



March 7, 1995 Meeting Minutes

SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

Aiken, S.C.

Members Present

Members present were Julie Arbogast, Lenola Cooks, Brian Costner, Bill Lawless Mildred McClain, Lane Parker and Bob Slay. Ex-officio representatives Tom Heenan and Steve Richardson of the Department of Energy; and Ann Ragan and Myra Reece of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control were also in attendance. Other SCDHEC representatives included Jim Brownlow, David Wilson and Harry Mathis. Tony Able represented the Environmental Protection Agency. Approximately five members of the general public and 20 SRS employees were also in attendance. Gary Davis served as meeting facilitator and Jerry Elliot served as meeting recorder.

Tom Heenan discussed the meeting purpose and desired outcomes; the Environmental Management (EM) goals; the expanded scope of the SRS EM Program; related issues; and opportunities for stakeholder input (see attached). Bob Slay gave an explanation of how this workshop had evolved stating due to time restrictions, a special meeting was required for the Board to attempt to have input into the SRS Fiscal Year 1997 Budget Submittal.

During Mr. Heenan's presentation, one Board member asked if SRS was on track in regards to meeting commitments and milestones for the current fiscal year. Tom Heenan answered yes, but that a few environmental remediation projects were being evaluated. One Board member observed that DOE sites doing the best job should receive larger budget allocations, emphasizing productivity. Another member asked for the amount of dollars being yielded from uncosted funds. Jim Buice of DOE responded \$100 million in FY 1995 and \$80 million in FY 1996 were being yielded to offset budget requirements and stated these funds could be better applied to other programs. He stated \$117 million had transferred to the EM Program with "Landlord" facilities in response to another question.

Clay Jones presented the Prioritization Model used to evaluate and prioritize EM activities (see attached). He explained the methodology uses a multi-attribute, risk/compliance-based approach with weighted criteria elements, including public health and safety; environmental protection; worker health and safety; compliance with standards; cleanup mission/business efficiency; safeguards and security; public and community relations; and cost effectiveness. He also discussed observations from the pilot application of the model at SRS.

Board members asked if the eight weighted criteria were prioritized in any manner and questioned why research activities and technology development activities were not included in the priorities list. Clay Jones responded that there was a broad range of scores that could be received in any one category. He noted that higher scores were available for the higher priority categories such as public health and safety. Tom Heenan responded that research activities and technology development were being pursued on a national basis and were included at the headquarters level since all DOE sites benefited from these activities and should not have to compete for site resources.

Board members questioned who had been involved in developing the priorities list and asked if many changes had occurred during the process. Clay Jones responded a group of experienced technical managers with a good understanding of the program had produced the list and presented it to WSRC senior management who in turn presented the priorities to DOE senior management. He said DOE had added priorities which encompassed other contractor activities, such as those conducted by Wackenhut, the security contractor.

One Board member stated that although some infrastructure activities may be low on the priority list, the cost of bringing the facilities back up after walking away from them for a year would be high. Clay Jones responded the cost could be high but not necessarily the risk, and that the model focuses primarily on risk. (Points are available for business interruption and cost effectiveness.) One Board member asked what percentage the EM budget was of the overall site budget and was told 90 percent. He asked if the model applied only to the 90 percent and was told it did.

Board members were interested in lessons learned about various values used in the model, excluding risk. Clay Jones responded that some non-risk factors made activities score higher and provided balance. He stated for example that just because an environmental remediation activity posed no offsite risk, it did not necessarily fall to the bottom of the priority list, that other categories gave it sufficient points to push it up the scale. A follow-up question focused on how compliance activities were ranked using the model. Clay Jones stated that some compliance activities were still clearly a high priority, where others such as pits and piles scored low. When questioned how funds are allocated, Mr. Jones responded funds are allocated based on how the priorities are ranked.

Board members were asked to choose their top three priorities for discussion and comments. The following comments and clarifying information were discussed regarding the DOE FY97 EM Integrated Priority List (see attached).

Bill Lawless

Priority #8 and 15, A/M Area Critical Groundwater Remediation
Burial Ground F& H Groundwater Assessment and Remediation

Priority #9 and 22, TRU Waste Storage and Base Operations
TRU Retrieval Project

Priority #17 and 32, CIF Minimum Operations (Mixed Waste)
CIF Treatment of Additional Waste Streams

Bill Lawless stated that if draft motions are passed by the CAB in March, he expects Priority #8 and 15 will drop significantly. He commented Priorities 9, 22, 17 and 32 should be scored significantly higher. He specifically noted that Priority #32 should be ranked above the #28 line and that TRU Waste and DWPF activities should be moved higher on the list.

Lane Parker

Priority #1, Nuclear Facility Surveillance & Maintenance-Tank Farm-HLW

Priority #4, SRS Nuclear Fuel Storage and Management

Priority #19, Operations to Meet FFA Requirements-High Level Waste System

Lane Parker commented that Priority #19 should be ranked higher on the list to show the public DOE will meet mandates they have already agreed to and to instill public confidence. He stated it was very important to get materials out of the tank farms.

Julie Arbogast

Priority #44, High Level Waste System Increased Assessment

Priority #46, 235-F & 247-F, Transition, Deactivation & Compliance Actions

Priority #50, Reactor Facility Deactivation

Julie Arbogast questioned why Priority #44 was ranked so low. Susan Cathey stated this priority would allow the program to be completed sooner and improve life cycle costs. Ms. Arbogast questioned if the program would be affected by the workforce reduction. Susan Cathey stated startup of the Defense Waste Processing Facility was scheduled for December 1995 and she hoped it would stay on track.

Lenola Cooks

Priority #4, SRS Nuclear Fuel Storage & Management

Priority #5, SRS Federal Program Direction (DOE)

Priority #15, Burial Ground F&H Groundwater Assessment and Remediation

Lenola Cooks asked if radioactive waste could seep into the water supply and stated this was her concern.

Bob Slay

Priority #37, Regulatory and Order Compliance Activities

Priority #45, Spent Fuel - Interim/Dry Storage Activities

Priority #33, Tank Farm Services Upgrade

Bob Slay stated Priority #37 was currently ranked to low and this was an important issue with the public, especially those directly surrounding SRS. He questioned how SRS would be able to comply with budgetary constraints. Bob Slay also stated that Priority #45 was very important and that the alternatives of dealing with the storage of spent nuclear fuel in a stable fashion is being followed closely by the general public.

Brian Costner

Priority #47, ER Low Priority Regulatory Commitments

Priority #45, Spent Fuel - Interim/Dry Storage Activities

Priority #36, SRL Seepage Basin Remediation

Brian Costner asked what is accomplished by ranking Priority #45 since SRS is not the only site being looked at for interim/dry storage activities. Carl Everatt of DOE stated this was a generic procurement specification. Brian Costner also noted that Priorities #47 and #36 are ranked low and that several Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and Federal Facility Agreement-driven projects are low on the priority list. He asked SCDHEC representatives if they had a sense of what projects might not get done. David Wilson of SCDHEC responded that the agency recognizes current agreements are in jeopardy and that one reason SCDHEC was in attendance today was to hear what others think. Mary Flora of WSRC answered that several field starts initiated in 1995 and 1996, such as coal pile runoff basins, would have to be stopped if funding were unavailable. Tom Heenan explained that a budget of \$1.183 billion is expected but \$1.542 billion is required and that is why stakeholder involvement is important to help prioritize activities.

Brian Costner commented that delays in the field add to the total cost of projects. Clay Jones agreed and stated that if a project is 90 percent complete, it only makes sense to continue and complete the project. He stated the ER projects had not yet been looked at on an individual basis.

Brian Costner strongly expressed that funds should not be transferred from groundwater remediation activities to Pu238 activities.

Mildred McClain

Priority #45, Spent Fuel - Interim/Dry Storage Activities

Priority #44, High Level Waste System/Increased Attainment

Priority #47, ER Low Priority Regulatory Commitments

Mildred McClain asked about the relationship between Priorities #4, #16, #26 and #45 and how they would be impacted if funding was not available for all priorities. Carl Everatt stated that Priority #4 dealt primarily with surveillance and maintenance of existing basins and what to do to maintain safety in their current condition. He said Priority #16 dealt with moving fuel out and operating the canyons to stabilize the materials. Priority #26 concerned the receipt of new fuels from foreign or domestic research reactors and Priority #45 looks at a long term plan if spent nuclear fuel is not processed by the canyons, he said.

Mildred McClain stated Priority #45 should be ranked higher because of stakeholder concern regarding the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel.

Mildred McClain also made a general comment that she would like SRS to address the areas that pose the greatest offsite danger to her community and wants funds allocated to activities that protect safety and the environment. She stated a great deal of trust is required for the individuals who developed the priority list and emphasized it was crucial to strengthen trust and confidence in site experts.

Overall Conclusions

The following conclusions were stated by Board members in attendance.

While trust in being restored, there should be an independent entity to turn to give validity to the budget prioritization process and to help the CAB in terms of processing information. Information should be in a more user friendly format.

TRU waste and CIF should be given top priority and incinerable soils should be dropped down. F&H groundwater remediation activities should be stopped until independent peer review is conducted.

DOE was commended for opening the budget process to stakeholders and general comments regarding the process will be included in a budget recommendation to Secretary Hazel O'Leary in late March.

Board members stated this was the third year DOE had attempted to involve stakeholders in the budget process and that this was the first time DOE had come close, noting that DOE was improving in involving stakeholders in the process.

Summary of Comments received March 7, 1995 Priority Workshop

1. Bill Lawless stated that if draft motions are passed by the CAB in March, he expects Priority #8 and 15 will drop significantly. He commented Priorities 9, 22, 17 and 32 should be scored significantly higher. He specifically noted that Priority #32 should be

ranked above the #28 line and that TRU Waste and DWPF activities should be moved higher on the list.

2. Lane Parker commented that Priority #19 should be ranked higher on the list to show the public DOE will meet mandates they have already agreed to and to instill public confidence. He stated it was very important to get materials out of the tank farms.
3. Bob Slay stated Priority #37 was currently ranked too low and this was an important issue with the public, especially those directly surrounding SRS. He questioned how SRS would be able to comply with budgetary constraints. Bob Slay also stated that Priority #45 was very important and that the alternatives of dealing with the storage of spent nuclear fuel in a stable fashion is being followed closely by the general public.
4. Brian Costner also noted that Priority's #47 and #36 are ranked low and that several Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and Federal Facility Agreement-driven projects are low on the priority list. Brian Costner commented that delays in the field add to the total cost of projects.
5. Brian Costner strongly expressed that funds should not be transferred from groundwater remediation activities to Pu238 activities.
6. Mildred McClain stated Priority #45 should be ranked higher because of stakeholder concern regarding the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel.
7. Mildred McClain made a general comment that she would like SRS to address the areas that pose the greatest offsite danger to her community and wants funds allocated to activities that protect safety and the environment. She stated a great deal of trust is required for the individuals who developed the priority list and emphasized it was crucial to strengthen trust and confidence in site experts.
8. Bob Slay commended DOE for opening the budget process to stakeholders and stated he would generate general comments regarding the process to be included in a budget recommendation to Secretary Hazel O'Leary in late March.
9. Brian Costner stated that this was the third year DOE had attempted to involve stakeholders in the budget process and that this was the first time DOE had come close. He noted DOE was improving in involving stakeholders in the process. Bill Lawless agreed.

Note: Above priority numbers are associated with documents released as of March 7, 1995.