



SRS Citizen's Advisory Board

January 2000 Process Retreat Meeting Summary

SRS Citizens Advisory Board

January 14-15, 2000
Kiawah Island Town Centre
Kiawah Island, SC

The SRS Citizens Advisory Board held a process retreat on January 14-15, 2000, at the Kiawah Town Centre, Kiawah Island, SC. Mike Schoener facilitated the meeting. The agenda for the retreat is included as Attachment One. Tom Heenan attended as the DOE Designated Federal Official. The personnel attending the retreat and their break-out session team assignments are listed below:

Red Team

Brendolyn Jenkins
Bill Lawless
Maria Reichmanis
P.K. Smith
Bill Vogele
Beckie Witter
Mary Flora, WSRC
Recorder

Green Team

Mel Galin
Ken Goad
Karen Patterson
Jimmy Mackey
Charleen Townsend
Ann Clark, SCDHEC
Dawn Haygood, WSRC
Recorder

Blue Team

Tom Costikyan
Gerry Flemming
Kathryn May
Lola Richardson
Murray Riley
Beaurine Wilkins
Judy Burch, WSRC
Recorder
Rick McLeod, CAB Advisor

On Friday, January 14, Board members convened at 5 p.m. to determine the Board's organizational structure. Two restructuring planning meetings held in 1999 had resulted in a shift in three issues-based committees and combined administrative, budget and outreach duties into one committee. On January 14, a new proposal was presented to board based on feedback from Board members that separated the three issues-based committees into the following four committees:

Environmental Remediation Committee
Waste Management Committee
Nuclear Materials Committee
Strategic & Long Term Issues Committee

This proposal was accepted and it was determined that all committees would report to the Chair of the Board. It was also determined that various topic areas, such as health effects, risk, technology deployment and transportation, were inherent to each committee and would be addressed as they pertained to an individual committee. The Board members did not want the committees to get "boxed in."

The Board also agreed that committee chair elections would be handled as officer elections with the candidate receiving the most votes serving as chair and the runner up candidate serving as vice chair. Since the Board's Bylaws state that committee chairs will appoint vice chairs, it was noted that the SRS CAB would strongly encourage the Chair to appoint the runner-up candidate until the bylaws can be modified.

Mike Schoener provided materials regarding the Recommendation Process for further study prior to Saturday's session. He discussed maintenance of the CAB Recommendation database and definitions pertinent to the database. He also introduced the concept of a more formal CAB Work Plan.

At 6:30 p.m., the Board had a group dinner and discussed the activities to be accomplished during the remainder of the retreat. They also reviewed action items from the last retreat and how they had been addressed.

Summary of Saturday Morning Session

On Saturday morning the participants separated into three teams to review and develop suggestions regarding the recommendation process and the need for a CAB Work Plan. After the completion of the break-out sessions, the entire group met to discuss the recommendations of each of the teams. Tom Heenan, DOE provided a brief presentation regarding how DOE responds to Board recommendations. He discussed DOE's target response date of ten days and noted the day-by-day process by which management reviews and replies to Board recommendations. Bill Lawless stated he would like for DOE to open up earlier in the process when recommendations are drafted. He noted it is disturbing that the Environmental Protection Agency does not actively participate in committee meetings or respond to Board recommendations. Mr. Heenan responded that DOE wants to be open but does not want to influence the recommendation process.

Below is a summary of the morning session large group discussion:

Recommendation Format

The Blue Team noted they would like to have an optional section before the recommendation for comments and that the benefits section requested by the Green Team could be included in this section as well. All teams agreed that the background section should not be limited to one page and that flexibility was necessary in some cases. The Red Team noted that Related Recommendations should be included as a separate section to stimulate thought, assist new members and provide a good tracking mechanism as well. It was noted that the recommendation should ask the agency to do something specific versus doing something different from what they are currently doing. It was also agreed by all that the Closure Criteria and Recommendation Manager sections were not required in the recommendation. Although all agreed that designating a recommendation manager is a good thing, Board members agreed that recommendation managers did not have to be a member of the "respective committee." However, an effort will be made not to negatively impact other committees. The Red Team noted that recommendations should be provided two weeks prior to the full Board meeting. All agreed that the sections identified would be the standard format for recommendations.

Developing, Reviewing and Approving SR CAB Recommendations

It was suggested that recommendations being worked between a few individuals should be footnoted as working drafts. Draft recommendations provided to a larger distribution should be noted first draft and so forth with dates in which to provide comments. The Red Team strongly encouraged that comment periods have closure dates and comment resolution be conducted by the Recommendation Manager and commentor. The Red Team also noted that official drafts of recommendations should be issued by CAB Support Staff only to avoid confusion. The Blue Team noted that it was not automatic that the Board's technical advisor would draft recommendations.

There were differing opinions regarding the length of presentations in full board meetings to explain recommendations. It was agreed that they should not automatically be limited to ten minutes, although that should be the goal. The length of presentations should be determined by the recommendation manager and be the responsibility of the facilitator during full Board meetings. It was agreed that CAB members should hold questions and comments until the end of a presentation. All agreed that background sections should not be read during board meetings, however a bulleted summary could be provided if necessary. The recommendation manager working with CAB support staff should prepare this.

Updating the Status of SR CAB Recommendations

It was agreed that formal communication with the agencies would be limited to the facilitator to discuss recommendation closure status. The Red team noted that closure of a recommendation should be

designated differently if the response is unacceptable. The committee to the full Board should also recommend closure determination. All agreed there should be probably be two categories of closed recommendations- successful and unsuccessful. Mike Schoener took the action to identify recommendations closed with unacceptable responses. Mr. Schoener will also work closely with the committees to implement the recommendation database process.

CAB Work Plan

All teams agreed that a work plan is a good idea. The Green Team noted it should have a definitive scope but allow for the unexpected. The Red Team echoed the need for flexibility. The Red Team noted that CAB and Agency input allows for integrated planning. A work plan would also allow for better resource planning. It was agreed that the work plan would address work within each committee for the next year. It would be updated about every six months. Mike Schoener took the action to draft a workplan for review in March with final approval in May. It was agreed that the recommendation manager would be identified in the work plan.

Focus Groups

Following discussion, it was agreed that Focus Groups should work under the direction of the CAB and be approved by the Board. It was also determined that guidelines should be developed for Focus Groups. There was discussion regarding the term "focus groups" and should they be called subcommittees. It was determined these groups would be referred to as "focus groups." Mike Schoener took the action to draft focus group guidelines for review at the next Executive Committee meeting. A special session will be held in conjunction with the March CAB meeting to finalize the guidelines. Bill Lawless encouraged the Board not to set up too many regulations regarding the focus groups, noting they solve many problems with public participation and keep the CAB from becoming an exclusive entity. Others agreed that technical expertise of interested stakeholders should be harbored, but noted focus groups should be sanctioned by the CAB.

Summary of Saturday Afternoon Session

On Saturday afternoon the participants again separated into their three teams to develop suggestions regarding improving meeting productivity and participation.

Improving Productivity & Participation

The Red Team reported that attendance should be incentivized and if required, must be flexible. They noted attendance should be tracked and reviewed at Executive Committee meetings. The Red Team also noted telephone, video and internet conferencing as viable options for improving participation. They noted meeting frequency and set schedules and other options for handouts and needing improvement.

The Blue Team noted that video conferencing should be investigated. They also noted better management of presentation to improve productivity. They also discussed handouts and the need for them to be more specific and the need to avoid duplication. The Blue Team also requested that Board members be able to stay over a second night when meetings extend to late afternoon. They stressed that members need to arrive for meetings on time. The Blue Team also suggested that Committee Chairs develop ways to improve member attendance and list committee member's names on notices regarding upcoming meetings. The Blue Team also noted that retreats should not be held in the same month as a CAB meeting and should avoid holiday weekends.

The Green Team proposed that the Board pilot CAB meetings every month (on the 4th Tuesday) with board business every other month, and committee meetings the months in-between. There was much discussion regarding public participation and would active stakeholders be precluded if meetings were not held in the evenings. By a show of hands, the CAB agreed to pilot monthly meetings beginning in April for six months. It was noted that monthly meetings held during the day would eliminate the need for evening meetings; and hopefully increase CAB and regulator participation.

It was also agreed that all meeting attendance would be tracked and provided to the Executive Committee. Each individual will receive an attendance report on a quarterly basis. Once a year the attendance chart will be provided to the full Board in conjunction with membership elections. The Board also agreed that committee meeting notifications will name committee members; agendas will include more description of topic areas; minutes will reflect members in attendance and absent; and various conferencing techniques will be pursued.

Action Items (In no particular order)

- Issue new version of organization chart
- Issue new Recommendation Format package
- Cross-link recommendations on Web Site
- Develop draft focus group guidelines for January Executive Committee Review/Special March session
- Begin developing draft CAB Work Plan in March and complete in May
- Identify recommendations closed unsuccessfully and reclassify closure in database
- Issue Conflict of Interest Statement
- Pilot monthly CAB meetings with alternate months dedicated to committees
- Track and report committee attendance to Executive Committee
- Issue individual attendance report to each CAB member quarterly
- Provide better descriptions of topics on committee agendas
- Issue card notifications to committee members
- List members in attendance and absent in meeting minutes
- Check travel regulations for second overnight stay
- Pursue internet, telephone and video conferencing
- Questionnaire regarding effect of one day committee meeting on public
- Facilitator work with support staff to review quality of handouts/information received