



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Summary

July 21, 1997

Aiken, South Carolina

The Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met on July 21, 1997, at 7:10 p.m. at the University of South Carolina, Aiken, South Carolina. CAB members attending were Suzanne Matthews, Deborah Simone, Bill Adams, Lane Parker, and P. K. Smith. Walt Joseph, CAB Facilitator, also attended. Members of the public who attended Tricia McCracken, Mike French, Lehr Brisbin, Lee Poe, Gerald Dewitt, and Jim Jordan. Virginia Kay from the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office (DOE-SR) attended as the Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. Marian Woolsey also from DOE-SR attended. Shelley Phipps, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, and Michael Gochfeld and Lynn Waishwell, Consortium on Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) attended the meeting. The Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) attendees were Clay Jones and Gail Jernigan.

Suzanne Matthews, Chairperson of the Subcommittee, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to the meeting and asked participants to introduce themselves. Since Lee Poe was also giving a presentation to the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Subcommittee, Ms. Matthews modified the agenda and introduced Mr. Poe. Mr. Poe had been asked by Ms. Matthews to provide comments on the Discussion Drafts of the Accelerating Cleanup: Focus on 2006. (The presentation materials presented are attached.)

Ms. Matthews then introduced Clay Jones who gave brief summary on the fiscal year (FY) 1999 budget submittal, referencing the letter from John Pescosolido, DOE-SR, and the attached FY 1999 budget priority list. (See attached.) He showed a chart with three funding lines: one line showed the outyear budget projects for all SRS projects and activities with \$80-100 million efficiencies as compared to FY 1997 budget, one, assuming SRS could absorb inflation of 2.7 percent, and the lowest line with DOE Headquarters efficiencies, including \$125 million for FY 1998 and \$160 million for FY 1999. He told the participants that SRS management believes the site can operate more efficiently, but they do not know exactly how efficient.

Mr. Jones explained how the previous consensus comments were used in the site's FY 1999 budget submittal to DOE Headquarters. (The comments are shown below in italics; the responses in plain text.)

Renegotiate low risk regulatory requirements and redeploy funds to higher risk activities. The Environmental Restoration Program budget for FY 1999 totals \$117 million. This was divided

into two pieces, a higher risk section and a lower risk section, which were evaluated in the ranking. The lower risk section moved to a lower position in the priority list.

Reduce risk to protect worker safety and health. Site management has always ranked safety and health as the highest criteria. These activities are still high on the list.

Place higher priority on materials stabilization activities than spent fuel shipments. This comment was accepted and the list modified to reflect this comment.

Defer funding for Alternative Technologies for spent fuel and rely on existing capability. The priority list does not show where the funding line will be so it is difficult to determine if this activity will be funded or not; however, site management did place it lower on the list than it was previously.

New missions must bring new funding. Site management agrees in this principle. Mr. Jones used spent fuel shipments as an example. The Spent Fuel Program received \$6-7 million in additional funding for the shipment of these materials. Mr. Jones further explained that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) have expressed concern that the new priority list may have the appearance of not requesting funding for all activities in regulatory agreements. SRS has a legal requirement to request adequate funding for all regulatory agreements. If there is a shortfall, the regulators must be notified. SRS management believes there are some cost improvements that can be made in the FY 1999 budget, but they are uncertain as to the exact amount that will be realized.

Lane Parker commented that as the older workers retire, replacements should be trained. Mr. Jones responded that maintaining competencies is a concern of SRS management since more of the workforce is older and eligible for retirement and because the attrition rate for young professionals is high.

Ms. Matthew then reviewed the draft FY 199 budget recommendation. (Attached is the draft recommendation as it was presented at the meeting and the draft recommendation which was presented to the CAB on Tuesday, July 22.) P. K. Smith expressed concern about safety and non-proliferation of nuclear materials from Third World countries. In response to Bill Adams question about the funding for the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility, Mr. Jones explained that funding for this facility would be from the Environmental Management and Material Disposition Programs budgets.

After the FY 1999 budget recommendation was drafted, Ms. Matthews introduced the recommendation on the national and SRS Discussion Drafts of the Accelerating Cleanup: Focus on 2006. She explained that there had been some discussion on having two recommendations, one for each Discussion Draft. The group decided to send one recommendation. (Attached is the draft recommendation as it was presented at the meeting and the draft recommendation which was presented to the CAB on Tuesday, July 22.)

Mr. Parker asked if there was a contingency for replacing older workers who are retiring. He commented that "efficiency" is they key word. Older workers are familiar with the older

facilities and might could find more efficiencies. He expressed concern about adequate training for workers replacing older, retiring workers, operations in older facilities, and the number of regulations, especially if the Nuclear Regulatory Commission begins to regulate DOE.

After this draft recommendation was completed, Ms. Matthews asked participants to complete the evaluation forms and adjourned the meeting.

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