m. at Hilton Oceanfront Resort, Palmetto Dunes, Hilton Head Island, SC. Topics of discussion were the Savannah River Site (SRS) Prioritization Process, Stewardship Subcommittee update and public comment. Those in attendance were:

CAB Members

Mel Galin*
P.K. Smith*
Carolyn Williams*
Brendolyn Jenkins

Stakeholders

George Minot
Chuck Powers, CRESP
Lynn Waishwell, CRESP
Kim Newell, SCDHEC

DOE/Contractors

Shayne Farrell, DOE
Mary Flora, WSRC
Jim Moore, WSRC

* Members of the S<I Committee

Note: Bill Adams and Bill Vogeles, members of the S<I Committee, were unable to attend.

Welcome and Introduction:

Mel Galin, Chair of the S<I Committee, welcomed those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. He reviewed the agenda and introduced Shayne Farrell, DOE.

SRS Prioritization Process Status:

Mr. Farrell stated that an SRS team has been reviewing the SRS prioritization process for several months. Improvements to the process would enhance SRS's ability to reduce risk and accomplish critical workscope. He reviewed the history of the process and the stakeholder input into that process. The current process has been in use for over five years, is multi-attribute, is a weighted system and has been recognized as a good process. The strengths of the process are the stakeholder involvement, it's a good communication tool and it promotes "buy-in" within SRS.

There have been some issues raised with the process from the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) and the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) and others. There are not a lot of projects that were impacted by only a one-year delay. The current process is also very difficult to explain. It is not understandable. Changes to the Integrated Priority List (IPL) were not tracked. The emphasis was on a list of activities versus the problems. The degree of backup was also not adequately explained.

Mr. Farrell stated that on February 27, there would be a budget review with the CAB Committees that would give the CAB confidence that there is background data supporting the IPL.

Mr. Farrell reviewed the eight steps in the improvement process. The team developed goals, defined criteria, consequence and probability and developed weightings. He stated that the team was currently finalizing recommendations, evaluating the recommendations and initiating reviews.

The team evaluated the CRESPP review of the SRS Prioritization Process to help resolve the issues. Chuck Powers, CRESPP, was an advisor to the SRS Prioritization Process team. A self-assessment of the current system was completed. Other priority systems were reviewed for applicability to SRS. The team determined the new process had to be understandable, flexible, consider risk reduction, be practical, defensible and must be able to be implemented. The current process did not consider risk reduction.

The new process determines how much is risk reduced by performing the work over a six-year period. In addition to risk reduction, business considerations are scored. Also, stakeholder and strategic missions are considered and noted. The elements in these criteria were reviewed.

The current process assumed an impact and determined when the impact would occur, between 1 year or 10,000 years. The new system predicts if an impact will be likely or unlikely to occur in the six-year period. The quantitative probabilities range from 0.1 to 1.0.

A multi-layered weighting system was developed to determine scoring within each risk and business considerations criterion. Each criterion is weighted against itself. This paired comparison is analyzed using a proven software package called Expert Choice.

Mr. Farrell stated that a workshop is being planned for early March to bring in other technical experts as well as the public to walk through an example first hand. Mr. Farrell invited those in attendance to participate.

In closing, Mr. Farrell stated that implementing these changes would help us better prioritize, communicate and accomplish the SRS workscope.

The following comments were received during the presentation and answered by Mary Flora, WSRC:

- How far off course from the original prioritization criteria is the current IPL versus the original IPL?

Mary Flora: The original prioritization criteria was followed pretty much, but certain projects were moved on the list. Sometimes it's not obvious why a project is funded where it is.

Chuck Powers: As business considerations came up, a project may climb higher on the list. Also, by only looking at a one-year time frame, it didn't allow for the impacts over time.

- In considering the tracking of changes to the IPL, the definitions should be considered. If the target is to produce 125 logs per month and the target stays the same but the percent of radioactivity changes in every log, then there is a change that may not be recorded. That's why the goal should be in terms of completion.

Mary Flora: How much risk is reduced will be included in the new prioritization process improvement.

- How close to the original process is the new process?

Mary Flora: The new process is very close to the old one. There were a few more criteria added.

- What was the evaluation of the CRESA peer review?

Mary Flora: The team agreed with the CRESA recommendations and is addressing the issues that were identified.

- Did the team consider the risk communication process as well?

Mary Flora: The team didn't actually look at risk communication, but we feel it would be addressed if the process were understandable.

- Does the process look at the positive impact as well as the negative impact?

Mary Flora: Yes it does. It looks at cost effectiveness and mortgage reduction. It also includes systematic obligation such as grants.

- If the half-life of a radionuclide is 14,000 years, how can you look at risk for only six years and be able to measure the impact?

Mary Flora: The criteria are evaluated for a period of six-years, for projects that are only for two years, this works. In addition, there is a life-cycle baseline that backs up the data for the IPL.

- Would you consider using the videoconference centers for the workshop planned in early March?

Mary Flora: Due to the complex nature of the issue and the interaction required to understand it, the videoconference centers may not be the best method for the workshop, however, we will look into it.

- Has this new prioritization process been presented around the DOE complex? What did they think of it?

Shayne Farrell: Some DOE individuals in Nevada and Oak Ridge reviewed the process. They felt it was mechanically good. They thought it was more transparent and could be communicated better than their process. There may be some reluctance to use the SRS process at other sites because they already have their own process.

- Has the process been communicated to the public?

Mary Flora: We are in the process of doing that now. We would like to increase awareness. We are planning a workshop for better understanding of the process.

Stewardship Subcommittee Update:

P. K. Smith, Chair of the Stewardship Subcommittee, stated that a videoconference was held in January for the first organizational meeting. Videoconference locations were Fort Discovery, Augusta, Coastal Georgia Center, Savannah, and the Savannah River Ecology Lab (SREL) at SRS. The videoconference worked very well for the first time and everyone was impressed. The subcommittee

discussed how it would operate and the policies. The next meeting is being scheduled for March 8, 6:00 p.m. at the same videoconference locations. Ms. Smith invited all to participate.

Public Comment:

Chuck Powers stated that CRESA has the challenge of looking at the science underlying stewardship. One action is to try to determine the background number for groundwater. This would be important for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) as they determine clean up targets for long term goals. CRESA has published a document, *How Research and Technology Needs for Long-Term Stewardship Guide CRESA Research*, CRESA Report 01-002, January 15, 2001. This document lists the scientific projects with stewardship drivers. He stated that if anyone had additional ideas for projects, they should let him know.

Adjourn:

With no other comments, Mr. Galin adjourned the meeting.

Meeting handouts may be obtained by calling 1-800-249-8155.