



SRS Citizens Advisory Board

Risk Management Working Group

Meeting Record

May 12, 1998

Holley House Aiken in SC

The Risk Management Working Group of the Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on May 12, 1998 at 6:00 p.m. at the Holley House in Aiken, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to set objectives and direction of the Risk Management Working Group. The members of the CAB in attendance were P. K. Smith, Karen Patterson, Wade Waters, Jimmy Mackey and Barbara Murphy. Other members of the public in attendance were Lee Poe and George Minot. Todd Crawford attended as the technical representative to the CAB. Mike Schoener attended as the CAB facilitator. Gary Little from the Department of Energy Savannah River Operations Office (DOE-SR) attended as the Associated Deputy Designated Federal Official. Members of the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) were Laurie Hunt, Jeff Crane, and Ken Feely. Members of the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) were Jennifer Hughes and Alan Collum. Members of the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) were Lynn Waishwell and Lynne Fahey McGrath. Members of DOE-SR in attendance were Virginia Kay and Jerry Nelsen. Bill Rajczak attended as a member of Bechtel Savannah River Inc (BSRI). Jim Moore attended as a member of the Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC).

P. K. Smith, Chairperson of the RM&FU Subcommittee, welcomed all in attendance and asked each one to introduce themselves. Ms. Smith then introduced Mike Schoener of MAS Consultants Inc. as the facilitator for the meeting.

Mike Schoener stated that the purpose of the meeting would be to try to get the Risk Management Working Group up and running and functional. Mr. Schoener stated that the agenda for the meeting would be to accomplish the following:

- Determine the mission/purpose of the working group.
- Determine the specific goals/objectives of the working group.
- Establish working group organizational structure
 - working group leader
 - subgroups, subgroup membership, and subgroup leaders
- Identify barriers, limits and/or restrictions.
- Identify resource requirements.
- Determine if additional training is necessary.
- Establish plan, schedule/milestones and deliverables.
- Define near-term path forward.

It was decided that before an attempt was made to define the mission, that the objectives of the working group should be defined. The following strawman objectives were presented to the group:

- Define risk
- Determine how risk is defined and determined per program
- Determine the analysis/model/process used to determine risk per program
- Identify how risk is defined/determined at other sites
- Review risk information available off-site (CRESP, Center on Risk Excellence)
- Determine how risk verses compliance is balanced on the integrated priority list
- Recommend methods of risk communication
- Recommend how SRS could improve their risk management process

Discussions on the various objectives brought out the following questions, concerns and comments:

What are the differences between the Working Group and the Subcommittee itself? Need to know how programs do risk so the group knows how they do as a whole. Understand differences in risk between programs. How programs arrive at risk? Include DP program. Consider the broadest spectrum of how risk is evaluated and feeds activities that go on. Total SRS budget is based on risk based assessments. Review how risk methodologies are developed/performed by program and review results. Integrated Priority List (IPL) is not based solely on risk. There are many definitions of risk, including human health, but not narrowed to human health. Want to include the IPL because it is one of the areas we budget. Want to understand how the programs define risk so can understand how a seepage basin can be considered a high risk site and yet a high level waste tank can be considered a low risk site. Communications of risk to the public is an integral part of the CAB. Understand how SRS uses risk to make decisions. Important in the growth process to see how others do risk. May like other risk analysis better than ours. Determine how risk is applied verses compliance and other factors. CAB as a whole, doesn't understand risk. Must educate CAB on risk. Add goal: Educate and provide information to the CAB. Become experts on risk to report back to the CAB. Members of other Subcommittees will take information on risk back to their Subcommittee. What are the lead agencies trying to communicate? How can the lead agencies improve?

Based on the above, the working group agreed on the following objectives:

- Define risk.
- Determine how risk is defined and determined per Program.
- Determine the analysis/model/process used to determine risk per Program.
- Identify how risk is defined/determined at other sites.
- Review risk information available off-site (CRESP, Center on Risk Excellence).
- Determine how risk is balanced with other factors in making decisions.
- Recommend improvements in risk communications.
- Recommend improvements in the risk management process.
- Recommend and provide information to the Citizens Advisory Board.

Once the objectives were set, Mr. Schoener asked each member to prioritize each objective so that they could prioritize the objectives as a group. Each member was to vote A= High, B=

Medium and C= Low on each objective. Based on the vote, the priority of the objectives are as follows:

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| - Define risk. | A= High |
| - Determine how risk is defined and determined per Program. | A= High |
| - Recommend improvements in risk communications | A= High |
| - Determine how risk is balanced with other factors in making decisions. | A/B=High/Med |
| - Determine the analysis/model/process used to determine risk per Program. | B=Med. |
| - Review risk information available off-site (CRESP, Center on Risk Excellence). | B=Med. |
| - Identify how risk is defined/determined at other sites. | C= Low |
| - Recommend improvements in the risk management process. | C= Low |
| - Recommend and provide information to the Citizens Advisory Board. | |

Mr. Schoener asked if it was possible to write a mission statement from the objectives. It was decided that they should wait on the mission statement until there is a better understanding of the details of the working group.

Mr. Schoener stated that the next activity would be to set up the organizational structure. Mr. Schoener asked if the working group wanted to stay together as one group or split up into several sub groups? After much discussion, it was a consensus that the group should stay together to define risk. This would allow all to be on the same level when the group splits up. It was agreed that Lynn Waishwell and Lynne McGrath of CRESP would try to find someone from CRESP to come down to give a presentation to the group on an overview, basic definition of risk. It was also requested that the presentation be video taped to send to those members that may not be able to make the presentation.

Laurie Hunt suggested that each member of the working group write up five (5) questions that they would like to know about risk. She felt that by knowing what the members were expecting from the risk presentation, whoever was developing the presentation would have a better understanding of how to present risk. All members were to send their questions to Lynn Waishwell and/or Jim Moore via e-mail, FAX or a phone call by May 18.

The next meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, June 16. Location to be determined.

P. K. Smith suggested that Jim Moore re-write the objectives based on the changes made and send them out to all the members. The members will write down their personal priority of the objectives and send them back to Mr. Moore so a strawman of the sub groups of the working group can be developed before the next meeting. It was suggested that this be sent out electronically.

Lee Poe recommended that a short summary in plain English be written of the various fundamentals of risk as used at the site and as defined by CRESP, EPA and SCDHEC. He stated

that this would be nice to have before the next meeting.

When asked about the chairpersons expectation of the deliverables from the working group, P. K. Smith responded that she felt the working group should be driven by the concern of members of the working group. Ms. Smith said that she was very interested in bringing the CAB up to speed as it relates to risk.

Mr. Poe asked for a schedule or list of SRS deliverables with dates, such as the ACP and Integrated Priority List, so that the working group would have some idea of timing to address milestones and meet SRS deliverables.

P. K. Smith asked Lynn Waishwell of CRESPP to inform the working group on the work that CRESPP has been doing on risk at SRS. Ms. Waishwell first talked about the telephone survey that CRESPP did on risk communication. She stated that they contacted various sources both upstream and down stream of the site. The survey addressed questions such as, can you get sick from eating fish? They also asked if they knew about the risk from eating fish. Ms. Waishwell stated that a draft copy of the study could be sent to anyone requesting it. Ms. Smith then stated that Ms. Waishwell and Lynne McGrath were at the site several weeks ago to review the sites risk assessment and communications. Ms. Waishwell stated that they had a paper due on June 15. Ms. Waishwell said that they were doing some homework to prepare for the working group. She stated that she concentrated on the risk communications at the site while Ms. McGrath concentrated on the risk assessments. She stated that their study was not all inclusive. Ms. Waishwell stated that there were different goals and lots of methods used on the site. She said they were building a database on what was being done, but she said there were no surprises. Ms. McGrath stated that the term risk was used fast and furious at the site, but that the term sometimes meant hazard instead of risk. Ms. McGrath stated that there needed to be some more discussions with the agencies involved. She stated that the agencies were coming up with different answers because they were using different limits when interpreting issues. Their presentation emphasized the need for the working group to get started. Ms. Smith asked Ms. Waishwell for a written summary report to share with the group.

Ms. Smith asked if there were any other comments. Mr. Ken Feely of the EPA stated that he felt it was important for the working group to have a clear understanding of the classical CERCLA process as opposed to how others look at risk. He stated that there was a fine line between risk and hazard and it was important. Ms. Smith stated that we may want EPA to give a presentation at a later date. Mr. George Minot was concerned about the publics recommendations being ignored. He stated that dollars should be applied to getting rid of hazards not keeping jobs or political agendas. Mr. Minot said that the public was interested in communicating hazard and risk. Mr. Jerry Nelsen, DOE-SR, said that he would like to be a part of the working group.

P. K. Smith thanked everyone for there comments and attending the meeting. Ms. Smith then adjourned the meeting.

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