



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

### **Stewardship Subcommittee**

#### **Meeting Summary**

January 9, 2001  
Savannah River Ecology Lab, Aiken, SC  
Fort Discovery, Augusta, GA  
Coastal Georgia Center, Savannah, GA

---

The Strategic and Long Term Issues (S&LTI) Committee Stewardship Subcommittee held a videoconference meeting on Tuesday, January 9, 2001 at 6:00 p.m. Videoconference locations and facility facilitators were as follows:

- **Savannah River Site (SRS) Savannah River Ecology Lab (SREL), Aiken, SC**  
**Facilitator - Marie Hamilton, SREL**
- **National Science Center – Fort Discovery, Augusta, GA**  
**Facilitator - Dr. Chip Schuster**
- **Coastal Georgia Center, Savannah, GA**  
**Facilitator - Carla Campbell**

The topics of discussion were overview of the stewardship process, review of comments of the stewardship statements from the Denver Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting, review of reference material available, projected scope of the Stewardship Subcommittee and the path forward. Those attending the meeting were:

#### **SREL**

##### **CAB Members:**

P.K. Smith  
Wade Waters

##### **Stakeholders:**

Karl Overcash  
Todd Crawford

##### **DOE/Contractors:**

Jim Buice, DOE  
Terry Vought, DOE  
George Mishra, DOE

#### **Fort Discovery**

##### **Stakeholders:**

Jack Hayes  
Sam Booher  
Lee Poe  
Mike French  
Dr. Nair  
Radha Nair  
Bill Lawless  
Rick McLeod

##### **DOE/Contractors:**

Sonny Goldston, BSRI

#### **Coastal Georgia Center**

##### **CAB Members:**

Mel Galin  
Bill Vogeles  
Jean Sulc

##### **Stakeholders:**

Jerry Artest Lloyd

Gary Wein, SREL  
Gary Davis, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC

Helen Villasor, WSRC

### **Welcome and Introduction:**

P. K. Smith, Chairperson, welcomed those in the various locations to the meeting. They were asked to introduce themselves. Some general instructions on the use of the facility and participation were given. Attendees were requested to make sure they filled out the sign-in sheet and indicate if they would like to be an active member of the subcommittee or just be on distribution. It was mentioned that at the end of the meeting, they would be asked to fill out a rating sheet. It was important that in filling it out, they fill out the meeting portion for the meeting content and in the comment section at the bottom to give their comments on the videoconference facilities and meeting method.

### **Overview of the Stewardship Process:**

P. K. Smith gave a background review of stewardship to date. She stated that the Oak Ridge site was one of the first sites to publish a stewardship plan. Their stewardship program was publicized and DOE headquarters started to become involved in stewardship. Two years ago, Oak Ridge sponsored an SSAB workshop on stewardship. Last year, a stewardship workshop was held in Denver. DOE headquarters also opened an Office of Long Term Stewardship of which Jim Werner is the manager. Ms. Smith stated that while these initiatives were important, they still didn't satisfy the question of long term stewardship at the SRS. The statements developed at both workshops were broad statements that may not be good for SRS. That's when the CAB decided to develop a Stewardship Subcommittee to look into stewardship at SRS.

A questions was asked as to where in the Stewardship Subcommittee process do we come to closure on significant issues such as D&D of certain facilities and institutional control? P. K. Smith responded that these issues should not be addressed on an as needed or individual basis, but the subcommittee will have to determine what activities should be included in the scope for the subcommittee and take a more strategic approach.

### **Review of Comments of the Stewardship Statements from the Denver Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Meeting:**

Ms. Smith stated that the SSAB representatives met in Denver and developed stewardship statements that were somewhat more specific than the statements developed at the first Oak Ridge SSAB meeting. It had been requested that the SSAB representatives have their respective SSAB's review the statements and respond. The review was to be an agree/disagree comment more than a change in the individual statements. Ms. Smith stated that the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) was in the process of reviewing these statements and would comment on them at the January CAB meeting.

There were questions related to the statements, in particular the statement on funding and budget of stewardship. It was asked how the public could send comments on the statements. Ms. Smith stated that the CAB was requested to get their comments in by December 15 and that she had received one comment. Ms. Smith said that if anyone wants to submit comments, they should get them in to her or Jim Moore as soon as possible.

### **Review of Reference Material Available:**

Ms. Smith stated that there was a lot of reference material available on stewardship. She referred to a handout that had a list of some of the reference material. Web site addresses were included for those documents that had them. She stated that to reproduce all the reference material for each member of the subcommittee would be monumental. It was suggested that the web sites be used to review any the material instead of hard copies. If someone wanted a copy of a document

that didn't have a web site, they were to call Jim Moore who would get a hard copy to them. It was suggested that for those documents that didn't have web sites that a hard copy be made available at the meeting locations for review to see if a hard copy would be desired. It was agreed to have a hard copy available.

**Projected Scope of Stewardship Subcommittee:**

P. K. Smith introduced Gary Davis, WSRC, to facilitate the process of trying to determine the projected scope of the subcommittee by developing a charter. Mr. Davis walked through the different sections that would be included in a charter.

After much discussion the following rough draft of the charter was developed. It was decided that everyone should review this rough draft and discussions would continue at the next scheduled meeting. Both objective statements are to be included in this draft charter and reviewed at the next meeting to see if they both remain in the objective section. It was also decided that the Payoff section of the charter should not be included. The rough draft of the charter is as follows:

---

**Savannah River Site**

**Stewardship Subcommittee**

**Draft Charter**

**Objective:**

- To protect future generations from hazards posed by residual radioactive and chemically hazardous materials.
- Bring about acceptance of the stewardship responsibility and the implementation of activities necessary to maintain long-term protection of human health and of the environment from hazards posed by residual radioactive and chemically hazardous materials.

**Task Description/Deliverables:**

- Develop strategies and actions for providing input to a long-range stewardship plan that is established and implemented by SRS.
- Develop and propose a process for ongoing public involvement in the development and implementation of the SRS stewardship plan. This is to include public comment on plans developed by SRS.
- Develop recommendations for key elements/features that the SRS long range stewardship plan should address.

**Team Structure:**

- The Stewardship Subcommittee consists of members of the public and all are welcome.
- The chairman of the Strategic and Long Term Issues Committee has designated P. K. Smith as the chair.
- WSRC and DOE will provide technical and administrative support.  
*To Be Added:*
- Add membership requirements.

#### **Boundaries:**

- **The Stewardship Subcommittee is not a decision making body of the SRS or the regulators.**
- **Recommendations can be sent to the CAB through the Strategic and Long Term Issues Committee.**
- **The National Stewardship Plan shall be considered by the Stewardship Subcommittee but the Stewardship Subcommittee shall not be limited only to the items contained in the Plan.**

#### **Decision Making Process:**

- **The subcommittee will function as a democratic organization.**
- **Controversial issues will be decided by a majority vote of the members present.**
- **Significant issues that require voting will be so identified and included on the agenda. The agenda will be distributed to members ahead of time.**  
*To Be Added:*
- **Add the definition of a quorum.**

#### **Special Resources:**

- **Meetings will be held in locations and time amenable to the subcommittee members.**
- **To best serve all locations influenced by the SRS, videoconference centers will be utilized when possible.**

#### **Reporting Requirements:**

- **The Stewardship Subcommittee reports to the CAB Strategic and Long Term Issues Committee who in turn reports to the CAB.**

---

#### **Specific requests, comments and questions were raised during the discussion:**

- **Jerry Lloyd requested that "health, economics, and environment" be included in the charter objective.**
- **P. K. Smith suggested that it be included in the deliverables later on.**
- **Lee Poe stated that long-range needed to be defined. Is it 100 years or many hundred years?**
- **Sonny Goldston stated that the subcommittee should consider including the scientific based tools available that can be used to determine stewardship direction and solutions**
- **There was strong support that the stewardship plans should be compatible with the three zones (industrial, industrial support and restricted public use) that are already identified in the Future Use Plan, March 1998. It may be appropriate that some areas of the site will not be cleaned up to "acceptable" levels. Unrestricted use may not be able to be accomplished. Making decisions in advance of which sites may not be cleaned to acceptable levels or unrestricted use could save considerable dollars.**
- **Specific sites that cannot be cleaned up to residential levels should be determined and identified.**
- **It was requested that the standing members of the subcommittee be able to review the charter before it is finalized.**
- **It was also requested that a copy of the notes from the subcommittee meetings be sent to all members.**

- Wade Waters stated that the weak link to the strong institutional control of the sites is the storage and retrieval of records. He stated that 35% of the records at the Smithsonian Institute are not retrievable.
- There was discussion on the Team Structure section related to the Stewardship Subcommittee being a subcommittee instead of a focus group. Mel Galin stated that the subcommittee format was reviewed by the CAB Executive Board and approved. If there were objections to the subcommittee format, individuals were welcome to express their opinion to the CAB.
- Under Team Structure, it was requested that membership and quorum for voting be defined in the charter. In addition, it was requested that if a vote on a controversial issue comes before the subcommittee, that a notice be sent to the members on the agenda before the meeting to inform them that a vote would be necessary at the meeting and the issue identified. There was concern about voting done at distant locations.
- It was asked if the meeting could be taped and placed on the web site. Also, could the meeting notes, reference material and other information be placed on the web site with links to other stewardship home pages. Gary Wein, SREL, stated that they didn't have the resources to place a tape on the web site. P. K. Smith stated that the meeting notes would be placed on the CAB web site. She stated that she would have to check to see if links could be made to other stewardship home pages.
- Mr. Davis stated that the charter would be modified before the next meeting and would be on the agenda for further discussion.

**Path Forward:**

Mr. Davis stated that as a path forward, he suggested that individuals identify subjects that they think should be included on the meeting agendas. They would then identify those items that should be included for the next meeting. The list of potential agenda items identified are as follows:

- Revisit charter
- Explore technical tools for decision making. Place Composite Analysis on the agenda.
- Jim Buice review of SRS stewardship program, including budget.
- Copy of reference documents without web site addresses be made available at meeting locations.
- Define institutional control
- Strategic approach for D&D
- Briefing on NDAA stewardship document
- Home page development
- Relation of the SRS stewardship plan to other site plans

It was determined the following items would be included on the agenda for the next meeting:

- Revisit charter
- Jim Buice review of SRS stewardship program, including budget.
- Briefing on NDAA stewardship document

It had been asked about the status of the NDAA stewardship document. Several individuals had submitted comments, the document was to be sent to Congress in December and they haven't heard anything on it. Terry Vought, DOE, stated that the NDAA report had just been approved on January 8 and is being sent to Secretary Richardson. By next Friday, January 19, it should be ready to send to Congress. It would be another two weeks for printing and would then be available for distribution. Mr. Poe requested that as soon as it goes to Congress it should be available to the public. The public should not have to wait weeks to get a copy. They also stated they would like to know what happened to their comments.

Mr. Davis asked about logistics and status of the next meeting. Other than Mr. Booher stating that Tuesdays were bad for him, there were no specific comments on date or time. It was suggested by all that the videoconference approach was very good and should be used whenever possible. P. K. Smith said that a date and time would be determined and checked to see if satisfactory to a majority of the attendees.

Near the end of the meeting, there was discussion on the effectiveness of the videoconference meeting and constructive criticism was given. All agreed that the videoconference approach was very good. The following are the main points of the constructive criticism discussion (Note: Some of these items were included from the comment sheets that were turned in as well as comments received after the meeting. While this is abnormal, it was felt all the constructive criticism on the videoconference should be included in one place.):

- It would be advantageous to be able to see both other sites at the same time. Currently only one other site is visible on screen.
- Some voices were louder than others were. There should be some way to control the volume.
- A button, light or show by raise of hands should be available so that the presenter knows when someone wants to makes a comment. It was felt the presenter had no control because someone from any site could just speak up and have control of the meeting. Some people hesitated speaking up because they thought someone else might be going to speak.
- The lighting or camera angle needs improving. It was hard to identify who was speaking.
- Some people experienced a little physical discomfort with the rapid camera movement at the other locations.
- Might be a good idea to lower the monitors at SREL. There were continuous shots of the floor.
- Explore instantaneous conferencing. A T-3 line was suggested.
- Have a faster lens.
- Better control of close up versus distant shots.
- Distant shots as PIP (picture within a picture) in corners of screen for all locations.
- Distributed speakers for surround sound (versus flat, hard sound).
- Meeting should be taped digitally and located on the home page.
- Need more instruction at contact (at beginning) on how it works.
- Develop guidelines to assist participants.

Gary Wein, SREL, complemented the group on how well they have adapted to the videoconference structure. Many times the individuals in out-lying areas are forgotten and not included in the discussions, but in this case, that was not apparent. Mr. Wein was very pleased with the success of this first meeting by videoconference.

With no other comments, P. K. Smith adjourned the meeting.

*Copies of handouts may be obtained by calling 1-800-249-8155.*