



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

### **Risk Management and Future Use Subcommittee**

#### **Meeting Record**

March 22, 1999  
University of South Carolina - Aiken  
Aiken, S. C.

---

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on Monday, March 22, 7:30 p.m., at the University of South Carolina – Aiken (USC-A) campus, Aiken, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to review the letter of response to CAB Recommendation #58, review a new motion on the Defense Waste Processing Facility reduced canister production, have presentation on Environmental Management Integration (EMI), receive Risk Profiles and receive public comment. Attendance was as follows:

#### **CAB Members**

P.K. Smith  
Wade Waters  
Bill Adams  
Karen Patterson  
Barbara Murphy

#### **Stakeholders**

Mike French  
Lee Poe  
Clay Jones  
Gail Jernigan  
Thomas Rolka, DHEC  
W. T. Goldston  
Lynn Waishwell, CRESP  
Helen Villasor  
Martha Massey

#### **DOE/Contractors**

Dave Huizenga, DOE-HQ  
John Pescosolido, DOE  
Jim Buice, DOE  
Virginia Kay, DOE  
George Mishra, DOE  
Jim Moore, WSRC

P. K. Smith, Co-Chair, welcomed those in attendance and asked each of them to introduce themselves. Ms. Smith reviewed the agenda. The first item on the agenda was the letter the RM&FU Subcommittee was considering having Ann Loadholt, the CAB Chairperson, send to DOE-HQ on the DOE-HQ response to CAB Recommendation #58, Accelerating Cleanup: Paths to Closure. Ms. Smith asked if there were two members of the Subcommittee that could take five minutes each to explain the Subcommittee's concern to Dave Huizenga, DOE-HQ, and John Pescosolido, DOE-SR. Lee Poe and Mike French explained the subcommittee's concern with the following points:

- There was over a six months delay in receiving an answer from DOE-HQ.
- The answers from DOE-HQ were trite.
- The Paths to Closure (PtC) should include all of DOE, not just the Environmental Management (EM) portion.
- There is no activity on Deactivation, Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) in the PtC.
- DOE-HQ answered that D&D activity couldn't be projected in the PtC because end states hadn't been defined. However, in the Environmental Weapons Bulletin, it stated that the D&D effort would cost more than \$32 billion. The two answers don't compute.
- There were no contingency plans in the PtC.

Mr. Huizenga responded with the following points:

- He apologized if the Subcommittee didn't think they received appropriate answers and he would take the Subcommittee's concerns back to DOE-HQ and cover the correct individuals involved.
- The task of the PtC was a huge task. This was their first attempt to get their hands around it so no one should be surprised if there were some things missing in this first attempt.
- The PtC document is here to stay.
- The funding received by Hanford was from reprogramming at Hanford. The funding was not taken from any other site.

Ms. Smith and the entire Subcommittee thanked Mr. Huizenga for coming to Aiken to discuss the budget. They also thanked Mr. Huizenga and Mr. Pescosolido for stopping by the RM&FU Subcommittee to hear what they had to say.

Wade Waters, Co-chair, reviewed the motion, FY 2000 Budget for SRS. After much discussion, modifications were made to the motion and the Subcommittee voted to take it before the full CAB.

Ms. Smith introduced Virginia Kay, DOE, to review the Environmental Management Program Integration. Ms. Kay stated that the integration is a culture that EM has embraced. It uses a system engineering approach to analyze and develop cleanup alternatives against current baselines, which accomplish more and ultimately cost less. The benefits of complex wide integration are that it maximizes use of existing facilities, shares technical information, minimizes duplication, promotes cost savings and facilitates accelerated cleanup. The initial integration team came up with 23 recommendations. In mid-1998, a series of "round-robin" meetings was held with the Field Managers and DOE-HQ. From those meetings, 49 additional opportunities were identified. Ms. Kay reviewed the integration structure and process. There are 12 Program Area Integration Teams (PAITs) of which the SRS is the lead in two, Plutonium and Other Nuclear Materials and Environmental Restoration.

Ms. Kay handed out copies of the SRS Draft Risk Summary document prepared by the Center for Risk Excellence and DOE. The Draft Risk Summary document will be incorporated into the PtC. The draft is due to DOE-HQ on April 15. Ms. Kay requested that comments or concerns be forwarded to either Jim Moore or her by April 9. Copies of this document will be mailed to the members of the Risk Management Working Group and the CAB.

Ms. Smith asked if there were any public comments. Mike French asked when the Subcommittee would hear about the future missions. It was stated that efforts have been made to have a future use presentation in the near future.

With no other comments, Ms. Smith adjourned the meeting.

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