SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use
and Environmental Restoration and
Waste Management Subcommittees

SRS FY 1998 Budget Prioritization Meeting
November 8, 1995
Graniteville, S.C.

The Risk Management and Future Use and Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Subcommittees of the SRS (Savannah River Site) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) hosted the second meeting for the SRS FY budget prioritization on November 8, 1995 from 5:30 p.m. to 8:45 p.m. at Bobby's Barbecue. SRS CAB members attending included Vernon Zinnerman, Bill Lawless, and Lane Parker; Walt Joseph, the SRS CAB facilitator also attended. Other attendees from the public included Lee Poe, Claudia Douglas, Ruthanne McVay, Bob Benson, Sam Booher, Elizabeth Peelle, Martin Schweiter, Michael Gochfeld, Chuck Powers, Joe Weaver, Victor Smith, William McDonell, Todd Crawford, and Murray Riley. SRS support staff who attended included: Anne Poe, Cliff Thomas, Bill Arrra, Jim Buice, Rosalyn Page, Ken Crase, Gary Percival, Ed Somers, Ron Frontroth, Bill Rajczak, Frank Wise, Robert Meadors, Jim McVay, Marilyn Garcia, Helen Villasor, Mary Flora, Gail Jernigan, and Joan Baum. Ernie Chaput and de'Lisa Bratcher were the designated federal officials for the meeting.

Vernon Zinnerman, Chairman of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee, welcomed the attendees to the meeting and introduced Bill Lawless, Chairman of the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Subcommittee, and recognized Lee Poe for the work he has done for this task. Mr. Zinnerman reviewed the agenda for the meeting (see below) and summarized the last meeting which was the first meeting on the FY 1998 budget prioritization. The Department of Energy (DOE) has asked the Risk Management and Future Use and Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Subcommittees to provide public input into the development of priorities for the Environmental Management work to use in the budget/planning decisions for FY 1998 budget submittal to Congress. Mr. Zinnerman explained the types of stakeholders involvement and due dates. The first input into the process was the development of criteria for prioritization which was completed at the last subcommittee meeting on October 26, 1995. By November 11, 1995, these subcommittees are to define the relative importance of the criteria and review results of priority list developed using the criteria they developed. Finally, these groups have been asked to review the Initial Priority List Development by January 19, 1996 which is when the SRS budget submission is due to DOE Headquarters.

Agenda

5:30 Introductions and Welcome Vernon Zinnerman
5:40 Risk Communication Course and Future Use Gail Jernigan Project Report Status

5:45 Review and discuss proposed criteria definitions Mary Flora Chuck Powers
6:45 Overview of Risk Data Sheets Cliff Thomas
7:00 Ranking and Weighting of Worst Case Definitions Chuck Powers (Consequence Value Matrix) Lee Poe
8:30 Adjourn

Gail Jernigan announced a risk management course which will be given to the members of CAB and other interested citizens. This course will be taught by the Medical University of South Carolina on November 18, 1995, from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Barnwell County Museum in Barnwell, SC. Registration is not required; however, Ms. Jernigan would like to know if someone is planning to attend so that she can be sure she has enough handout materials for the participants. She also announced that the Draft SRS Future Use Project Report was mailed on November 8, 1995, and that the public comment period will end on November 29, 1995.

Mary Flora explained that DOE Headquarters has developed a list of 7 criteria (Public Health and Safety, Site Personnel Safety and Health, Compliance, Mortgage Reduction, Environmental Protection, and Social/Cultural/Economic) and that these subcommittees had added four additional criteria (Cost Effectiveness, Public and Community Relations, Safeguards and Security, and Site/Mission Viability). She explained that SRS suggests combining Mortgage Reduction with Cost Effectiveness and Social/Cultural/Economic with Public and Community Relations. The group concurred.

Mary Flora discussed the proposed definitions for the criteria and definitions of the worst case scenario; she then led the discussions on these definitions which were modified and revised by the meeting participants. These changes were captured at the meeting on a computer with an overhead display so that participants could see their changes as they were made. Below are the proposed definitions in plain text and the revised definitions in italics.

Public Safety & Health

Includes potential adverse impacts to the health and safety of the off-site population surrounding the site. Worst Case: Immediate or eventual loss of life or permanent disability due to radioactive or hazardous material releases from SRS operations.

Public Safety & Health

Includes potential adverse impacts from SRS operations to the health and safety of the off-site populations. Worst Case: Loss of life due to SRS operations.

Worker Health & Safety

Includes potential adverse impacts on the safety and health of individuals inside the facility boundary. This includes site workers and visitors.

Worst Case: Loss of life or permanent personnel disability related to site operations. Could be due to a criticality event, release of radioactive or hazardous material, or an accident from a site hazard which could cause worker death or permanent disability.

Worker Health & Safety

Includes potential adverse impacts on the safety and health of individuals inside the SRS boundary. This includes site workers and visitors.

Worst Case: Loss of life or permanent personnel disability related to SRS operations. Could be due to a criticality event, release of radioactive or hazardous material, or an accident from a site hazard which could cause worker or visitor death.

Regulatory Compliance

Includes noncompliance with laws, regulations, codes, standards, formal legal agreements or formal government directives which apply to the Department of Energy.

Worst case: Major violations of the laws, regulations, codes, standards, formal legal agreements or formal government directives which apply to the Department of Energy which could cause significant adverse impact to the environment, safety or health of the public or workers, and would result in significant fines and penalties.

Regulatory Compliance

Includes noncompliance with laws, regulations, codes, standards, formal legal agreements or formal government directives which apply to the Department of Energy's environmental, safety, and health programs.

Worst Case: Major criminal violations of the laws, regulations, codes, standards, formal legal agreements or formal government directives which apply to the Department of Energy's environment, safety, and health programs and which could cause significant adverse impact to the environment, safety or health of the public or workers, and would result in significant fines and/or penalties.

Environmental Protection

Includes all releases, spills, and/or the spread or migration of radiological and/or hazardous materials to the environment (e.g., air, surface waters, groundwater, soils, or wetlands) and the associated impacts to the environment and/or natural resources (including wildlife) both within and outside the SRS facility boundary.

Worst Case: A release or spill that causes or has the potential to cause the spread or migration of radiological or hazardous materials beyond the SRS facility boundary and that has either widespread and/or a short - or long-term irreversible impact to the environment and natural resources. A spill or release of this nature will require corrective action and will result in a

restriction of public access, use and consumption of resources available to the public, including wildlife, private and public property, and groundwater.

Environmental Protection

Includes all releases, spills and/or the spread or migration of radiological and/or hazardous materials to the environment (e.g., air, surface waters, groundwater, soils, or wetlands) and the associated impacts to the environment and/or natural resources (including wildlife) both within and outside the SRS boundary.

Worst Case: A significant release or spill that causes the spread or migration of radiological or hazardous materials beyond the SRS boundary and that has widespread and a irreversible impact to the environment and natural resources.

Mission Impact

Includes potential adverse harmful impacts on the ability to perform the research, remediation, or production mission of the facility or the ability to carry out important parts of the mission.

Worst Case: Serious negative impact on ability to accomplish major program mission. Consequence: Program disruption (>1 month); DOE, HQ, DNFSB commitment missed. Significant project cost overrun (>15%). Program includes needs defined in DOE Strategic planning documents and addresses mutual needs of multiple DOE sites. Will cause major negative impact on high risk activities.

Mission Impact

Includes potential adverse harmful impacts on the ability to perform the research, remediation, or production mission of the facility or the ability to carry out important parts of the mission.

Worst Case: Significant negative impact on ability to accomplish major program mission.

Mission Viability

Includes potential or actual loss of SRS core competencies (e.g., personnel training, proficiency, background and experience) and/or infrastructure capabilities (e.g., communications, transportation, facility integrity, utility maintenance, etc.) and that may impact consideration or selection of the SRS for future mission and/or programs. Examples could include loss of personnel, through budgetary restrictions/layoffs, who have a specialized background or level of experience that enables the SRS to attract new mission or programs.

Worst Case: Irreplaceable loss or decay of core competencies and infrastructure capabilities to a degree that SRS is not considered as a viable option for future mission or programs by either the federal or state government or private initiatives.

Mission Viability

Includes potential or actual loss of SRS core competencies (SRS has Centers for Technological Innovation [the Savannah River Technology Center and the Savannah River Ecology Laboratory], Technologies [Hydrogen Technologies, Vitirfication, Environmental Technologies, Advanced Remote Sensor Systems, Stabilization of Nuclear Materials, Robotics and Remote Engineering Systems], Capabilities [Design/Engineering/Fabrication, Technical Support, Operations Support, Environmental Remediation and Restoration, Waste Management, and Chemical Processing]; and Technology Transfer Tools [Cooperative Research and Development Agree and/or infrastructure capabilities (e.g., communications, transportation, facility and/or equipment integrity, utility maintenance, etc.) and that may impact consideration or selection of the SRS for future mission and/or programs. Examples could include loss of personnel, through budgetary restrictions/layoffs, who have a specialized background or level of experience that enables the SRS to attract new mission or programs.

Worst Case: Irreplaceable loss or decay of core competencies identified in the SRS strategic plan and infrastructure capabilities to a degree that SRS is not considered as a viable option for future mission or programs by either the federal or state government or private initiatives.

Safeguards & Security

Includes the protection of personnel, property and resources (examples include: information, equipment, technology, Special Nuclear Material (SNM), communications, workplace violence) from loss, theft, destruction or injury from a reasonable or likely threat.

Worst Case: Outsider attack and entry into a Material Access Area (MAA), where special nuclear materials are stored; and/or loss of control or accountability of sufficient quantities of weapons grade special nuclear material which would pose a threat to national security.

Safeguards & Security

Includes the protection of personnel, property and resources (examples include: information, equipment, technology, Special Nuclear Material (SNM), communications, workplace violence) from loss, theft, destruction or injury from a reasonable or likely threat.

Worst Case: Outsider attack and entry into a Material Access Area (MAA), where special nuclear materials are stored; and/or loss of control or accountability of sufficient quantities of weapons grade special nuclear material which would pose a threat to national security.

Cost Effectiveness/Mortgage Reduction

This involves either the loss of Department of Energy capital investment due to accidents/deterioration or the loss of an opportunity for cost savings that would have a positive financial impact. Loss of investment could include loss of buildings, equipment, materials, finished products or supplies. Such loss could be incurred by events such as fire, explosion, human errors or natural occurrences.

Opportunities for cost savings are situations in which an immediate investment can help avoid a potentially greater cost impact in the future. Examples include neglected facility infrastructure for which short term expenditures on physical upgrades or increased maintenance or surveillance can help avoid increased long term costs. It could also include situations in which present investments could reduce the overall future cost of an activity significantly.

Worst Case: Significant loss of capital investment due to an accident or deterioration of buildings, equipment, materials, etc. or the loss of an opportunity for future cost savings (total cost or potential savings >$25M or annual cost or potential savings > $5M).

Cost Effectiveness/Mortgage Reduction

This involves either the loss of Department of Energy capital investment due to accidents/deterioration or the loss of an opportunity for cost savings that would have a positive financial impact. Loss of investment could include loss of buildings, equipment, materials, finished products or supplies. Such loss could be incurred by events such as fire, explosion, human errors or natural occurrences. Opportunities for cost savings are situations in which an immediate investment can help avoid a potentially greater cost impact in the future. Examples include neglected facility infrastructure for which short term expenditures on physical upgrades or increased maintenance or surveillance can help avoid increased long term costs. It could also include situations in which present investments could reduce the overall future cost of an activity significantly.

Worst Case: Significant loss of capital investment due to an accident or deterioration of buildings, equipment, materials, etc. or the loss of an opportunity for future cost savings, (e.g., total cost or potential savings >$25M or annual cost or potential savings > $5M).

Social/Cultural/Economic

Includes impacts to community attitudes, perceptions, and concerns related to the work activity and the likelihood that these interests could disrupt or delay the activity. This category also includes any potential impact to accepted community values including, but not limited to, social traditions, education, recreational activities, damage to cultural or archaeological resources, and/or impacts to the local economy.

Worst Case: Major public outcry, including negative media coverage resulting in negative (or loss of) trust and credibility; adverse impact to accepted community values (e.g., damage to historical or tribal site; impact to hunting, fishing or other recreational activities); or negative impact to the community economic base.

Social/Cultural/Economic

Includes any support to accepted community values including, but not limited to, social traditions, education, recreational activities, damage to cultural or archaeological resources, and/or impacts to the local economy. This category also includes impacts to community attitudes, perceptions, and concerns related to the work activity and the likelihood that these

interests could disrupt or delay the activity. The use of media will continue to foster a positive public relationship between SRS and local communities.

Worst Case: Loss of community support for SRS. After a break Cliff Thomas reviewed the Risk Data Sheets and the Qualitative Risk Matrix. DOE Headquarters has developed the Risk Data Sheet (RDS) Evaluation Program to help with input into the Environmental Management budget. This program looks at the major criteria (see above definitions), the consequences (rated as very high, high, medium, and low); and the likelihood of an event occurring. Risk is the product of frequency times consequence. The DOE Headquarters version also looks at subcriteria for each of the criteria. Due to time limitations, the subcommittees do not have time to look at the subcriteria for this budget, but the group agreed that, because this is an ongoing effort, they will continue to work on the subcriteria through the year.

Chuck Powers and Lee Poe began the discussions on ranking and weighing the criteria by asking the group to decide on the most important criteria from the list of 9 criteria discussed earlier. Three criteria were suggested which were: Public Health and Safety, Mission Viability, and Safeguards and Security. After much discussion, the participants decided that Public Health and Safety was the most important criteria.

Lee Poe then asked the group to decide on the relative weights of the Public Health and Safety and Worker Health and Safety by looking at the worst case for each: a death to a member of the public compared to the death of a worker. If the death of a member of the public was assigned a value of 1, what would be the relative weight for the death of a worker? The group's initial range was .33-.95 which was refined to .9 Due to time limitations, Lee stopped the discussions at this point and announced that this process would be continued on November 9, 1995.

Chuck Powers provided some closing statements, reminding the participants to "look at the big picture." Vernon Zinnerman thanked the group for attending and reminded the participants the importance of attending the meeting on November 9, 1995, to provide continuity to the process.

Note: Meeting handouts may be obtained by calling the SRS CAB toll-free number at 1-800-249-8155.