



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management Working Group

Meeting Record

August 5, 1998

Holley House in Aiken, SC

The Risk Management Working Group of the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on August 5, 1998 at 6:00 p.m. at the Holley House, Aiken, S. C. The purpose of the meeting was to hear team reports on their definition of risk, team objectives and path forward. Members of the Risk Management Working Group attending were: P. K. Smith, Karen Patterson, Ed Hallinan, Barbara Murphy, Jerry Devitt, Murray Riley, Mike French, Jimmy Mackey, Wade Waters, Lee Poe, Donna Martin, Julie Corkran, Alan Collum, Jennifer Hughes, and Laurie Hunt. Members of the technical support group attending were: Jerry Nelsen, Virginia Kay, Gary Little, Bill Rajczak, Steve Etheridge, Mary Flora and Jim Moore.

P. K. Smith, Chairperson, welcomed those in attendance and asked each individual to introduce themselves. Ms. Smith reviewed the agenda for the evening. Ms. Smith stated that all the teams needed to be aware of what other teams were doing so that there was not duplication of time and energy for the DOE and WSRC people. Ms. Smith introduced Mr. Ed Hallinan who requested to make a short presentation on the definition of risk.

Mr. Hallinan apologized for having not attended the Team A meeting and expressed his concern of the definition of risk as defined by Team A. He stated that in some ways the definition was too simple and in others, not simple enough. He expressed his concern that the definition of risk should not be completely tied to a mathematical formula. He stated that the site does not do evaluations of total risk but the site does design basis accident scenarios. Mr. Hallinan stated that the site is not controlling accidents at the same level of risk. He said the site was interested in controlling rare accidents. Mr. Hallinan showed two charts emphasizing how safety class controls are calibrated. Mr. Hallinan was concerned that the definition of risk by Team A projected a linear formula that was inconsistent with the site safety projections.

Ms. Smith thanked Mr. Hallinan for his input and asked Team A Lead, Jennifer Hughes, to present the Team A input.

Ms. Hughes stated that Team A had nine of eleven members present for the meeting and had a long discussion of the definition of risk. Ms. Hughes presented Team A definition of risk, objectives and path forward, which are as follows:

Team A:

Definition of risk: Risk equals probability times adverse consequence.

Mission: Determine how risk is defined and determined per program.

Objectives: To understand risks as they are used at the Savannah River Site.

1. Where are risks used?
2. How are risks defined?

Path Forward: Brief written descriptions of risk programs as SRS. A representative of a risk program will give a presentation on the risk process. Potential presentations:

- Safety analysis
- OSHA
- Budget priority
- Remediation
- Ecological
- NEPA
- Permitting

P. K. Smith thanked Ms. Hughes and asked Karen Patterson to present Team C findings. Ms. Patterson stated that with overlapping members, their definition of risk was the same as Team A.

Team C:

Definition of risk: Risk equals probability times adverse consequence.

Mission: Determine how risk is balanced with other factors in making decisions.

Objectives:

1. Human risk
2. Others such as management programs, technology research and development, human relation decisions/plans/policies, regulatory, programmatic policies and site strategic plan.

Path Forward: *Presentation on the SRS Strategic Plan.*

- Determine how objectives are developed and the general importance of

the document.

Presentation from Savannah River Technology Center

- Understand how research and development decisions are made and funded

Ms. Patterson stated that when people think about normal risk, not in terms of management or analysis, they think all or nothing. If a person assumes they will get cancer, then the risk is perceived as high. If a person doesn't think they will get cancer, then the risk is low. Ms. Patterson said that the working group had to get over the feeling of all or nothing when thinking about risk.

Ms. Patterson expressed the need for a team lead on Team C.

Ms. Patterson stated that their team would be looking at the SRS Strategic Plan to pick those items that don't have risk in the decision process to see how they compete with risk in the decision making process. Why are they important? Examples of items were keeping good qualified people, natural resource management and infrastructure. Ms. Patterson asked if members had other examples that the team should look at.

P. K. Smith introduced Donna Martin for Team D. Ms. Martin presented Team D input:

Team D:

Definition of risk: The likelihood (or probability) of harm and it's consequences.

Mission: Review risk information available off-site.

The group proposed that the mission statement be re-written to review the risk evaluation processes used by non SRS offsite. The emphasis was that this team should not only collect material, but also critique the material and get it as input to the appropriate teams. It was suggested that this team look offsite at those business areas appropriate to SRS such as, EPA, NRC, DOE, OSHA, chemical engineering, chemical manufacturing and others. Based on this new emphasis, the objectives were considered inappropriate and were not reviewed. It was suggested that this team needed to meet together rather than just using e-mail. It was suggested Team D may want to wait to meet until they understood the other teams objectives.

Ms. Smith introduced Jimmy Mackey to review Team B input. Mr. Mackey reviewed Team B input:

Team B

Definition of risk: (Two definitions)

1. Risk is a hazard that endangers or jeopardizes.
2. Risk is the probability that something will cause injury combined with the severity of that injury.

Observations of risk:

1. Risk should be related to the subject.
2. The definition of risk drives the communication.
3. Risk communication is different in emergency response situations.
4. Risk communication is consensual.
5. Some risks have higher probabilities than others.
6. How do people perceive risk?

Mr. Mackey stated that the difficulty in defining risk could be explained by this statement he read: Note: In defining risk, CERCLA and NEPA each defines risk separately. CERCLA defines risk in guidance issued by EPA 1991 for human health and EPA 1992 for ecological. NEPA who prepares EIS and EA's for DOE defines risk as a Variety of Meanings defined from guidance from DOE-HQ 1993 which states that risk should be defined when using the term and the context should be provided for its use in determining as EA or an EIS. This may help explain why it is so hard to put a definitive definition on risk because everyone has their own and this is what complicates the risk management and risk assessment scenarios.

Team B

Objectives:

1. Review resources on risk management
2. Compile risk management plans from various agencies
3. Review the plans and conduct a standard critique
4. Develop a grid to identify where plans are similar and where they are different
5. Assess the success of the various plans
6. Develop recommendation to improve risk communication

Critique Sheet for Risk Assessment Plans

1. Identify the organization's definition of risk
2. Identify the goals and risk assessment process
3. Identify the regulatory requirements for risk management and communication
4. Determine if and when the organization goes beyond mandatory activities
5. Identify who has responsibility to (a) approve the plan and (b) implement the plan
6. Identify groups within organization responsible to write communication messages and to identify the target audience
7. Identify how the risk communication program is funded
8. Characterize the organization's perceptions of risk

9. Characterize the organization's method for assessing success (performance measures)

Actions:

1. Review/comment/approve notes
2. Request Risk Management plans and develop grid
3. Contact Risk Assessment Group onsite (Request possible presentation and project participation)
4. Prepare for full group meeting on August 5
5. Distribute plans to all team members
6. Conduct critique of plans
7. Hold second Team B meeting

During discussions, it was recommended that the team review and rewrite their objectives, critiques and action to focus on risk communication instead of risk management. It was also recommended that EPA, DHEC and others in the risk business be reviewed for lessons learned in risk communication. It was suggested that a site that has stakeholder problems be reviewed to see how they communicate. Approval was expressed on the idea of sitting down with DOE and the contractor to see how risk is communicated.

At the conclusion of the presentations, Ms. Smith asked the group to review each of the definitions of risk to come up with one, which the group would agree. It was decided that the definition by Team D was satisfactory, The likelihood (or probability) of harm and it's consequences.

The objectives of each team were then reviewed for group approval. Results were as follows:

Team A All right as written.

A

Team B Needs to be re-written to risk communication.

B It was asked if "SRS" should be included in the missions statement. P. K. recommended that the team decide if that was required.

Team C Stated their mission was their objective. This relates to business and other non-risk related items.

Team D It was decided the objectives needed to be developed based on the review of risk offsite.

D

Ms. Smith reiterated the need for the teams to work together to combine SRS resources. Mr. Poe requested to make a couple of points. Mr. Poe asked that they be given copies of the safety manual brought up by Mr. Hallinan. Mr. Poe was interested in seeing the basis used to establish safety and regions of acceptability.

After collaboration, Ms. Smith stated that the next full Risk Management Working Group meeting would be Wednesday, November 4. The meeting location may be the Federal Building in Aiken. Ms. Smith also reminded the group of the Team A meeting on August 24 at 6:30 p.m.

at the District office of DHEC and the RM&FU Subcommittee meeting on August 19, 6:00 p.m. at the North Augusta Community Center. It was reiterated that a leader was needed for Team C.

Ms. Smith adjourned the meeting.

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