



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

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

SRS FY 1998 Budget Prioritization Meeting November 9, 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 third meeting for the SRS FY 1998 budget prioritization on November 9, 1995 from 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. at Bobby's Barbecue. SRS CAB members attending included Vernon Zinnerman and Bill Lawless; Walt Joseph, the SRS CAB facilitator also attended. Other attendees from the public included: Bob Benson, Carl Johnson, Bob McNeill, Sam Booher, Chuck Powers, Christie Drew, Joe Weaver, William McDonell, Todd Crawford, Murray Riley, and Murray Riley, Jr. SRS support staff who attended included: Bob Campbell, Anne Poe, Cliff Thomas, Bill Arrra, Jim Buice, Rosalyn Page, Gary Percival, Ed Somers, Ron Frontroth, Bill Rajczak, Frank Wise, Ken Crase, Mary Flora, Gail Jernigan, and Joan Baum. Ernie Chaput and deLisa 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. Mr. Zinnerman reviewed the agenda for the meeting (see below) and summarized the last meetings for 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 stakeholder 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 by January 19, 1996, which is when the SRS budget submission is due to DOE Headquarters.

Agenda

5:30 Introductions and Welcome Vernon Zinnerman

5:45 Continue Ranking/Weighting Chuck Powers Todd Crawford

6:45 Discussion of Path Forward All
8:30 Adjourn Vernon Zinnerman

Vernon Zinnerman 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). He explained that SRS suggested combining Mortgage Reduction with Cost Effectiveness and Social/Cultural/Economic with Public and Community Relations and that the group from the November 8 meeting had concurred.

Chuck Powers explained the group he is with, the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation or CRESP. This is a group from several universities including Rutgers, University of New Jersey, and Washington University who are working with citizens groups to understand how risk evaluations are being developed at the Savannah River Site and Hanford and how community values can be used to develop national priorities. The Environmental Management Program is becoming more risk-based. This is the first time a governmental agency has tried to tie community values into budget activities.

Todd Crawford began the discussion on weighing the various criteria by reminding the group that Public Health and Safety had been chosen as the most important criteria at the previous evening. This criteria had been assigned a value of 1 and Worker Health and Safety had been assigned a value of 0.9. The task the group was to accomplish was to review the other criteria and assign values to each.

(NOTE: The italics shown below reflect discussions on each of the criteria. Not every comment has been recorded in these meeting notes; in the interest of brevity, only a synopsis has been captured. The final weights are in a matrix which is attached.)

Regulatory Compliance Final value = 0.6

- Rules were put in place to protect the public's health and safety.
- We are a government of laws.
- However, laws are not ever final as they are changed by Congress every day.
- Changing the laws is a function of Congress, not the Citizens Advisory Board.
- Regulatory Compliance is a means to an end.
- We can get caught up in the rules and forget the reason for the rules.
- We don't want to send the message that we are willing for anyone to dump hazardous or toxic materials.
- Example: if a personal car of an employee spills a quart of antifreeze in the parking lot, the site is required to report this as a "reportable quantity." The ramifications of that quart of antifreeze on the health and safety are small.
- The law says that people should not carry AK-47 guns and kill people. That is an important law that we should all follow. Laws are important for protecting people.
- However, liquid high-level waste is different.
- The problem is that the extremes in this category vary by large orders of magnitude.

- Does the community want DOE to "push back" on regulations that may be unreasonable?
- Should the site be asking for variances?
- Environmental Protection Final value = 0.85
- The definition for Environmental Protection is about flora and fauna, not people.
- Laws are necessary, but not necessarily sufficient for protecting the environment.
- If you are following the law, you still may not be protecting the environment, health, or safety. Example: Cd rods used in reactors cannot be retained onsite because the Cd is considered a hazardous waste and they are also radioactive (transuranic); however, there is no evidence that storing transuranic waste, such as Cd, will harm health and safety.
- Environmental Protection is a goal, not a means to an end.
- Example: if there is a 1 in 400,000 chance that a release may cause one death, but to clean it up, you will lose several ecosystems. Do you clean it up?
- DOE has lost public support because of DOE's lack of concern for the environment in the past.
- Comparing health and safety to environmental protection, which one would you chose?
- We all know that Environmental Protection is less important than public health and safety.
- If the environment is clean, then worker health and safety is taken care of. If you foul the environment, then everything breaks down.

Mission Impact Final value = .75

- Compared to worker deaths, this is not as important.
- Example: if you could not meet a RCRA regulation, the DWPF could not be started.
- But is research that an important mission for the site?
- There are certain missions you would not want to shut down, for example, DWPF and tank farm operations.
- This is why subcategories are important.
- Since this is prioritizing the EM budget, the tritium mission should not be included.

Mission Viability Final value = 0.7

- Core competencies are very important.
- How many dollars do we need to attract missions?
- The new mission might be to develop a new technology for waste disposal.
- We could bring new missions from other sites.
- The new mission could be the proposed International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor or ITER.
- We tend to want to rate this lower than mission impact.
- Safeguards and Security Final value = 1.0
- This is extremely important. A terrorist could destroy life as we know it.
- An interesting point: SRS security force personnel are asked to defend property with their lives.
- Cost Effectiveness/Mortgage Reduction Final value = 0.5
- Cost effectiveness is important to tell us if we are going in the right direction.
- Can we get where we want to go in 10 years or 100 years?

- Cost effectiveness was not important to DuPont, the previous contractor for the site.
- Example: 12 years ago the disposition of plutonium-238 was a great concern. An alpha waste incinerator was built, but has never been used.
- As part of mortgage reduction, we need to get rid of the high-level waste.
- A good example of not reducing the mortgage would be to no operate DWPF.
- What about if we take longer to process the waste? What if we take twice as long to process the high-level waste for the DWPF? That would stretch DWPF operations to 60 years, making the costs increase by a magnitude of 10.
- Do we want to reduce the life cycle costs even if it takes away from something else?
- We want to avoid the problem of postponing an activity so long that we can't do anything about it.
- How about an example of cost effectiveness that does not involve DWPF. What if there was a warehouse that costs \$1 million to keep it from collapsing and it will cost \$5 million to tear it down. Is it worth \$5 million to keep from spending \$1 million a year?
- Mortgage reduction is important -- not just to keep jobs and help the local economy, but it is an important mission from the Environmental Management point of view.
- Is the message we are sending (by assigning a value of 0.5) a different message than Congress is sending? No, we need to achieve the same mission objectives, but be more efficient.

Social/Cultural/Economic Final value = 0.4

- This criteria impacts future missions.
- As an example, look at those DOE sites who have lost their community support. They have no mission other than cleanup.
- Loss of community support has an impact on current and future missions.
- If you lose community support, you may lose the other criteria except for Public Health and Safety and Worker Health and Safety with a few guards.
- How much should you pay for this?
- If you do a good job, then community relations takes care of itself.
- Need to keep the public involved.
- If you are not doing a good job, then community relations can overwhelm you.
- Issues of economic development are key.
- This is the only category where economic development can be measured.
- This category determines if the Citizens Advisory Board will be funded.

Todd Crawford told the audience that this process decided the rankings, but not the weights. Chuck Powers asked the group if they want to take a few tasks from last year's exercise and apply these rankings to them. The group thought this would be helpful. Mary Flora promised to provide definitions for the "best case" and the "middle case" for each of these criteria at the next meeting on November 14. She also said she would bring various workpackages from last year's budget process for the group to evaluate, based on these criteria. Bill Lawless asked that the group be provided with a blank rating sheet first for the group to evaluate the tasks, then be told how the site evaluated these tasks.

Vernon Zinnerman concluded the meeting by thanking Todd Crawford for his help and by thanking the audience for attending and participating. He announced that the next meeting will be on Tuesday, November 14 at 5:30 at the North Augusta Community Center.

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