



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee

### **Meeting Record**

**March 31, 1998**

**North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, SC**

---

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on March 31, 1998 at 6:30 p.m. at the North Augusta Community Center, N. Augusta, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to review the Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure and the National and Regional trip reports. The members of the CAB in attendance were P. K. Smith and Wade Waters. Members of the public in attendance were Bill Rajczak, Martha Ebra, Sam Booher, Bill McDonell, Bill Pitka, Jennifer Hughes, Mike French, Todd Crawford and Murray Riley. Gary Little from the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office (DOE-SR) attended as the Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. DOE-SR attendees were Jim Buice, Don Scott and Steve Baker. The Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) attendees were Matt Zimmerman, Mary Flora and Jim Moore.

P. K. Smith, Chairperson, welcomed those in attendance and introduced the first presenter, Jim Buice, DOE-SR. Jim Buice stated that instead of doing a formal presentation, they would sit at the table and be informal. He felt that this format would give everyone a greater opportunity to talk and interact. Mr. Buice introduced Matt Zimmerman, WSRC, Don Scott, DOE-SR, and Steve Baker, DOE-SR. He stated that this group was basically responsible for developing the Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure (ACP) and would help in answering any questions from the group.

Mr. Buice stated that they would address the CAB Recommendation #41 which were the CAB's comments to the Draft ACP. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the first slide on the handout gives the location of the "Responsiveness Summary" in the National and Site ACP. Mr. Buice stated that the CAB's concern about Item #1 in the Recommendation, Contingency Plans, considered two issues, optimistic results and operation of aged facilities. Mr. Buice said the optimistic results are addressed in the current ACP by considering only those cost efficiencies they think they can actually attain and schedules that are conservative. It was asked if anyone had seen 60 Minutes concerning Hanford high level waste tank program and groundwater contamination. Based on the problem at Hanford, it was stated that we don't have a problem at SRS. Discussions proceeded concerning the pumping of wells, glass vitrification and the ground water levels at Hanford. It was asked if SRS had any leaking tanks? Todd Crawford mentioned that Tank 16 had a small leak that ran into the saucer shaped container surrounding the tank. Mary Flora stated that there was a transfer line back in 1989 or 1990 which had a leak, but they caught it quickly and removed the soil. Mr. Buice said that SRS is in competition with other sites for funding and the Hanford problem could impact SRS. It was stated that on 60 Minutes it was reported that the

pump and treat method of treating the ground water was not working at Hanford. Mr. Zimmerman said he felt that was because of the large plume and the depth of the groundwater at Hanford versus SRS. There was a concern that DOE-HQ did not accept the first item on the recommendation of CAB, the contingency plan. Mr. Zimmerman stated that there were more issues than funding. He said that DOE-HQ admitted there was a problem also. In an effort to help resolve the problem, he said that DOE-HQ is now more willing to discuss moving funds. He said DOE-HQ got rid of the stove pipe arrangements. Mr. Zimmerman said that within the funding source, it is easier to re-apply funding. He also said that DOE-HQ is more willing to go back to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Congress to get funding. Mr. Zimmerman stated that there was a refining of the categories for the priority list to give it more credibility. He said that some projects are now breaking out their funding to better show the compliance piece versus the safety and operation piece. Mr. Zimmerman said that there use to be seven sources of funding in the Environmental Management program and now there are two, excluding technology. The sources of funding are broken down into (1) activities prior to Fiscal Year 2006 and (2) activities after Fiscal Year 2006. This method of funding is new this year. Mr. Zimmerman said that DOE-HQ is more willing to shift funding between sites. He felt DOE-HQ is closer to putting a contingency plan together. It was asked what type of approval is needed to change the funding within the source. Mr. Zimmerman stated that it is a local decision, DOE-SR only needs to inform DOE-HQ. Mr. Buice stated that while there is no contingency plan, that this is an interim process. If the assumptions don't hold then the strategy will be revised. It was asked how SRS could continue to meet compliance with continued reduction in funding? Mr. Zimmerman stated that we have a commitment to meet the agreements, however, safety is first. He stated in the eight categories, that compliance is now third. He stated that risk is looked at as "acceptable risk". Mr. Zimmerman stated that compliance will not jeopardize safety. Mr. Zimmerman stated that at one time mortgage reduction was high on the list of categories, it is now on the bottom. It was asked how is DOE accountable in meeting it's goals. Mr. Zimmerman stated that it starts with the Project Managers. He said they sign a commitment and from there it goes up the line to Greg Rudy, DOE-SR Operations Manager. It continues up the line until the Secretary of Energy signs a performance agreement with the President of the United States. For clarification, Mary Flora stated that there was no one single outside agency that monitored the work. Mr. Buice stated that we are committed to the regulatory milestones as well as there being an award fee item. It was requested that the Subcommittee move on to item 6 in the Recommendation.

Concern was expressed about whether privatization would remain under DOE standards. Mr. Buice stated that privatization would remain under DOE standards. Mary Flora stated that the public will be involved in the privatization process. She stated an example was the Consolidated Incinerator Facility. Once the public and the regulators shot down the privatization issue, it was not pursued. A question was asked related to following DOE orders versus not having DOE orders. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the Program Managers were asked what scope of work they did involving only DOE orders. The answer was, not much. There is very little DOE order driven activity. About 94 percent of the budget is driven not only by DOE orders, but by other federal, state and local regulations and other outside agencies.

It was noted that about 6 pages of the same information was in the National and Site ACP. Mr. Zimmerman explained that the cause was due to working on both ACP's in parallel. In addition,

both ACPs talk about the same thing. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the ACP's were in a development stage and there should be changes next year. It was noted that there were differences in the Landlord ending date for the site. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the difference was due to funding levels. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the Environmental Management Program was responsible for the site until year 2028 while the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control had responsibility until year 2038. It was noted that the difference was not recorded in the write up in the ACP.

It was asked if the site would remain under DOE control whenever the Environmental Management program was completed? It was thought that the Landlord might be the National Research Wildlife Park after Environmental Management. It was asked if the National Research Wildlife Park was under DOE? It was also asked if the National Environmental Research Park designation would continue? The status of the endangered species was questioned once the Landlord changes. The answers to the above questions were not known. Mr. Buice said that we would have to get back to the Subcommittee with those answers.

It was acknowledged that item three and four in the recommendation, containment of executive summaries and final end states respectively, was completed satisfactory. It was noted that words may need to be added on how accountability of the program is handled. In addition, it was noted that there are a lot of plans out there and keeping track of all of them can get confusing. Mr. Zimmerman noted that by trying to integrate the cross cutting issues across the complex, makes the ACP more complex and sometimes hard to follow. Mr. Buice stated that now that there is a better understanding of the components of the ACP, a linkage needs to be shown. Mr. Zimmerman stated that the ACP does link to the strategic plans. It was asked if by reading the Site ACP, was there any benefit in reading the National ACP? Mr. Buice stated that by reviewing the National ACP, you could see how the Site fits into the national picture. He said it would also give you a cross site integration, i.e., it would show how the site supports closure of Rocky Flats.

It was asked if in item #8 in the Recommendation, there was an effort to show recognition of the probability of Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) having regulatory oversight? Mr. Zimmerman stated that no, it had not been considered since that is a "what if" option. He stated that it was felt that there would not be much of a difference in the laws or the funding. Mary Flora stated that a group is looking into the effects of NRC regulatory oversight. She stated there were two pilot projects, the first one at Los Alamos. Ms. Flora said they will try to get a report from Los Alamos to see the results.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that items 9, 10 and 11 were all lapped together since they all related to integration across the complex. It was stated that there was a National Meeting in Dallas and a Regional Meeting in Knoxville in which the stakeholders participated. In addition, a workshop is planned in June and a Low Level Waste Forum is planned in August. In addition, on March 30th, DOE-HQ made several presentations to the National Governors' Association. It was noted that equity is going to be a big issue.

P. K. Smith stated that this would be a good opportunity for her to speak on the meetings she had attended, both in Dallas and in Knoxville. She stated that in Knoxville it was a cross site/cross section pilot meeting in which those who came brought their issues and basically asked DOE-HQ

what they were going to do about the issues. Ms. Smith thought that the meeting was not very productive.

P. K. Smith said the meeting in Dallas was more focused and with a smaller group. The two major items discussed at the meeting were the Environmental Management Budgets and 2006 Plan and Transportation. In addition, each site gave a presentation on their Boards top issues. Out of this meeting came the proposal for a Low Level Waste Transportation Forum. The forum will include those sites shipping or receiving Low Level Waste. The forum has been moved to the fall of this year. Ms. Smith said that she felt that the national integrated meetings should have smaller focused objectives. She felt in order to accomplish anything you had to start small. It was asked if all citizens were invited? Ms. Smith answered yes. Ms. Smith said that the sites have done a good job of including citizens in their decisions but it has been slower on the national scale. It was asked how big the DOE-HQ staff was at the meeting? Ms. Smith answered that the staff participation was not large, but that Al Alm did attend and listened. It was suggested that satellite hook up is a possibility and we should not lose site of that tool. Mary Flora mentioned that the Low Level Waste Forum is scheduled for August. Ms. Flora stated that the sites were asked for input into the June workshop and we submitted some comments. One comment is that the meeting should not spend much time on discussing perspectives. It is felt that they already should have that information and should send it out ahead of the meeting. It was asked how many people would be in the delegation attending the June meeting? Ms. Flora said that had not been determined yet. Mr. Buice stated that there was a lot going on and that maybe we should develop a list of activities and when they were happening. It was asked if the last National ACP addressed the Environmental Management Integration Plan. Ms. Flora said yes it did, but it had to be updated to correct the disconnects. Ms. Flora said that the comments from the citizens were incredibly valuable.

It was mentioned that item #7, reducing risk is a top priority, in the Recommendation was addressed loud and clear. Mr. Buice stated that DOE-HQ was very serious about reducing risk. He stated that as the funding/assumptions/decisions change, the ACP will be updated each year. He stated that the ACP is a guiding document for DOE-HQ.

P. K. Smith requested comments on the ACP be sent in by April 15 to give time to place them into a format to be addressed at the next meeting. Ms. Smith stated that the Subcommittee needed to have their comments to DOE-HQ by May 1. She stated that the comments will be sent to the CAB at their meeting on May 19 as a proposed recommendation. Ms. Smith mentioned that it would be beneficial for Mr. Buice or a member of his group to attend the next meeting in order to answer any questions. Ms. Smith stated that the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for either April 21 or April 23. She stated that a notice of the meeting will be distributed. Ms. Smith stated that comments can either be sent to Gary Little, Jim Moore, or herself.

P. K. Smith opened the meeting for public comment. Sam Booher thanked P. K. Smith for the opportunity to speak. Mr. Booher stated that he had two comments. The first comment was to note that he had met with individuals developing the Future Use Plan concerning the renaming of the Buffer Zone around the site to the Industrial Support Zone. He stated that his issues were all ironed out. His second comment was related to the Wetlands Mitigation Bank. He was concerned that the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) had been signed by everyone concerned in 1996

without anyone from the public looking at it. He stated that it is at the point of implementation and the public was not involved. Mary Flora pointed out to Mr. Booher that there was a meeting in January on the subject but Mr. Booher was not at the meeting. Mr. Booher said that was correct, he could not make the meeting and that it was only because of the announcement of the meeting that he knew about the Wetlands Mitigation Bank project. Mr. Booher stated that the ball was dropped on this one. Ms. Flora requested that Mr. Booher write down his concerns and they would get them to the responsible party. Mr. Booher suggested that a meeting be set up with those individuals involved and he would come to the Site to give his input. Ms. Flora agreed that a meeting will be set up and we will let Mr. Booher know the timing and location of the meeting.

P. K. Smith asked if there were any other public comments. There being none, she adjourned the meeting.

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