



## **SRS Citizens Advisory Board**

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

#### **Meeting Summary**

July 12, 1999  
Holley House Inn  
Aiken, SC

---

The Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Risk Management and Future Use (RM&FU) Subcommittee met on Monday, July 12, 6:00 p.m. at the Holley House Inn, Aiken, S.C. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the budget update for fiscal year (FY) 1999, 2000 and 2001, the Comprehensive Plan, the Long Term Stewardship, the Risk Management Working Group Team B – Risk Communications – report, the Transportation Workshop Statements and receive public comment. Those in attendance were:

#### CAB Members

P.K Smith  
Wade Waters  
Jimmy Mackey

#### Stakeholders

Jerry Devitt  
Russ Messick  
Jack Hayes  
Sam Booher  
Gail Jernigan  
Lee Poe  
Sandra Threatt, DHEC  
Mike French

#### DOE/Contractors

Charles Borup, DOE  
Steve Baker, DOE  
Don Scott, DOE  
Jerry Nelsen, DOE  
Joan Bozzone, DOE  
Mary Flora, WSRC  
Chris Barton, SRI  
Robert Meadors, WSRC  
Chris Noah, WSRC  
Jim Moore, WSRC

P. K. Smith, Co-Chair, welcomed those in attendance and asked them to introduce themselves. Ms. Smith reviewed the agenda and then introduced the first speaker, Steve Baker, DOE, for a budget review.

Mr. Baker reviewed the Environmental Management (EM) funding for the years FY 1999, FY 2000 and FY 2001 which were \$1.2 billion, \$1.2 billion, and \$1.4 billion, respectively. He stated the original EM budget submittal for FY 2001 was \$1.5 billion. Mr. Baker reviewed the projects where funding was reduced to meet the \$1.4 billion budget. He also reviewed the major projects the budget would fund. Mr. Baker stated that with reprogramming, SRS projects would be able to be funded in FY 1999 and FY 2000. In FY 2001, DOE-HQ would have to commit to an additional \$170 million to meet the SRS objectives. He said that DOE-HQ seems committed to meet this addition at this time. Some questions and answers related to the presentation are as follows:

- Question: Is the plutonium mission including Mixed Oxide Fuel (MOX) included in the FY 2001 budget?  
Answer: No. When the plutonium missions are assigned to the site, then dollars would be allocated to the site.
- Question: Lee Poe was concerned what the 30% cut in budget would do to the Alternate Salt budget. He was concerned that this cut would mean a significant delay in schedule.

Answer: Mr. Baker stated that the department felt the \$67M requested in the FY01 budget submittal was sufficient to cover FY01 Alternate Salt activities, and that we should all "stay tuned" for further developments.

- Sam Booher requested that a presentation on the "big picture" be presented to the citizens sometime when the DOE-HQ personnel were visiting SRS.

Ms. Smith introduced Chuck Borup, DOE, to speak on the Comprehensive Plan and Long Term Stewardship. Mr. Borup stated that the Comprehensive Plan guides the long-range site development based on strategic goals and objectives similar to local government comprehensive plans. The Comprehensive Plan gives an integrated in-depth view of the site over a 50-year time frame. Mr. Borup reviewed the purpose of the various chapters. He stated that chapter five consolidates and integrates the information contained in the first four chapters. He stated if someone could only read one chapter, chapter five was the chapter to read.

- Question: Lee Poe requested that since this was the first time the public was involved in the Comprehensive Plan, that the message needed to get out to a larger public group. He requested a public meeting on the Comprehensive Plan be set up with the press involved.

Answer: Mr. Borup stated that a public meeting was possible. They would pursue that avenue.

F or Long Term Stewardship (LTS), Mr. Borup stated this was a DOE-HQ initiative. It would include from cleanup to stewardship and was not a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document. It would include the protection of people and the environment by physical and institutional controls. A draft of the LTS would be developed in one year and would be based on the Paths to Closure document. Greg Rudy will formally approve this document. (NOTE: It was pointed out after the meeting that Mr. Rudy would sign the Comprehensive Plan. However, the LTS is a DOE-HQ document and will go through appropriate reviews and concurrence at SRS.)

Ms. Smith asked Jimmy Mackey to present the Risk Management Working Group Team B – Risk Communications – report. Mr. Mackey, Team B Lead, reviewed the objective of the team as well as the team members who participated. He stated there were two significant points which were (1) when talking about risk, the uncertainties should be stressed and (2) companies should get away from the idea they can't talk to the public. The recommendations from Team B were in two areas, SRS improvement actions and CAB improvement actions.

SRS improvement actions were as follows:

- SRS should develop a formal plan to communicate with down stream population regarding risk SRS poses to the Savannah River. The plan should include information exchanges and various methods of communication.
- SRS summarize for the CAB any events that may have resulted in courtesy notifications to offsite regulatory agencies or emergency preparedness authorities.
- SRS emphasize to all CAB presenters that the CAB has an ongoing interest in receiving information about risk.

CAB improvement actions were as follows:

- CAB designate a member or members to serve as spokespersons for the CAB on specific site topics with the names provided to the news media.
- CAB develop a media packet to be provided and available at CAB meetings.
- Individual CAB members, on limited occasion, write letters to the editor, or opinion columns addressing issues of risk from the perspective of a CAB member.

Some questions, answers and comments were as follows:

- Comment: Mr. Waters stated that one question that did not get answered from Team B to his satisfaction was the role of the CAB in risk communication.
- Question: Concerned that CAB members were not qualified to speak for SRS. Answer: Mr. Mackey stated that some of the members on Team B had the same concern. They stated that on the highly technical issues, the CAB members would not address those issues they did not understand or were not qualified to answer.
- Comment: The difficulty in benchmarking other industries is real and significant. It should be presented in a positive way for SRS. SRS does an excellent job in being open with their information and that should be presented in a positive light.

Ms. Smith reviewed the Transportation Statements. She stated that the Transportation Workshop developed the Transportation Statements. Each group took two statements, reviewed them, took them back to the full group, discussed them, took them back to the individual small group again and then took them back to the full group. The Transportation Workshop leaders were requesting that the individual CABs review the statements and respond as to whether they agreed with the statement or did not agree. They were requested not to make changes in the statements. Ms. Smith read the first statement.

Comments related to Statement #1 were:

- Don't understand the model or comprehensive risk.

Comments related to Statement #3 were:

- The federal government has rules, why don't the states comply?
- If I were a governor, I wouldn't support the statement just because the members of the Transportation Workshop agree with it.
- Not sure the CAB has a place in this discussion.
- Too vague to be statements of effect.
- If states don't support, the statements won't help.
- Why are they writing these statements when the nuclear industry is shipping material on a daily basis? Why not ship the way they are?
- Don't see classification mentioned in any of these statements. Therefore, the statements are not complete.

It was felt that enough information was not available to vote on the statements. It was requested that the trip reports be sent to the members present so they could understand the statements better.

Ms. Smith asked anyone who had comments on the statements to send them to her. She would make sure the CAB received their comments when she made the presentation to the CAB.

Ms. Smith asked if there was any public comment. Since there was none, Ms. Smith adjourned the meeting.

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