



# **July 1994 Meeting Minutes**

## **SRS Citizen's Advisory Board**

---

### **Members Present**

Members present were Julie Arbogast, Anne Brown, Thomas Costikyan, Brian Costner, Myles Grant, Thomas Greene, Rachael Harper, Alice Hollingsworth, Thelonius Jones, Walter Jones, William Lawless, Ann Loadholt, Kathryn May, Mildred McClain, Josephine Nestor, Lane Parker, Kamalakar Raut, Andrew Rea, Robert Slay, Perjetta Smith, Patricia Tousignant and Beaurine Wilkins. Ex-Officio Representatives were Thomas Heenan, Steven Richardson and Jeff Crane.

Members absent were Lenola Cooks, Harry Jue and Moses Todd. Constance Jones of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) sat in for ex-officio member Camilla Warren. Jim Brownlow of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) sat in for Myra Reece and Keith Collinsworth of SCDHEC sat in for Ann Ragan. (see attached list of other attendees)

### **Key Decisions Made by Board**

The Board invited the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board to give a presentation at the August 23 meeting.

A three-day CAB retreat will be held September 30 - October 2, 1994.

The Board adopted Bylaws on a first read with six amendments made during the meeting. The final Bylaws will be presented August 23 for adoption.

It was decided that any operating procedures developed by subcommittees be approved by the Board.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes from the June 28, 1994 CAB meeting were approved with fourteen changes submitted by Brian Costner.

### **Agency Updates**

Keith Collinsworth of SCDHEC stated that the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) outyear schedules, which had been in formal dispute, were resolved. He said the number of field

investigations and remediation schedule would allow many sites to be remediated within the 30 year schedule. He also noted there was a lack of public participation when changes to the appendix of the FFA were made and SCDHEC was looking at a process to involve the Board in the annual review of Appendix E.

Jeff Crane of EPA added to Keith Collinworth's update by stating Section 4 of the Keystone Report is dedicated to the public participation process in the annual budget review and priority setting process on which the three parties would be working together. He also discussed five Records of Decision being pursued by EPA that are in the Proposed Plan stage and being reviewed. He said two were Resource Conservation and Recovery Act units which are already closed, and that the Records of Decision will document these actions as complete. He stated the three remaining were Interim Remedial Actions and he anticipated approval of these documents shortly with public comment periods beginning in early August. These units are the TNX Groundwater, the D Area Oil Seepage Basin and Par Pond. He suggested the Board may want to consider these Interim Action Proposed Plans at the next CAB meeting.

Tom Heenan of the Department of Energy (DOE) reinforced that the Appendix E dispute was now resolved and the three Agencies were on the same track. He stated that there was still a significant portion of the Environmental Restoration Program in addition to the units listed in Appendix E and encouraged the Board to get involved in other parts of the program as well.

## **Administrative Discussions**

Bob Slay stated the Executive Committee recommended Board members look at the various subcommittees and choose one on which to serve. He suggested members choose the subcommittee for which they could offer the most time and help.

## **Conduct Expectations of Board Members**

Mildred McClain discussed conduct expectations of Board members. She stated while she was traveling in Japan, her father died and she had lost five other family members this year as well. She said this was in one way a blessing because it allowed her to reflect on her interactions with human kind and particularly brought to mind the Board because of its complexity. She stated that as the Board gets deeper into the work they have been selected to do that the dynamics of the group will become ever challenging, requiring the highest exhibition of humanity possible. She said the Board needs to remember the large goal and this requires members to use extra skills to work together and respect each other.

Ms. McClain said there is a way to challenge each other's thinking, positions and orientation without necessarily attacking the person. She asked everyone to remember the golden rules taught by parents and asked that the Board try to treat each other with the highest amount of respect. She said if there is a difference of opinions members should refrain from accusations or unsubstantiated comments. She said to remember the Board was here to make things better for everyone living around the Savannah River Site. She asked for respect for her and Bob Slay as Co-Chairs, and for members from each other. She asked that members always put the interest of the people ahead of personal interest.

## **Charter Discussion**

Tom Heenan addressed issues raised at the previous Board meeting. He stated he had worked in the federal government for a long time and knew the rules could be frustrating and encouraged the Board to stay focused on real outcomes. He stated DOE would try to minimize the red tape, but that there were rules which had to be followed. He discussed the scope of the Board's charter and said it was to provide advice on a range of Environmental Management (EM) activities, including environmental restoration, waste management and technology development.

Andrew Rea questioned whether DOE was trying to limit the Board's scope citing the possibility of a new production reactor as an example, and stated that the Board should be able to work on issues most important to them. He said recommendations could always be ignored by DOE.

Brian Costner stated Tom Heenan was correct in pointing out the broad scope of the EM program and that it was hard to exclude anything at SRS. He said the locally developed SRS charter referred to related activities but that the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) leaves open the possibility of any number of other issues.

Tom Heenan continued his presentation, stating the Board could provide advice to DOE, EPA and SCDHEC. He said it was the desire expressed in the FFA and that nothing in the FACA charter prohibited it. Mr. Heenan also discussed the differences between the original SRS charter and the FACA charter, stating there were few conflicts between the two. He stated certain administrative functions are required by FACA but should not greatly impact the Board.

Brian Costner asked if the conflict of interest language in the DOE order only referred to those employees who accepted a reimbursement other than travel expenses.

Rachael Harper said the provision applies to every Board member since the DOE order is the guideline set for advisory boards, but that the two paragraphs Mr. Costner was referring to were unrelated. She said that when the order referred to special government employees it was pertaining to a code of ethics.

Brian Costner stated that he hopes everyone is well informed and aware of what members are signing up for when they ask to receive compensation. He asked that DOE provide the Board with a very clear statement of its position on special government employees and a copy of relevant regulations. He wanted to ensure that anyone who receives compensation is aware of restrictions that may apply.

Mildred McClain asked that the rules and special restrictions that apply to Board members receiving compensation be provided to her immediately.

Bob Slay clarified the request, asking if a different set of standards will be applied to those members who apply for and receive compensation. Tom Heenan stated that the DOE Chief Counsel Office is available to the Board to deal with these issues.

## **Subcommittee Reports**

Tom Greene, Budget Subcommittee Chair, announced that the Board's budget proposal had been sent to DOE and asked for a status. Tom Heenan stated that the budget was currently being reviewed locally and must be submitted to DOE-Headquarters for final approval. He said he hoped it would be approved by the next Board meeting.

## **Educational Path Forward**

Brian Costner presented a proposed educational agenda for the next four Board meetings. (see attached) He asked for feedback to help keep the educational process on track. He stated the August meeting would include a presentation on the SRS High-Level Waste Program, including the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF), and that this facility has been reviewed by many outside parties, such as the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB).

Brian Costner explained that the DNFSB, with a technical staff of 100 people, is a federal government agency created to look at safety issues and that DWPF was a high priority for them. He said members are appointed by the president and confirmed by the senate and that all are highly respected in the nuclear field.

Brian Costner also presented the September educational agenda which focuses on Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) Activities and Solid Waste; the October agenda on DOE budget issues; and the November agenda on risk management.

Mildred McClain asked how the Tulane and Xavier University Consortium fit in with regard to the educational agenda. Brian Costner explained that this group is providing a report to Congress on the quality of existing data. He said this was only part of the process and that if ultimately DOE is going to incorporate risk management in a meaningful way, the program would have to be redefined. He said the efforts of this group played a key role and their presentation was designed to give the Board a sense of the current status and background on concepts relating to risk management.

Brian Costner asked for reactions to his proposal. Mildred McClain asked if the Education Subcommittee had considered the ongoing Environmental Impact Statements in the education process and stated this was one area the Board could make recommendations of substance. Brian Costner answered they had not, but have included updates on the status of EIS, and other decision-making processes under each topic. He also stated that the Board may want to consider dropping some of the educational process to get to issues work more quickly.

P.K. Smith suggested the Education Subcommittee look at this issue and those raised by Jeff Crane and prepare fact sheets for the next Board meeting.

Brian Costner also stated it was not too early to start thinking about how to transition from the education process to providing recommendations and what issues to concentrate on.

Ann Loadholt questioned whether there were decisions being determined that the Board could be of assistance or give input. Brian Costner stated that every month many decisions are made and this will always be the case. He said the Board would have to spend time in order to effectively

understand the issue. He stated that the Board could not do everything in addition to current business, but there are a few things they can do and the Board needs to decide which are important.

Bill Lawless gave feedback on the proposed educational agenda, stating it would be a good idea for a member of the DNFSB to give a status of unresolved issues with DWPF. He also said D&D issues were important and the Board needs discussion on Tank 16 in particular. He said when the SRS canyons are moved into the D&D program and how long they remain there is the biggest unresolved issue. He stated that budget issues are overwhelming and the Board needs to compare the SRS budget to other industries and DOE sites. He said he had for four months been asking for information on the risk ranking system at SRS and would like this discussed in November by all three Agencies.

**Bill Lawless moved the Education Subcommittee invite the DNFSB to the August meeting. Ann Loadholt seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to invite DNFSB.**

P.K. Smith discussed the CAB retreat and a telephone survey conducted of Board members. She said the only available weekend to hold the retreat is September 30 - October 2, 1994, and that every effort will be made to hold it at a convenient location at reasonable costs. She said the topics will focus on risk management and assessment, an SRS overview, worker safety and risk and radiation and hazardous materials.

**By a show of hands, the Board voted to hold the retreat on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Nine members favored a three-day retreat while 7 preferred a two-day retreat.**

### **Bylaws Subcommittee Report**

Rachael Harper presented the draft Bylaws to the Board. She said the subcommittee had analyzed the FACA charter, the original SRS charter and the DOE guidelines in order to develop balanced Bylaws. She began her presentation discussing voting guidelines. She stated that a quorum for conducting a meeting will be two-thirds of the directors serving, meaning the number of directors presently on the Board. She said proxies are allowed at special meetings but not regular meetings.

Tom Heenan and Tom Greene questioned the language used in the Bylaws which referred to Board of Directors and asked if this was interchangeable with membership on the Board. Rachael Harper stated it was and perhaps the language should be changed. Andrew Rea stated this specific language may be appropriate if members of the general public were participating on subcommittees.

Rachael Harper stated that proxies would be allowed at special Board meetings and issues may be passed with a majority vote of members present. The exception to this was in election of officers which requires a majority of the full Board. Following several questions, Rachael Harper clarified that voting by proxy could only be done at a special meeting, not a regularly scheduled meeting, and that the proxy must be written, signed, dated and delivered to the Chairman or designated representative prior to the meeting.

Rachael Harper stated that a vote to remove a director requires approval by two-thirds of the full Board (or 17 members). She then discussed amendments to the Bylaws and that three-fourths of the full Board is required for an amendment. Andrew Rea questioned the percentages required as they apply to the full Board, and asked what would happen in the case of a mass resignation.

Kamalakar Raut asked if a Board member could be removed without notice. Rachael Harper discussed a provision of notice and the opportunity to be heard before a member is removed.

Bill Lawless questioned whether the original SRS charter could be changed since it was not to be amended for one year. Bob Slay pointed out that charter was an unofficial document. Brian Costner stated the SRS charter was approved through a public participation process and signed by the three Agencies and that is why the Bylaws were so good since they reflected the original charter. Mildred McClain asked that the Bylaws, once established, not be amended for one year. Andrew Rea stated operating procedures would allow flexibility for the Board. Rachael Harper stated that additions should be allowed and that amendments in the form of change should not be allowed for one year.

**By a show of hands the Board decided that an affirmative vote from two-thirds of the Board members serving would be required for removal of a Board member or amending the Bylaws. Ten members were in favor and nine opposed.**

Rachael Harper stated that according to the original SRS charter, which everyone feels obliged to follow, an affirmative vote of three fourths of the full membership of the Board is required to amend the Bylaws, and the Bylaws are not to be changed for one year.

Rachael Harper then discussed elections of chairpersons and stated that the Board would elect a candidate for nomination to be submitted to DOE for its approval. She said the FACA charter provides that DOE appoint the chairperson and the SRS charter provides that the Board elects the chairperson. Tom Heenan stated that DOE would work in good faith with the Board to accept their nomination and he would provide a letter to that effect.

Rachael Harper said that Board members are elected by the Board and confirmed by DOE and that FACA requires an appointment letter from DOE for all Board members. Thelonius Jones and Andrew Rea cautioned that public perception is very important and the public should not be misled.

Bill Lawless moved that the exact procedures of how officers are elected be written in the operating procedures and not in the Bylaws. Julie Arbogast seconded the motion. Andrew Rea asked for clarification that any operating procedures created by subcommittees be approved by the Board.

**The Board voted 18 in favor, none opposed and one abstaining.**

Andrew Rea moved that any operating procedures developed by subcommittees should be approved by the Board. Walter Jones seconded the motion. Rachael Harper suggested amending the motion stating that a provision to the Bylaws on operating procedures be added. Lane Parker

made this motion and it was seconded by Andrew Rea. **The Board voted unanimously in favor of the amended motion.**

Rachael Harper walked through the various Articles of the Bylaws explaining the origin of each. She explained the terms of office were set forth by FACA and there was no option but to allow for two-year terms although the Bylaws allowed for three consecutive terms. Therefore, she said, members could serve for up to six years. There was also discussion over whether applications for Board membership on file would have to be resubmitted or merely updated. Bob Slay stated that applicants should be notified and given the option of either submitting a new application or having the one on file considered.

Several Board members felt that "chairman" should be changed to "chairperson" in the Bylaws, so no one present or in the future would be offended. **A show of hands favored changing all references to chairperson by a count of nine to five.**

Bill Lawless questioned Section 6.1 of the Bylaws, stating that quarterly meetings were decided upon in the SRS charter to allow Board members flexibility and make removal requirements less stringent. He stated bi-monthly meetings made it easier to remove a Board member. Tom Greene agreed. **A show of hands indicated 16 Board members favored Board meetings be held at least quarterly with three opposed.**

Bill Lawless questioned Section 6.2. and whether six members were enough to request a special meeting of the Board. Bob Slay agreed and said he would like the number to be greater than six. **A show of hands indicated 12 members would prefer a majority of members serving to agree to a special meeting. Four members thought one-third was appropriate and one member felt six was appropriate.**

Discussion continued over Board member attendance. Bob Slay asked Beaurine Wilkins to begin work promptly on a proposal for operating procedures for the Membership Subcommittee.

Bill Lawless and Brian Costner questioned the stringency of Section 6.9 B (Major Policy Recommendations to the Agencies) and whether it was necessary language. Rachael Harper stated she would change the Bylaws to reflect the SRS charter.

Brian Costner asked for clarification of Section 8.2, which concerns the duration of the Board. He asked when the annual starting date was and when the first annual report was due to DOE-Headquarters.

Discussion pursued over the conflict of interest portion of the Bylaws and the number of employees of DOE contractors at SRS that could participate on the Board. **The Board decided eight to five that the number of employees should be restricted to five.**

Lane Parker moved that the Bylaws be adopted as presented on the first read and reconsidered at the next Board meeting. Alice Hollingsworth seconded the motion. **The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.**

Brian Costner encouraged the Board to request clarification of two phrases in the conflict of interest statement. The first is how to assess a "direct and predictable impact" and the second is what does "companies, organizations, or agencies with which they or any member of their family are associated with" mean in Section 7.1. DOE General Counsel representative Lucy Knowles said she would provide clear guidance on both.

## **EM Risk Assessment Briefing**

Bob Ward presented a CERE Program Overview (see attached). CERE, the Consortium for Environmental Risk Evaluation is a team of leading experts from academic institutions and consulting firms retained under a DOE cooperative research agreement to perform an independent evaluation of current knowledge regarding risks and costs at weapons complex sites, with meaningful stakeholder involvement. The Consortium has visited six DOE sites in a six-week period, gathering information and public concerns. Those sites are Hanford, Idaho National Engineering Lab, Rocky Flats, Fernald, Oak Ridge and the Savannah River Site. He stated CERE intends to hold workshops in each of the six locations in late 1994.

Bob Ward introduced Monika Fraley, David Conn and Andrew Puzzio of the Waste Policy Institute as part of the CERE team. He then turned the presentation over to Warner North who introduced himself as a national CERE team leader. Mr. North discussed some of the various members of the CERE team and their credentials and then opened the floor to questions.

Tom Greene asked what product would be delivered to DOE and what DOE would do with it. Mr. North responded that three reports, originally thought to be one, would be delivered on risks, costs and public comments. Frank Baxter of DOE-HQ responded the report would be sent to Congress and was being prepared by CERE to provide credibility for DOE as well as put it in a readable and understandable format for the public. Tom Greene asked what Congress would do with the report. Mr. Baxter stated he did not know but that the group was charged with looking at existing risk assessment data to determine gaps.

Bill Lawless expressed concern over the independence of the group and stated that independence in and of itself is not adequate. He asked what the group would be able to contribute that is unique. Warner North said Mr. Lawless' skepticism was well founded, and said he had much hope that CERE would be able to give DOE information that is used effectively.

Brian Costner asked if the CERE group had been charged to look at six facilities, which may or may not be representative of the complex, and make qualitative comments on DOE data. Mr. North said, that was the case, but to substitute "information" for the word "data" and said these six sites were where the bulk of DOE money is being spent.

Bill Lawless questioned this and asked why they were not considering Los Alamos or the Nevada Test Site. Frank Baxter said the task was in two phases. He said the first phase included the six sites with reports due by June 1995, and that all DOE sites be reviewed by January 1996. Mr. Lawless questioned whether a year's work would make a difference and suggested the group look at the process of risk assessment itself to be effective.



Brian Costner asked if the group would focus on environmental restoration activities. Mr. North said waste management and D&D activities were also on the agenda. Mr. North cited the Gaseous Diffusion Plant, K25, at Oak Ridge and the fact that the roof is beginning to buckle and crack and that funds are questionable for D&D of this plant as an example of issues of concern. He also cited the death of a worker caused by a roof collapse at Hanford, and said he regarded it within their charter to look at risk to public health, the health and safety of workers and the environment, broadly defined.

Brian Costner questioned how the process works if CERE's job is not to go back and collect data and do independent risk assessments, but to provide a qualitative response on data already gathered by DOE contractors. Mr. North responded it was clear with limited time and resources, they would not be able to do things such as use measuring equipment or develop transport models but they will review existing documents and report on what has been done or not done and talk to people to try to get a sense of problems not addressed. Mr. North stated he hoped to come out with a knowledge map which showed where risks are well known and where there are areas of great ignorance.

Jo-Ann Nestor asked for a ball park figure of the cost of this project. Mr. North responded approximately \$20 million.

Andrew Rea cautioned the CERE group about an appearance of conflict of interest, since both Tulane and Xavier universities were in Louisiana and Senator Bennett Johnson is the chairman of the Senate Energy Committee.

Mr. North stated the group planned to be judged by the quality of their product, but acknowledged the concern. Thelonius Jones expressed the same concerns as Mr. Rea.

P.K. Smith was concerned there was no set scope of work for the project and that the topics were broad. She also questioned how public concerns would be identified and tracked. Mr. North responded that the scope had actually been tightened from seven sites to six and that he did not expect to answer all questions, but to grapple with problems and come up with an overview. He stated public concerns were very important and asked for any ideas.

Bill Lawless expressed concern that CERE is using existing data and is completely dependent on information developed by DOE processes. Mr. North welcomed his input as to where the problems are. Mr. Lawless stated the scientific community has been dealing with this issue for years and said if there are problems, at least make it known that there are no peer reviews.

Rachael Harper questioned how Tulane and Xavier universities were chosen and what criteria was used. Mr. North responded that Tulane submitted a "think piece" to DOE about providing an overall assessment and then submitted a formal proposal and it was accepted by DOE as an unsolicited bid.

Brian Costner asked if the work being done by CERE was anything like that called for in the National Academy of Science January report which talked about the desire to consider public concerns. Mr. North stated CERE is informing the decision-making process on issues dealing

with costs and risk and that a comprehensive job on all characteristics, such as employment issues, could not be done .

Tom Costikyan asked if the public's focus would be improved as a result of the CERE report. Mr. North stated that high on the agenda is to get a map and let people know where the highest risks are.

Jeff Crane asked if CERE was going to evaluate the method of baseline risk assessment intended under Superfund. Mr. North stated it would in a qualitative sense but that it was hard to apply equal weight to human health versus ecological risk assessments.

Bill Lawless suggested the CERE group obtain a risk ranking of all wastes sites at SRS from DOE, EPA and SCDHEC. As an example, he said the Silverton Road site is high on the list for remediation, yet poses no risk, while other sites have very high risk. Warner North said that in a comprehensive risk ranking, value judgments must be made, and that there is a political process for making those decisions.

## **Public Comments**

Commentor: Irene Rudnick, S.C. State Representative District 81, Aiken, S.C.

Irene Rudnick stated she had participated in the previous night's meeting about spent nuclear fuel and read a prepared statement. (see attached) Ms. Rudnick stated if SRS is selected for reprocessing and storage of spent nuclear fuel, then South Carolina should be given all the economic benefits that go with any associated possible risks. She also urged there not be a repeat of the office space incident in which people are faced with financial ruin because of misleading encouragement.

Commentor: Susan Payne, Aiken, S.C.

Ms. Payne is the Executive Director of the Savannah River Regional Diversification Initiative and stated this group is a sister organization to the CAB charged by the Secretary of Energy to develop an economic strategic plan to offset downsizing at SRS. She complimented the CAB on the job they have done thus far and asked to open the lines of communications between the two groups. She offered to give a formal presentation and asked to use the CAB as a resource for the environmental impact of some of the economic decisions they would be faced with over the next few years.

Commentor: King Morris Singleton Jr., Augusta, Ga.

Mr. Singleton stated that the Board was created and funded by DOE to render recommendations. He stated two main functions were listed in the Board's budget proposal and stated he would like to make several points.

He said the Board has decided to use Westinghouse entirely for administration, but that \$250,000 has been funded to the administrative function of the Board. He stated it is necessary for WSRC

to have a contributing factor for this Board to function, but that complete dependency on WSRC is not necessary. His second point was that \$250,000 is already appropriated to the Board and is being spent now with no review by the Board. He said this will continue and waves the Board's responsibility to handle their own money. He said the money should be turned over to the CAB for accountability. He stated that, the honorarium is now to be awarded based on need, and Board members will have to divulge their financial situation and DOE will decide whether members receive compensation and how much.

He went on to say that his credibility, integrity and character have been attacked or questioned. He said he began work on this Board in December 1992. He said when he offered his company to work with the Board, the questions and attacks on his integrity and motivation were brought to his attention and that it was very discouraging considering the commitment, effort, time and work he has given the Board.

He said that despite these problems, he would continue to work with the board and would do so voluntarily.

Commentor: Charles Irving

Mr. Irving was concerned that the CERE team would use report to address a problem which took 50 years to create and questioned whether it would be meaningful. He stated he had the pleasure of traveling to China and Russia for technical exchanges and suggested physicists at a research center in Central Siberia be asked to help address waste problems since they have no loyalties to anyone in the United States.

Following the public comment session Brian Costner raised the issue of response to these comments. He stated that Susan Payne had offered a presentation and King Singleton had raised specific concerns and asked what is the process of dealing with public comments and how it will be handled in the future.

Ann Loadholt said that it was public comment sessions and that if the Board got involved in conversations with all who spoke, it may discourage others who would like to speak.

P.K. Smith questioned if response should not be given in writing in a more formal manner. Tom Greene agreed to respond to Mr. Singleton's concerns.

Bob Slay stated that any Board member can respond to public comment.

## **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held August 23 at SRS in Building 703-41A in the main administration area. A public comment session will be held August 22 from 6 - 7 p.m. at the Telfair Inn in Augusta, Ga.

## **Handouts**

- "Draft Bylaws for SRS CAB," Rachael Harper.
- "Proposed Educational Agenda for SRS CAB August-November 1994 Meetings," Brian Costner.
- "Results of Telephone Interviews for SRS CAB Retreat," P.K. Smith
- "CERE Program Overview," Bob Ward, CERE member
- "Fact Sheet, June 1995 Report to Congress," Brian Costner.
- Defense Waste Processing Facility Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Update.
- "The Nuclear Waste Primer," The League of Women Voters Education Fund.
- U.S. Department of Energy Order 1130.6, Advisory Committee Management.
- "Corrections to draft minutes from June 28, 1994 meeting," Brian Costner.
- "Letter of invitation to Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board to present at August 23 CAB meeting," P.K. Smith.

## **Evening Public Comment Session**

An informal public comment session was held at 6 p.m. at the Aiken Conference Center. Board members and the public discussed SRS and CAB related issues. The session was attended by the following individuals:

Justin Shepard, Augusta, Ga.  
 Lee Poe, Aiken, S.C.  
 Dean Bowman, Aiken S.C.  
 Laurie Bowman, Aiken, S.C.  
 Russ Messick, Aiken, S.C.

Board members gave a brief overview of how the Board was created and discussed general background information about SRS. They also gave an update on the education process the Board was pursuing and briefly discussed the environmental restoration program at SRS. The following issues were discussed during the session:

## **Format of Public Comment Sessions**

Lee Poe felt the meeting was too informal and suggested the CAB have a prepared presentation. He said prepared opening remarks should include a status update of CAB activities. Mr. Poe also expressed concern over the scheduling of meetings and the fact that at times several public meetings are scheduled on the same day.

Brian Costner stated SRS recognizes that the growing number of public meetings is a problem and is working on it. He said the CAB had not addressed this issue. Mr. Costner also described the three main areas of CAB activities including fundamental administrative items, education and the first issue-based subcommittee, Risk Management and Future Use. Mr. Costner stated that by January, the Board would be in a position to set priorities and focus on issues.

## **Advertising and Promotion of CAB Meetings**

Lee Poe stated that the public is confused over the avalanche of information on environmental impact statements, spent nuclear fuel and what the CAB is doing.

Justin Shepard said the CAB advertising should be altered to more clearly inform citizens they are welcome at Board meetings. She said she felt like she would be interrupting if she had come during the day. Dean Bowman asked that a clear agenda of the CAB meeting be added to the employee electronic mail message and P.K. Smith suggested production of a quarterly CAB update which could be placed in site newsletters.

Russ Messick asked if CAB members received the site newspaper and suggested the CAB present to rotary clubs and local civic organizations and ask for comments.

Andrew Rea complimented DOE and WSRC on public notification and suggested other agencies could learn from the site. He said the public attendance at this CAB meeting was far greater than any other meeting and suggested methods of notification used for the July meeting be repeated. P.K. Smith discussed other public notification techniques which could be used and Jo-Ann Nestor suggested a subcommittee might be required to help increase public participation in CAB activities.

### **Other Issues Discussed**

Laurie Bowman stated that education was an important step for the Board but also very important for citizens. She stated there was a lack of general public education that was required for citizens to provide informed input. Brian Costner offered three responses stating that all Board meetings are open to the public, subcommittee participation is open to anyone, and the Board may also choose to make recommendations to the Agencies on their public participation opportunities and materials.

Justin Shepard asked how long Board members served. She also questioned whether any Board members were SRS employees and asked if they reported on quality assurance activities at the site. P.K. Smith said she was an employee and could bring any concerns to the Board. Dean Bowman stated that SRS has an open-door policy and encourages employees to express concerns. Brian Costner stated that unfortunately, a fair degree of change has only happened in recent years. Andrew Rea felt that a good part of the SRS employees did not want people knowing anything. Lee Poe took exception to Mr. Rea's comment, and Mr. Rea said it depended on what part of SRS one was dealing with.

Dean Bowman stated he had lived in Aiken for eight years and works in construction at the site. He asked if the CAB had a position on aquifers and stated that at first he was afraid to work at SRS with the waste problems, but that he felt safer now and felt that SRS is really doing the best it can. Jo-Ann Nestor stated any Board member could be contacted with a concern and it would be kept confidential. Mr. Bowman observed that when something happens at SRS, people are quick to respond, but that sometimes technology has to be developed to deal with problems, such as spent nuclear fuel.

Lee Poe expressed concern over the Decontamination and Decommissioning program, stating that the SRS position on this program is totally different from DOE-Headquarters. He also suggested the Board become involved in the annual Site Development Plan. Dean Bowman asked if the CAB's scope would be broadened as SRS transitions from Defense Programs to an Environmental Management program and was told it would because the scope of the CAB includes the entire EM program.