



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

**Meeting Summary**  
**November 18, 1996**  
**Barnwell, SC**

---

A Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee of the Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board held a meeting on November 18, 1996 at 7:00 p.m. at the Winton Inn, Barnwell, SC. Citizens Advisory Board members attending included: Kamalakar Raut, Andrew Rea, Kevin Reed (appointment pending), Beaurine Wilkins, Bob Slay, and Vernon Zinnerman; Camilla Warren from Region IV of the Environmental Protection Agency, an ex officio member of the CAB, and Walt Joseph, the CAB facilitator, also attended. Members from the public who attended included Mary Elfner, Lee Poe, Carl Mazzola, Audrey Goetsch, Todd Crawford, and Beamme Wall. SRS staff attending included Gail Jernigan, Chris Noah, Mary Flora, and Leslie Huber. Gerri Flemming from the Savannah River Operations Office of the Department of Energy was the designated federal official; Joan Glickman, from the Department of Energy Headquarters Office of Public Accountability, also attended. Vernon Zinnerman, chairman, opened the meeting by welcoming the attendees. After a review of the agenda (shown below) attendees made self-introductions.

### **Agenda**

Welcome and Introductions Vernon Zinnerman

FY 1998 Budget Prioritization Status Vernon Zinnerman

Comments on the Draft SRS Future Use Project Report All

Comments on the Draft Vision document All

Vernon Zinnerman reviewed the status of the FY 1998 Budget Prioritization. He explained to the group that the Risk Management and Future Use and the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Subcommittees were approached by SRS staff on October 12, 1995, to determine these subcommittees interest in participating in the FY 1998 Budget Prioritization process. He explained that a meeting was held on October 26, 1995 to begin the process by determining which criteria should be used to determine the budget priorities. Additional workshops were held on November 8, 9, and 14, to define these criteria, to define the worst case definitions for each of these criteria, to rank these criterion, and to test the results of the subcommittees' work on 12 work packages to determine if the values of the members were reflected in the prioritization of these 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. He announced that the next meeting to work on the FY 1998 Budget Prioritization will be held at the North Augusta Community Center on December 6, 1995, at 5:30. He also thanked Lee Poe for his efforts during this process.

Andrew Rea asked if all the meetings on this budget prioritization will be held in the Aiken-Augusta area and if there were any meetings scheduled for the areas downstream of SRS. He felt that the current prioritization values reflected only the values of the stakeholders in the Aiken-Augusta area who benefit from the site economically. He was especially concerned that compliance requirements were not ranked as high as mission impact and mission viability.

Mr. Zimmerman thanked Mr. Rea for bringing this concern before the subcommittee and committed to having FY 1998 Budget Prioritization meetings in the Low Country in the future. Mr. Zimmerman and other participants also explained that the budget prioritization process will become an ongoing process. For example, participants in the earlier meetings determined that each criteria needed 5-7 subcriteria to improve the process. Mr. Zimmerman referred the group to a letter that summarized the process. (See attached.) Because this letter was not available at the subcommittee meeting that night, Mary Flora committed to having a copy of the process and summary sent to all members on the mailing list of the subcommittee.

Camilla Warren from the Environmental Protection Agency told the group that the SRS regulators will also have comments on the budget prioritization submitted by the Department of Energy. She said she was pleased that the stakeholders were involved early in the process but will also take note that downstream residents may not have participated due to the location of the meetings. Mr. Zimmerman also requested that the SRS staff supply him with the demographics of names in the subcommittee mailing list, specifically the geographic demographics.

The Vision document which supports the CAB Recommendation 8 was discussed next. Todd Crawford reminded the group that the CAB had asked the subcommittee to revise the Vision document to reflect changes made in the recommendation. A draft had been prepared which incorporated public comments, as long as the comments did not contradict the recommendation which was passed by the CAB in September, and had been revised to reflect changes made by the full Board. He reminded the participants that various versions of this Vision document has been available at CAB meetings for the last 6-8 months and that a previous version had been sent to the names on the subcommittee mailing list.

Andrew Rea pointed out several areas in the revised Vision that did not reflect the Board's recommendation such as the omission of biodiversity and the discussion on enhanced forest resources.

There was a general discussion as to the purpose of the Vision document. Some felt that this was a working document that had helped the CAB arrive at their recommendation; others felt that this was supporting documentation for the recommendation; still others felt that this Vision document provided more details to the recommendation. Some felt that finalizing this document was not necessary and that the recommendation was sufficient. Walt Joseph reminded the group that various versions of this document have been circulated and that the group may want to provide a final version for that reason. It was decided that a purpose statement would be added to the

document and that a statement should be added that this document was only reflecting the Vision of the subcommittee. A draft, with the purpose statement and "caveat" along with some suggested changes by the participants will be sent out soon. Mary Flora suggested a conference call be used to resolve any additional comments.

NOTE: At the CAB meeting the next day, the CAB requested that the Vision document be revised so that it could be voted on by the full membership. All portions of the document that might be considered controversial should be underlined to facilitate discussion and voting on this document. Lee Poe expressed some of his concerns with the Draft SRS Future Use Project Report written by the Department of Energy. He is concerned that the internal stakeholders' recommendation is missing from the report, that no consensus was reached outside of the CAB, and that the "themes" in the Executive Summary do not reflect all nine parts of the CAB Recommendation 8. Gail Jernigan told the group that the Land Use Technical Committee's recommendation (the internal stakeholders' recommendation) has been finalized and can now be included in the report. Joan Glickman who is responsible for writing the complex-wide future use report reminded the group that the official deadline is the end of December; however, since her report will not be finalized until February, DOE may be able to accept SRS's report later than that date. She also told the group that many DOE sites are facing the same problem of reaching consensus with all stakeholders, but it may be possible to reach an agreement even if there are different opinions.

Most of the participants were extremely concerned that the Draft SRS Future Use Project report themes did not include all nine parts of the Recommendation Number 8. Parts 6, 7, and 8 have been omitted from the themes. Bob Slay asked that a DOE representative be available to explain why these sections were omitted from the report at the full CAB meeting on Tuesday, November 28. He said that the CAB should demand to know why their recommendation was not included in its entirety. Andrew Rea reminded the group that the recommendation with all its parts was passed together as a unit and should not be separated. Gerri Flemming said she would have a DOE spokesperson available at the CAB meeting on Tuesday.

NOTE: At the CAB meeting on Tuesday, Ernie Chaput explained to the full CAB that apparently during the writing and editing of the report, some of the CAB's recommendations were omitted inadvertently. He assured the group that all parts of the CAB Recommendation 8 will be include in the final recommendation.

Vernon Zinnerman thanked everyone for attending and participating in the discussion during the subcommittee meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:20 p.m.

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