



Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board

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

Meeting Notes

December 6, 1995

North Augusta, S.C.

The Risk Management and Future Use and Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Subcommittees of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met on December 6 to discuss further the FY 1998 Budget Prioritization. CAB members present included Vernon Zinnerman, Bill Lawless, Kamalakar Raut, and P. K. Smith; members from the public who attended included Lee Poe, Bob Benson, Danny Hanson (South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control), Chuck Powers (Consortium for Risk Evaluation for Stakeholder Participation), and Ed Russell. SRS staff attending were Mary Flora, Leslie Huber, Frank Wise, Ron Frontroth, Clay Jones, Gary Percival, Mike Nelson, Jim Buice, Cliff Thomas, Marilyn Garcia, Helen Villasor, and Gail Jernigan. The Department of Energy (DOE) federal officials were deLisa Bratcher and Virginia Gardner. Vernon Zinnerman, Chairman of the Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to the meeting; self-introductions were made by all participants. Vernon then reviewed the agenda for the meeting which is shown below:

Agenda

Introductions and Welcome Vernon Zinnerman
Review Adjusted Matrix Sub-criteria Definitions Clay Jones
Description of Path Forward All
Subcommittee Future Efforts All
Close meeting Vernon Zinnerman

Mr. Zinnerman reviewed that past work that the Risk Management and Future Use and the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Subcommittees as done on the FY 1998 Budget Prioritization Process. These subcommittees were approached by SRS staff on October 12, 1995, to determine these subcommittees interest in participating in the FY 1998 Budget Prioritization process. Additional meetings have been held as described below:

- October 26 Develop prioritization criteria
- November 8 Develop definitions of criteria
- November 9 "Ranked" criteria to develop a priority model
- November 14 Tested models using 12 work packages

He expressed his thanks to SRS in allowing public participation early in the process -- much earlier in the process than was done last year for the FY 1997 Budget Prioritization process. Clay Jones explained that the purpose for this meeting was to provide feedback to the working group on the Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) initial application of their recommendations, to recommend to the working group some "fine tuning" based on the initial application, and to agree on the path forward for reviews of the integrated priority list(s).

Mr. Jones further explained that WSRC had applied the Working Group's recommendations on criteria weightings to the sub-criteria. The Working Group had proposed either a straight line or geometric scale; WSRC proposed using a geometric scale from 1-3000. The sub-criteria were distributed across 14 "columns" based on the worst case relative weighting recommended by the Working Group. (Fourteen was the number of columns used because some criteria had 7 sub-criteria and a scale was needed that was large enough to spread these sub-criteria.)

These sub-criteria were also compared with all sub-criteria to ensure that consistency in the weightings. The "point value" sub-criteria were also subject to a "sanity check" by program managers and as a result, these program managers recommended changing the Social/Cultural/Economic criteria weighting from 0.4 (as recommended by the Working Group) to 0.7. As an example of why the program managers believe the Social/Cultural/Economic criteria should be 0.7, Mr. Jones used the tritium release in December 1991. This release had very little impact on the health and safety of the public or workers; however, as a result of this release there has been a change in the way the site does business, increasing the costs of operations, for example, the increased public involvement at SRS. Mr. Jones explained that the worst case for Social/Economic/Cultural would be a mass panic where many residents left the area because of a fear for their health and safety.

Lee Poe reminded the group that the Working Group's definition of the worst case would be the loss of public trust and that the Working Group originally wanted this criteria shown as two separate criteria. Mr. Jones apologized for the misunderstanding in the definitions of the worst cases. There was also a difference in the worst case for public health and safety. The Working Group's definition of the worst case was the death of one person due to operations at SRS; WSRC's definition was multiple deaths due to SRS operations.

Various work packages were "scored" to "calibrate" program managers to achieve consistent application of assessment criteria. In the evaluation of these work packages, risk was defined as consequence times the probability of the consequence occurring. (If the site does not do a certain activity, what will happen?) A risk matrix was established with decreasing probability across the horizontal axis and increasing consequence down the y axis. Therefore, the "worst" case would be in the lower left corner and the "best" case would be in the upper right corner. The WSRC program managers used this matrix to prioritize work packages within each program, then the program managers used this tool for evaluating all work packages, and finally looked at the work packages relative to their position on the budget prioritization to perform a "sanity" check. The Department of Energy and Dr. Mario Fiori are the final decision makers in this process.

The participants were given 14 representative work packages to see how each scored. Mr. Jones gave a brief definition of the tasks as described below:

F Canyon S&M is the surveillance and maintenance for F Canyon without any operations. This task received a high score in Safeguards and Security.

ETF Normal Operations task supports F and H Area low-level waste streams and assumes that without funding, the discharges would go directly into the site streams.

H Tank Farm Surveillance and Maintenance is the maintenance for the tank farms and related facilities in H Area.

TRU Waste Operations are the site activities necessary for the safe storage and handling of transuranic waste.

DWPF Op @ 200 cans is the operation of the Defense Waste Processing Facility for 200 cans. This is in addition to the minimum costs for the operations of the DWPF and is less than full capacity for the DWPF.

CIF Low Operations is the basic operating costs for the Consolidated Incinerator Facility.

Am/Cm Processing is the costs of processing americium and curium. A/M Groundwater Critical is the costs of remediating the groundwater in A and M Areas. It was considered critical because of the possibility of off-site contamination.

K Reactor S&M is the costs for surveillance and maintenance of K Reactor.

F/H Groundwater is the costs for remediating the groundwater at F and H Areas.

A/M Groundwater Non-Critical is the costs for remediating the groundwater at A and M Areas that are non-critical.

Fire Protection, Line Item is the costs for the line item project for the sitewide fire protection upgrade.

FRR Processing is the cost associated with processing the foreign reactor research spent nuclear fuel.

Mr. Jones led the discussion on four different scoring systems: (1) using a geometric progression for the FY 1998 Value Matrix, (2) using the 0.4 value for the Social/Cultural/Economic, (3) using the FY 1997 Value Matrix, and (4) using a straight line value matrix. The differences and similarities among the different scoring systems was discussed. After this discussion, Mr. Jones asked for feedback on the process. This feedback includes the following:

- Thought we may have made a mistake on the value for Environmental Compliance by using 0.75 instead of 0.85. I thought that Environmental Compliance should have the same value as Mission Impact (0.75).
- Looking at the values and priorities for the ETF Operations and H-Area Tank Farm Operations, Social/Cultural/Economic value should be 0.4 instead of the proposed 0.7.

- Mortgage Reduction should have a higher score. Cost Effectiveness has been added to Mortgage Reduction and probably should be separate. Although they are related to one another, there is an inverse relationship at times. Let's separate these two values.
- The criteria and sub-criteria need more work than we have time to do right now to meet the deadline. This may be something we need to work on over the next year.
- The finished product will need some explanation to the public. Just providing the list of tasks as prioritized will not be sufficient.
- We need some type of "score card" to score how this process worked as compared to last year's process and next year's process. Some type of benchmark would be helpful to help us determine if we are improving on the process.
- As a working group based on the CAB's subcommittees, we need to communicate the results of this process with the general public. We need to give them the Working Group's criteria, definitions of worst case, and weights with the ranking.
- Why doesn't Environmental Compliance have a value of 1? You must follow the law. The value for Environmental Compliance was dropped to below one because the category includes laws that do not necessarily make sense, as well as DOE Orders, etc. The Public Health and Safety category values the public, not Environmental Compliance. These categories are not independent of each other.
- We worked hard to put the worst case definitions in plain English. We need to go back to that idea again and make sure all the definitions are in plain English.
- There should be training for all of those who work with this system to ensure conformity so that one task is not valued differently than the others.
- Selectively picking activities will affect mission viability.
- The participants then discussed the path forward. WSRC agreed to change the definitions of the worst case for Public Health and Safety and Worker Health and Safety to the loss of one life, to use a 0.4 weight for the Social/Cultural/Economic criteria, and to separate Mortgage Reduction from Cost Effectiveness.

The attendees suggested having another workshop in January to use these changes and see the results. There may not be consensus among all stakeholders in the process; if this is the case, then the list will go to Dr. Fiori with the comments from those who agreed and from those who disagreed.

There was also discussion about a formal recommendation from the CAB. The March meeting was discussed as the appropriate time to bring this to the CAB; however, the agenda for the CAB meeting will be filled with the new membership selection. It was suggested that at the January meeting, the members of the CAB be asked if they wanted the FY 1998 Budget Prioritization on the agenda for March. In January another workshop should be held that includes the full list of Environmental Management funded activities for public comment. There was also discussion about what steps will be needed for next's year's Budget Prioritization process. The Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee also has a commitment to complete the Vision document before the January CAB meeting. Vernon Zimmerman thanked everyone for attending and participating.

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