



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

Meeting Record

September 22, 1997

Marine Air Station, Beaufort, SC

The Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee of the Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) met on September 22, 1997, at 7:10 p.m. at the Officers Club, Marine Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina. SRS CAB members attending were P. K. Smith, Bill Adams, Jimmy Mackey, and Ken Goad. Tom Williams, representing Senator Max Cleland, attended the meeting. Joy Powell and Mark Stewart attended from the South Carolina Department of Health and Environment Control; Lynn Waishwell from the Consortium on Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) also attended. Virginia Kay from the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office (DOE-SR) attended as the Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. Karen Poore, Terry Spears and Chuck Borup also from DOE-SR attended. The Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) attendees were Clay Jones, Chris Noah, and Gail Jernigan.

P. K. Smith, Co-Chairperson of the RM&FU Subcommittee, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to the meeting and asked participants to introduce themselves. Ms. Smith asked if participants had any additional questions on the Draft SRS Strategic Plan for Terry Spears who gave a presentation on this plan at the joint subcommittee meeting. She then introduced Karen Poore who gave a presentation on the draft SRS Material and Facility Stabilization (MFS) Fiscal Year (FY) 1998 Strategic Management Implementation Plan.

Ms. Poore explained that the draft FY 1998 MFS Strategic Management Implementation Plan is part of the integrated SRS planning cycle. This plan supports the DOE Headquarters' and SRS's Draft Strategic Plans, Accelerating Cleanup: Focus on 2006, as well as the FY 1998 Government and Performance Plan Measures, and is supported by the Program Execution Guidance and Annual Operational Plan. This implementation plan provides the Material and Facility Stabilization organization with a "road-map" of priorities, goals, and areas of emphasis for the next few years by providing the link between long-term and short-term planning. The plan is being written in partnership with customers and suppliers. Ms. Poore asked for input from stakeholders as well as site regulators. She reviewed the mission, vision, and core values from the draft plan and explained that this draft plan supports two business lines from the Draft SRS Strategic Plan: Environmental Quality and Nonproliferation. The goals of this plan are as follows:

- SRS Material and Facility Stabilization, as good and careful stewards, will aggressively cleanup the environmental legacy of nuclear weapons and civilian nuclear research and development programs, safely manage nuclear materials, support disposition of surplus fissile and other nuclear material, and promote nonproliferation and international nuclear safety.
- SRS will be a center for Nuclear Materials Management and Disposition well into the next century.
- SRS Material and Facility Stabilization continuously demonstrates organizational excellence in its sound environmental, safety and health practices, communication and trust efforts, and its corporate management systems and approaches.

Ms. Poore concluded her presentation by reviewing the schedule for the plan. She asked for comments by September 30, but acknowledged that the comment period on the draft SRS Strategic Plan ends on October 13 so she will accept comment through October 13 as well. She told the group the plan would be issued in late October, about the same as the SRS Strategic Plan.

Ms. Smith thanked Ms. Poore for her presentation and explained that Mr. Spears' presentation on the Draft SRS Strategic Plan represented the "skeleton" of planning and that Ms. Poore's presentation put some "muscle" on the "skeleton". Ms. Poore reiterated her request for public comments on the plan.

Ms. Smith then introduce Jim Buice who provided an overview of the FY 1998 and FY 1999 SRS budgets. Mr. Buice explained that the federal budget is from October 1 through September 30. If a budget has not been passed by Congress by October of any given year, a continuing resolution is usually passed to fund government agencies for a set period of time, usually 7-14 days. In his presentation he would discuss what the SRS budget was for FY 1997, what is expected in FY 1998, and what the site's request for FY 1999 will be, based on preliminary numbers.

Mr. Buice explained the various Environmental Management (EM) Program activities, such as Environmental Restoration; High Level Waste; Nuclear Materials Stabilization; Spent Nuclear Fuel; Reactor, Facility Deactivation and Heavy Water; Solid Waste Management, and Infrastructure. In a comparison of FY 1997, FY 1998, and FY 1999, Mr. Buice showed that the site budget will remain somewhat constant at about \$1.4 billion per year with a peak in FY 1999 at \$1.495 billion. Mr. Mackey asked for an explanation of the privatization for the Spent Nuclear Fuel Transfer and Storage Facility. Mr. Buice explained that privatization is a new approach for DOE for funding some facilities. This project originally was to be a line item, beginning in FY 1998. However, by privatizing this facility, DOE can contract with a private company to build and operate the facility onsite. DOE will not pay for the construction; the contractor will pay the upfront cost of building the facility. However, once the facility is operating, the contractor will charge a fee to transfer and store DOE's spent nuclear fuel. This fee will allow the contractor to recoup his investment, pay his operating expenses, and allow for a profit. This process will allow contractors to become more innovative and become more cost efficient. Ms. Smith asked if the DOE Orders and requirements are what is driving the costs up, why not re-evaluate some of

these orders and requirements. Mr. Spears told the group that DOE is challenging its orders and requirements and trying to find the best way to operate its facilities.

In response to his questions, Mr. Mackey was told that the contractor would be allowed some flexibility in the scope of work and that there has been no design work yet. The design will be left to the contractor once the scope is defined and Congress approves of the project. Clay Jones explained that this same concept is being used at SRS now with a private contractor vitrifying some radioactive sludge. The contractor had some problems with his melter and he will have to fund the project until he gets it to work. This is a savings for the taxpayer in that they are not funding the extra work to get the melter to work properly.

Mr. Buice explained that Program Direction is the money necessary to pay for the DOE employees to provide oversight to the Management and Operating (M&O) Contractor. This pays for their salaries, benefits, travel, training, etc. Someone asked if the funding would stay level beyond the year 2000; Mr. Buice said that the EM Program assumed level funding beyond 2000.

Mr. Buice then reviewed some major highlights of the EM Program. He explained that the site fully complies with regulatory requirements with its Environmental Restoration work on site cleanup, removal and vitrification of high level liquid waste, and treatment, storage, and disposal of sanitary, hazardous, and low level radioactive waste. SRS will continue progress on its commitments to the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board to stabilize and safely store nuclear materials and the site will meet all tritium recycle requirements and new tritium source milestones. Mr. Buice went on to explain that SRS will provide for spent nuclear fuel receipt and management, prepare transuranic waste for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, and sustain essential infrastructure and support activities. In discussing site budget issues, Mr. Buice explained that in FY 1998 SRS work scope will be delayed or changed if the \$80 million of "plus-ups" do not materialize. He went on to explain that if the site is unable to develop \$115 million improvements in FY 1998, more workscope could be cut. He also said that there may be some layoffs of federal employees, depending on the results of the joint conference committee involving both houses in Congress. Mr. Mackey asked if any federal employees were being encouraged to take an "early out". For example, Mr. Mackey said that the Navy is offering \$25,000 to federal employees who decide to leave voluntarily. Mr. Buice explained that a financial incentive was offered to DOE employees and only 20 employees elected to retire or leave the site.

Mr. Buice also explained that in FY 1999 there is a \$53 million shortfall. Someone asked if foreign countries are paying us for the receipt and management of their spent nuclear fuel. Mr. Buice explained that developed countries are paying for the United States to manage their spent nuclear fuel, but that under-developed countries are not able to pay for this. Mr. Buice concluded his presentation by reviewing the current schedule for the budget and Accelerating Cleanup: Focus on 2006. He noted that there will be several opportunities for stakeholders to become involved in either plan. The next version of the 2006 Plan will be issued in February, not October as originally planned and that there will be a public comment period until May 1, 1998.

Ms. Smith thanked Mr. Buice for his presentation and asked Gail Jernigan to make note of the dates for public comment on the 2006 Plan for the Risk Management and Future Use

Subcommittee. She also reminded participants to send comments on the draft SRS Strategic Plan and draft FS Management Implementation Plan to Ms. Jernigan.

The meeting was then adjourned.

NOTE: To save costs for duplicating and mailing, handouts from the meeting will no longer be included in the distribution of the meeting notes. If you wish to have a copy of any of the handouts, please contact Gail Jernigan at 952-6969 or 800-249-8155.