

Summary Notes – August 15, 2017  
 Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB)  
 Strategic & Legacy Management (SLM) Committee Meeting

The SLM Committee held a meeting on Tuesday, August 15, 2017, from 4:30 – 6:20 pm, at the Department of Energy Meeting Center in Aiken, SC. It was also streamed online via YouTube and posted to the CAB website and YouTube channel. The purpose of this meeting was to receive updates on the Point of Contact status. There was also time set aside for committee discussion and public comments.

Attendees:

<u>CAB:</u> Gil Allensworth Dawn Gillas Eleanor Hopson Daniel Kaminski Cathy Patterson Earl Sheppard Bob Smith Nina Spinelli Joyce Underwood	<u>DOE/Contractors/Others:</u> Avery Hammett, DOE-SR James Tanner, S&K Federica Staton, S&K Chelsea Gitzen, S&K	<u>Agency Liaisons:</u> None  <u>Stakeholders:</u> None
---	---	---

Committee Welcome: Bob Doerr, SLM Chair

CAB member Doerr welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Point of Contact Status Update: Zachary Todd, DOE-SR

Mr. Todd gave a status update on the current government/SRS/DOE budget which is still pending approval.

Q&A Session

CAB member Vovakes asked if Mr. Todd could comment on the FY 19 budget, which he responded that he could not.

DOE Response: Recommendation #343 SRS Strategic Plan

CAB member Doerr opened up discussion on this response and noted that DOE accepted recommendations one and two.

CAB member Hoel asked if SRS is supposed to update the strategic plan every five years, which CAB member Vovakes answered that the next update is in February 2018 because of the recent president election. Mr. Todd answered that yes, they try to do it every five years. CAB member Hoel asked when it was last updated, to which Mr. Todd responded that it was five years ago.

CAB member Hoel noted that recommendation response to number two was not clear – and asked if they wanted the CAB or public to provide comment. Jack Craig, DOE-SR site manager, responded that both were preferred and the CAB CRO may have a public meeting about it.

A motion was made to forward this response to the full board for approval, which was seconded and passed through a vote.

DOE Response: Recommendation #344 Prescribed Fires

CAB member Doerr read the response to this recommendation.

CAB member Hoel noted that when he used to work for DOE he can attest that they won't know from one day to the next (referencing recommendation response number two) because of a number of variables, so he is not surprised by their response.

A motion was made and seconded to forward this response to the full board, which was passed after a vote.

Draft Recommendation: SRS Pension Budget Line Item

CAB member Allensworth read this draft recommendation entirely. He displayed a graphic including figures from DOE-SR and his own estimations to depict current and future contributions to the pension budget.

CAB member French noted there is a real difficulty to meet the full funding needs for processing nuclear materials and the pension. He further noted that there's no clear answer.

CAB member Allensworth noted that EM mission dollars are at risk and those missions are critical. He also noted that retirees deserve their pension and shouldn't have to deal with a pension cut – there are people still working who depend on it.

CAB member French noted that if the pension funding was created under its own PBS, it would leave that PBS vulnerable as a target [which could be eliminated from the budget immediately or in years to come].

CAB member Allensworth agreed with CAB member French and further noted that SRS is the only EM site with this problem. His desire as he explained it, is to put a spotlight on it so DOE-SR can go about fixing this problem.

Jack Craig, DOE-SR site manager, noted that he had no objections to these recommendations. He noted that future years' budgets are just guesses. He also noted that there is a board of directors who make decisions on the pension, and there are penalties for going under 80%, but no law requirements as CAB members had asked about.

CAB member French noted that when a payment is calculated to go towards the pension it's based on return of investment. CAB member Allensworth further noted that since this is a private plan it'll fall under new Department of Labor rules – DOL decides who pays penalties for going under 80%. CAB member French continued by stating that more details are needed in order to understand better how to solve this issue – maybe in a separate work group.

CAB member Hoel asked if past recommendations were looked through in order to create this recommendation, to which CAB member Allensworth replied he did not. CAB member Hoel noted that a reference should be made to how DOE funded the pension at minimum levels in years prior, leading to this crisis. CAB member Allensworth stated he was not going to point fingers, this is a mistake that companies and government entities everywhere have made.

CAB member Spinelli suggested the creation of a work group should be left to CAB member Allensworth, and she noted she does not know if a work group would be a good use of the CAB's time. CAB member French responded that it could allow the CAB to understand assumptions and how to balance this budget issue with not impacting the EM mission.

CAB member Kaminski noted that if a past recommendation was created with regards to this issue, it failed because this pension is government funded and a privately funded pension would lose public support. He noted he had three different pensions which were completely dissolved from the private sector. He further noted that the public doesn't get tax money for pension funding in the private sector. He also suggested that speaking in absolutes should be avoided because it is unreasonable. Lastly, he noted there are a lot of great points to this recommendation.

CAB member French stated that pensioners look to the company to make them whole in the private sector, and DOE looks to the government which makes this a unique situation.

CAB member Vovakes noted that usually the risk is all on the employee, and in this case it's all on the employer.

CAB member Sheppard asked how many people are affected by these numbers. Mr. Craig replied that it is about 8,000-9,000 who have retired, about 4,000 who are currently working on site and have not retired yet, and any employee after 2008 received a 401K.

Mr. Tanner suggested asking for an Ad Hoc committee to be formed during the September full board meeting. CAB member Allensworth asked if this committee would meet ongoing or as needed, to which Mr. Tanner replied it would be ongoing if need be based on a pre-determined output. CAB member Spinelli asked if this would need to be in writing, to which Mr. Tanner responded that it would, which would be presented to the rest of the CAB at the September full board meeting. CAB member Allensworth offered to write it.

CAB member Doerr asked for a motion for a proposal for this Ad Hoc committee to be created, which was made, seconded and passed with a vote.

#### Public Comment

No members of the public came forward for the public comment period.

~Meeting Adjourned