

# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board Monthly Meeting



**Wednesday, September 11, 2013**

6 p.m., DOE Information Center  
1 Science.gov Way  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

The mission of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) is to provide informed advice and recommendations concerning site specific issues related to the Department of Energy's (DOE's) Environmental Management (EM) Program at the Oak Ridge Reservation. In order to provide unbiased evaluation and recommendations on the cleanup efforts related to the Oak Ridge site, the Board seeks opportunities for input through collaborative dialogue with the communities surrounding the Oak Ridge Reservation, governmental regulators, and other stakeholders.

# CONTENTS

## AGENDA

PRESENTATION MATERIALS – Long-term Stewardship for the Oak Ridge Reservation –  
*to be distributed at meeting*

## CALENDARS

1. September
2. October (*draft*)

## BOARD MINUTES/RECOMMENDATIONS & MOTIONS

1. June 12, 2013, draft meeting minutes
2. Proposed Amendment to the ORSSAB bylaws

## REPORTS & MEMOS

1. Recommendation Tracking Chart
2. EM Projects Update for July/August
3. Abbreviations/Acronyms for EM Projects Update
4. FY 2013 Travel Opportunities
5. Summary of ORSSAB Annual Meeting
6. Trip Report – Corkie Staley, EPA Community Involvement Training Conference
7. Trip Report – Pete Osborne, EPA Community Involvement Training Conference



# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

## September 2013

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	2 Labor Day DOE/Staff holiday	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11 Monthly SSAB meeting 6 p.m.	12	13	14
15	16	17 Environmental Management & Stewardship Committee 5:30 p.m.	18	19	20	21
22	23	24 Public Outreach 5:30 p.m.	25 Finance & Process Committee 5 p.m.  Executive Committee 5:30 p.m.	26	27	28
29	30					

All Meetings will be held at the DOE Information Center, Office of Science and Technical Information, 1Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge unless noted otherwise.

**ORSSAB Support Office:** (865) 241-4583 or 241-4584      **DOE Information Center:** (865) 241-4780

**Board member travel:** A. Cook, RadWaste Summit, Las Vegas, Nev., Sept. 3-6

Board meetings on cable TV and YouTube	
<b>Knoxville:</b> Charter Channel 6, Comcast Channel 12	Sundays at 3 p.m.
<b>Lenoir City:</b> Charter Cable Channel 3	Wednesdays, 4 p.m.
<b>Oak Ridge:</b> Channel 12	Thursday, September 26, 9 p.m.
<b>Oak Ridge:</b> Channel 15	Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 8 a.m. & noon
<b>YouTube</b>	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB">http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB</a>



# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

## October 2013

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9 Monthly SSAB meeting 6 p.m.	10	11	12
13	14 Columbus Day Holiday DOE/Staff Holiday	15	EM SSAB Chairs' Meeting Portsmouth, Ohio		18	19
20	21	22 Public Outreach 5:30 p.m. teleconference	23 Finance & Process Committee 5 p.m.  Executive Committee 5:30 p.m.	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

All Meetings will be held at the DOE Information Center, Office of Science and Technical Information, 1Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge unless noted otherwise.

**Environmental Management & Stewardship Committee meeting to be determined.**

**ORSSAB Support Office:** (865) 241-4583 or 241-4584      **DOE Information Center:** (865) 241-4780

**Board member travel:** D. Hemelright, B. Hicks, EM SSAB Chairs' meeting October 15-17, Portsmouth, Ohio

Board meetings on cable TV and YouTube	
Knoxville: Charter Channel 6, Comcast Channel 12	Sundays at 3 p.m.
Lenoir City: Charter Cable Channel 3	Wednesdays, 4 p.m.
Oak Ridge: Channel 12	Thursday, September 26, 9 p.m.
Oak Ridge: Channel 15	Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 8 a.m. & noon
YouTube	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB">http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB</a>

DRAFT

*Many Voices Working for the Community*



# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

---

## Unapproved June 12, 2013 Meeting Minutes

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) held its monthly meeting on Wednesday, June 12, 2013, at the DOE Information Center, 1 Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge, Tenn., beginning at 6 p.m. A video of the meeting was made and may be viewed by contacting the ORSSAB support offices at (865) 241-4583 or 241-4584. The presentation portion of the video is available on the board's YouTube site at [www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB/videos](http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB/videos).

### Members Present

Jimmy Bell  
Lisa Hagy  
Gracie Hall<sup>1</sup>  
Bob Hatcher  
David Hemelright, Vice  
Chair  
Bruce Hicks

Howard Holmes  
Chuck Jensen, Secretary  
Jan Lyons  
David Martin, Chair  
Fay Martin  
Donald Mei  
Greg Paulus

Belinda Price  
Julia Riley<sup>1</sup>  
Coralie Staley  
Scott Stout  
Thomas Valunas

### Members Absent

Alfreda Cook  
Janet Hart<sup>2</sup>  
Jennifer Kasten  
Scott McKinney

<sup>1</sup>Student Representative

<sup>2</sup>Second consecutive absence

### Liaisons, Deputy Designated Federal Officer, and Federal Coordinator Present

Dave Adler, Liaison and Alternate Deputy Designated Federal Officer, Department of Energy-Oak Ridge Office (DOE-ORO)  
Susan Cange, DOE-ORO Deputy Manager for Environment Management (EM) and Deputy Designated Federal Officer  
Melyssa Noe, ORSSAB Federal Coordinator, DOE-ORO

### Others Present

Andy Binford, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC)  
Spencer Gross, ORSSAB Support Office  
Dale Rector, TDEC  
Jon Richards, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 4

Ten members of the public were present.

**Liaison Comments**

Mr. Adler – Mr. Adler explained that the original presentation scheduled for July was to have Dan Goode, U.S. Geological Survey, who is acting as a liaison to the board on the Groundwater Strategy Workshops, to provide a briefing to the board on the status of the workshops. The workshop schedule has fallen behind and Mr. Goode's travel has been impacted by the federal budget sequestration. Mr. Adler said it would be better to delay his presentation to late summer or early fall when the workshops have been completed and sequestration should be lifted by then.

He said that while the July board meeting has been cancelled, a July 10 training session for four new members will be conducted at the DOE Information Center.

Mr. Adler said a response is being prepared on Recommendation 215 on Remaining Legacy Materials on the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR).

Ms. Cange – Ms. Cange said the Oak Ridge EM program has been working to develop its FY 2015 budget request to DOE Headquarters, which includes a list of priorities for cleanup for the ORR. That list will be shared with EPA and TDEC to ensure that regulatory milestones are in place and work continues. She said headquarters has provided a target amount for budget planning, but that figure is embargoed and cannot be shared publically.

Ms. Cange said significant progress is being made on the remaining six sections of the K-25 Building at East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP). Final demolition is expected to begin in the early fall. Progress continues to prepare the K-27 Building for demolition. Ms. Cange said progress continues on the processing of uranium-233 for disposition from Oak Ridge National Lab (ORNL) and on processing transuranic waste at the Transuranic Waste Processing Center.

Mr. Paulus asked when the figures on the budget request will be available. Ms. Cange said during this time when budgets are being formulated that information is embargoed until the President releases his budget request to Congress, which is usually in November.

Mr. Rector – Mr. Rector said TDEC's annual Environmental Monitoring report is available on the agency's website at <http://www.tn.gov/environment/doeo/pdf/emr2012.pdf>. Mr. Martin asked that the website be shared with board members.

Mr. Richards – Mr. Richards had no comments but complimented TDEC on its Environmental Monitoring Report.

**Public Comment**

None

**Presentation**

Mr. Adler provided an overview of DOE's national EM program. The main points of his presentation are in Attachment 1.

He said a suggestion had been made to provide an overview of the national EM program to give board members a better understanding of the cleanup issues complex-wide.

DOE and its EM program are headquartered in the Forrestal Building in Washington, DC. The EM Program was established in the late 1980s to deal with cleanup of about four decades of work associated with the Manhattan Project, the Cold War, and other nuclear energy work.

EM's mission is to clean up hazardous or potentially hazardous radioactive materials or other substances at various sites around the country (Attachment 1, page 3). That mission includes demolishing structures no longer needed, disposing of spent nuclear fuels and materials from weapons production, and disposition of transuranic and tank wastes.

Mr. Adler showed a map of former cleanup sites across the country (Attachment 1, page 4). To date 90 of 107 former nuclear weapons and research sites have been remediated. The remaining sites where work continues is also shown. Mr. Adler said those sites have significant cleanup challenges and work will continue for years to come. He said he would provide additional information on some of the larger sites, primarily those that have SSABs similar to ORSSAB.

Mr. Adler showed a graphic depicting how the national EM budget is apportioned (Attachment 1, page 5). Radioactive tank waste receives about 34 percent of the EM budget. Tank waste work is done at Hanford, Wash., Idaho National Lab, and the Savannah River Site. Facility decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) takes about 19 percent of the EM budget. Oak Ridge has a large amount of D&D work underway. Oak Ridge also works with spent nuclear fuel, transuranic waste, and soil and groundwater remediation.

Page 6 of Attachment 1 shows how much money in FY 2014 is apportioned to the various sites. Richland and River Protection are parts of the Hanford, Wash., site. Mr. Adler said while Oak Ridge is a significant part of the EM mission, it also is very important to the national DOE science and defense missions.

Mr. Adler then discussed some of the individual cleanup sites across the country.

The Hanford site is located in the southeastern portion of Washington State (Attachment 1, page 8). It was one of two places that produced plutonium for weapons development, and the site has a lot of tank waste that contains high levels of radioactivity. Hanford is building a large facility to treat tank waste. Hanford does not have a significant production mission, and when cleanup is completed the site will be closed.

Idaho National Lab (Attachment 1, page 10), located about 30 miles west of Idaho Fall, was developed primarily to test reactor technology. Spent nuclear fuel reprocessing was also done at Idaho. Most of the current work deals with decommissioning old facilities built to test reprocessing methods and disposing of related waste streams. The Idaho Lab still has some continuing nuclear energy research missions.

Los Alamos is one of the three sites that were part of the Manhattan Project (Attachment 1, page 12). Located on a mesa about 40 miles northwest of Santa Fe, N.M., it has a continuing mission as a defense laboratory, but also has a significant cleanup mission from previous weapons and energy research activities. Similar to Oak Ridge, Los Alamos is adjacent to the community.

The Nevada National Security Site (Attachment 1, page 13), located about 65 northwest of Las Vegas, is where most of the nuclear weapons testing was done from 1950 to 1992. Most of the tests were conducted underground. Nevada has a continuing role in national defense and is also the site where DOE sends much of its waste from other sites. The disposal areas are surface repositories. Oak Ridge sends low-level wastes to Nevada that do not meet the waste acceptance criteria to be disposed in the waste disposal facility in Oak Ridge.

Mr. Adler said Oak Ridge is probably the most complex cleanup site in the country because of its multiple missions and various waste streams (Attachment 1, page 15). About half of the money spent on the Manhattan Project was used in Oak Ridge to test the methods for enriching uranium

for use in the first atomic bomb. It was also the site where the first gram quantities of plutonium were extracted using methods that were scaled up to production size at the Hanford B Reactor.

Mr. Adler said in the early 1950s the government decided to triple the amount of uranium being enriched for defense purposes. As a result, two more uranium enrichment plants were built near Paducah, Ky., and Piketon, Ohio (Attachment 1, pages 16-19). These sites are shutting down enrichment activities and will eventually close. The work at both sites will be D&D activities similar to the work underway at ETTP. Several years ago Oak Ridge finished sending about 6,500 large cylinders of depleted uranium hexafluoride to Paducah and Portsmouth to be converted to a more stable form for disposal. The eventual goals for both sites are to clean up and convert to areas for reindustrialization.

The Savannah River Site (Attachment 1, page 21) is located near Aiken, S.C. It is a large site that was used to complement the Hanford site for plutonium production and also for tritium production. It has some continuing missions to assist in dispositioning excess plutonium.

Mr. Adler talked about some of the facilities that have been built around the country to achieve the principal missions of DOE EM.

At the Savannah River Site the Defense Waste Processing Facility (Attachment 1, page 22) has been built to convert liquid waste to a solid glass. These glass forms will be disposed eventually in a geologic repository, but in the meantime the vitrified waste is kept in safe storage.

Idaho has built the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit, which will treat the site's inventory of about 900,000 gallons of liquid tank waste (Attachment 1, page 22). Mr. Adler said these are both large multi-billion dollar facilities.

The largest treatment facility for liquid radioactive waste is being built at Hanford (Attachment 1, page 23). Mr. Adler said this facility is costing more and taking longer to construct than was anticipated. He said this project is a high priority for DOE to finish because the cost of maintaining the inventory of tank waste is expensive. He said when the project is finished it will relieve DOE of a huge carrying cost of maintaining the tank waste and will free up a large amount of money that can be used for other DOE projects.

Mr. Adler said Oak Ridge has the largest D&D project in the complex (Attachment 1, page 25). Page 25 shows how the K-25 Building looked prior to demolition beginning in 2008 and how it looks today but still showing the North Tower, which was demolished in January. The K-25 Building was the largest D&D project in the world. About 90 percent of the waste generated from the demolition of K-25 is sent to the Environmental Management Waste Management Facility in Bear Creek Valley near Y-12 National Security Complex. About 10 percent that doesn't meet the waste acceptance criteria for the disposal facility is sent to Nevada.

The next big D&D projects after Oak Ridge will be at the Paducah and Portsmouth sites.

The H Canyon at the Savannah River Site (Attachment 1, page 26) is a huge, well-shielded facility that takes highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel for processing. It is the only facility of its type in the DOE complex.

Mr. Adler said Oak Ridge has a significant inventory of special nuclear material in uranium-233 at ORNL (Attachment 1, page 27). He said U-233 is excess material for national defense and is a challenging and expensive project. The inventory requires special handling and security and it's currently stored in the central campus of ORNL. It needs to be disposed to make the lab safer for current science missions.



The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) near Carlsbad, N.M., is the repository of transuranic (TRU) waste (Attachment 1, page 29). Mr. Adler said TRU waste has a very long half-life and tends to be mobile in the environment so it requires special disposal methods. TRU waste is required by law to be disposed in a geologic repository. WIPP is a series of caverns in a huge salt dome about 2,100 feet below the surface. Packaged TRU waste is deposited in the caverns and over time the salt will entomb the waste. The map on page 30 of Attachment 1 shows sites that send TRU waste to WIPP.

Mr. Adler said Oak Ridge will be dependent on western disposal sites for some of its waste streams for many years to come, but he said most of its waste is disposed on site.

Because the EM Program is focusing on facilities that were built for specific purposes with unique hazardous materials there are significant technological challenges associated with cleanup, particularly the high-hazard facilities in the west. Mr. Adler said there is a national technology development program that is part of EM. He said the hope is to invest some money in technology development to find ways to reduce the projected high-cost of cleanup (Attachment 1, page 31). Oak Ridge has some high-tech disposal challenges, but most of the work is lower-tech D&D. Mr. Adler said, however, anything that can be done to characterize and clean up mercury contamination will aid in work at Y-12 National Security Complex. He said there are complicated groundwater challenges in Oak Ridge so characterization technology in groundwater will be useful in Oak Ridge.

In conclusion, Mr. Adler said the EM Program faces large financial challenges and finishing the cleanup program will require creative approaches. Budget appropriations over the years have fallen from the \$7-\$8 billion range to about \$5.6 billion today. Mr. Adler said DOE must work with environmental regulators and other stakeholders to find ways to continue the work cost effectively. He said it could be 30 to 40 years to complete the work nationwide.

After Mr. Adler's presentation a number of questions were asked. Following are abridged questions and answers.

Mr. Bell – This was a great presentation. Is there a book that puts all of this together? Mr. Adler – There are materials produced by headquarters that lay out the big picture of what we have left to do. Ms. Cange – You can find a good synopsis of the program in the budget volumes that have been released with the president's budget. We can provide a link that gives a synopsis of the sites, their challenges, funding profiles, etc.

Mr. Bell – I thought there was to be some enrichment activities at either Paducah or Portsmouth, but you said they were going to close? Ms. Cange – The Portsmouth plant was shut down some time ago. USEC is building the American Centrifuge Program plant there. That's where they plan to use centrifuge technology to enrich uranium. The Paducah plant is operating but is expected to be turned back to the EM Program sometime in the next year or two.

Ms. Hall – You mentioned that the cleanup for Hanford is all under the EM Program as opposed to Oak Ridge being under a lot of groups. Is it better for cleanup finance-wise and management-wise to be under one entity or to have a joint effort? Mr. Adler – The cleanup in Oak Ridge is under one entity. There are multiple entities conducting multiple missions in Oak Ridge. There is a column that runs ORNL, there is another column that runs Y-12, and another column that runs cleanup. It makes for a complicated situation, but they intentionally organize it so that is an efficient and a manageable program as possible. At Hanford there isn't a science column or defense column like we have in Oak Ridge.

Mr. Valunas – Has vitrification been abandoned? Mr. Adler – It's still a technique that is used in certain situations. In situ vitrification in Oak Ridge does not look like it will be a very useful technology because we have groundwater so close to the surface and we have steam excursion

issues. We've already tried that. In situ vitrification of these large tanks is not the current selected approach and we're heading down these more elaborate expensive approaches. From a regulatory standpoint and planning standpoint we are not contemplating in situ vitrification of those tanks.

Mr. Mei – How many nuclear power plants are using the mixed oxide fuel? I understand only two companies were interested in doing that. One was Virginia Power and one was Duke Energy. Virginia Power withdrew from the testing and only the Duke Catawba Plant continued with the testing. I don't know what the status of that is now. Mr. Adler – I don't know the status either. The people pushing the mixed oxide process presume they have a market for everything they produce, but I don't know the answer to that. Mr. Jensen – My company had some dealings with that and as far as we know Duke Energy Systems has abandoned their effort. I think they decided that the engineering was just too complicated to pursue.

Mr. Hatcher – In regard to the two maps (on page 4 of Attachment 1), what is the decision that removes a dot from the map? Mr. Adler – It involves bringing the sites into compliance with environmental regulatory standards developed for that site. The task is to go in and work with the regulators to agree on what the site will look like when it's clean and that's typically specified in terms of allowable concentrations of residual uranium in the soil or groundwater or surface contamination limits for buildings and so forth and then achieving those end states. Typically there is a sign off by either a state or federal regulatory agency and a certification that is done. Often an independent group is brought in to take measurements to confirm that DOE has achieved what it agreed to achieve. Documentation is done to wrap up the job and the site is released for unrestricted use. In some cases the end state is not fully unrestricted. You may finish a site but there is still a landfill there or there is a residual groundwater contamination problem that couldn't be restored. But basically it's done when your regulators say it's done.

Mr. Hatcher – On [page 5 of Attachment 1] I notice there is no mention of 'hotel costs.' Mr. Adler – On that graphic they are spread across the columns.

### **Committee Reports**

Board Finance & Process – Mr. Paulus reported that the board's finances are in order and on budget and that a contract is being finalized with the facilitator, Jenny Freeman, for the annual meeting in August. He said the facilitator's work scope has been modified and the cost should be less than in years past. He said the committee will not meet in June.

Mr. Hemelright said the annual meeting will be on Saturday, August 17 at the Holiday Inn in Pigeon Forge. The agenda has been shortened from a full day to a half day. Plans for a Friday evening event are still being made.

Ms. Freeman will be contacting members to get input on issues, work plan topics, and other points of discussion for the annual meeting.

EM – Mr. Hatcher reported that the committee did not have a regular meeting in May, but interested committee and board members received a briefing on May 23 from Dan Goode, who is acting as a liaison to board for the Groundwater Strategy Workshops being conducted by DOE, EPA, and TDEC.

Members of the committee toured the Transuranic Waste Processing Center on May 22.

The committee will meet again on June 19 and have a discussion about a possible recommendation on disposition of nickel, which could be taken to the EM SSAB Chairs' meeting in the fall.

Public Outreach – Mr. Hemelright said one of the topics that was brought up at the FY 2012 planning meeting was signage around the ORR. The committee has been discussing the topic throughout the year. Mr. Adler attended the May committee meeting and said the ORR has several administrators that have various responsibilities for the operations conducted on the ORR. These administrators report to DOE Headquarters so there is no central authority that dictates signage requirements. Mr. Adler reminded the committee that the board's charter is focused on EM operations on the ORR and that the committee and the board should not stray from its mission. Mr. Adler said records of decision indicate what signage is needed and the types of signage required have evolved over time. Mr. Hemelright said what the committee wanted initially is out of the EM SSAB and ORSSAB scope. The committee decided not to pursue the issue further.

Mr. Hemelright reported that the board will not have an exhibit at the Oak Ridge Secret City festival because not enough board members volunteered to staff a booth.

The committee will meet again on June 25 in teleconference.

Stewardship – Ms. Staley said the committee did not meet in May. The committee will meet again on June 18 and she encouraged all board members to attend.

Executive – Mr. Martin said the committee met on May 22 and discussed the May 8 presentation on the Remediation Effectiveness Report. The committee determined no further action was needed regarding the presentation.

The committee reviewed the three draft recommendations that were presented at this meeting and agreed they were ready to go on the agenda.

The committee will meet by teleconference on June 20 at 9 a.m.

#### **Announcements and Other Board Business**

ORSSAB will not meet in July. Its next meeting will be the annual meeting at the Holiday Inn in Pigeon Forge on August 17.

Ms. Cange recognized Ms. Hart, Mr. Jensen, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Valunas for their service to the board.

The minutes of the May 8, 2013, meeting were approved.

A proposed revision to the ORSSAB bylaws had its first reading (Attachment 2).

The recommendation on the Stewardship Point of Contact (Attachment 3) was approved.

The recommendation on to Develop a Fact Sheet on Site Transition at Ongoing Mission Sites (Attachment 4) was approved.

A Nominating Committee for FY 2014 board officers was elected. The committee includes Lisa Hagy, Howard Holmes, Scott McKinney, and Belinda Price.

#### **Federal Coordinator Report**

No report.

#### **Additions to the Agenda**

None.

**Motions****6/12/13.1**

Mr. Jensen moved to approve the minutes of the May 8, 2013 meeting. Mr. Bell seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

**6/12/13.2**

Mr. Hemelright moved to approve the Recommendation on the Stewardship Point of Contact (Attachment 3). Mr. Hatcher seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

**6/12/13.3**

Mr. Hatcher moved to approve the Recommendation to Develop a Fact Sheet on Site Transition at Ongoing Mission Sites (Attachment 4). Ms. Staley seconded. The motion **passed** with 15 voting 'yea' and 1 abstention (Ms. Price).

**6/12/13.4**

Ms. Staley moved to approve the Recommendation on the Test Site Transfer (Attachment 5). The motion **failed** for lack of a second.

**6/12/13.5**

Mr. Hemelright moved to approve the nominations for the Nominating Committee for FY 2014 ORSSAB officers (Ms. Hagy, Mr. Holmes, Mr. McKinney, and Ms. Price). Ms. Martin seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

**Action items**

1. Staff will provide website address of TDEC monitoring report to board members.
2. DOE will provide a link to budget volumes that provide descriptions of cleanup sites, their challenges, and funding profiles.

Attachments (5) to these minutes are available on request from the ORSSAB support office.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the June 12, 2013, meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board.

Dave Hemelright, Acting Chair  
Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board  
DH/rsg

DATE

Proposed revision to the ORSSAB Bylaws  
June 2013

Current wording:

**XII. AMENDING THE BYLAWS**

**A. Policy:** The Board shall have the power to alter, amend, and repeal these bylaws in ways consistent with the Amended Charter of the EM Site Specific Advisory Board, and other applicable laws, regulations and guidelines. Any member of the public, the Board, or one of the Agencies may propose an amendment. However, to be considered by this Board the proposed amendment must be sponsored by a Board member. The Board may consider and take action on the amendment to the bylaws at the meeting following the introduction of the proposed amendment.

Proposed revision:

**XII. AMENDING THE BYLAWS**

**A. Policy:** The Board shall have the power to alter, amend, and repeal these bylaws in ways consistent with the Amended Charter of the EM Site Specific Advisory Board, and other applicable laws, regulations and guidelines. Any member of the public, the Board, or one of the Agencies may propose an amendment. However, to be considered by this Board the proposed amendment must be sponsored by a Board member. ~~The Board may consider and take action on the amendment to the bylaws at the meeting following the introduction of the proposed amendment.~~ The bylaws may be amended at any regular meeting of the Board by a two-thirds vote of the entire Board membership, provided that the proposed amendment was submitted in writing and read at a previous regular business meeting.

## Recommendation Response Tracking Chart for FY 2013

	Date	To	Recommendation	Originating Committee	Response Date	Response Status	Committee Review of Response
1.	10/10/12	Susan Cange, DOE Oak Ridge Deputy Manager for EM	211: Recommendation on Availability of DOE Environmental Management Documents	EM	1/8/13	<b>Complete:</b> DOE is working with information technology to improve search capabilities. The 'search tip' function has been reactivated. On request, training can be provided to access information. DOE Information Center staff is always available to provide documents. DOE is working to ensure documents are available at the information center no later than the date when availability is announced.	<b>Complete:</b> EM Committee accepted recommendation response at its January 2013. It asks that DOE notify the board when upgrades to the system are complete.
2.	5/8/13	Susan Cange, DOE Oak Ridge Deputy Manager for EM	215: Recommendation on Remaining Legacy Materials on the Oak Ridge Reservation	EM	7/19/13	<b>Complete:</b> DOE Oak Ridge has developed an inventory of all waste/materials stored on the reservation and has prioritized the inventory for disposition. The highest priority is to address hazardous and/or radioactive waste that may pose a threat to the environment.	
3.	5/8/13	Mark Whitney, DOE Oak Ridge Manager for EM	216: Recommendations on the Fiscal Year 2015 DOE Oak Ridge Environmental Budget Request	Board Finance & Process	5/22/13	<b>Complete:</b> DOE responded that it is sending the recommendation to DOE EM Headquarters along with its FY 2015 budget request.	
4.	6/12/13	Susan Cange, DOE Oak Ridge Deputy Manager for EM	217: Recommendation on Stewardship Point of Contact for the Oak Ridge Reservation	Stewardship			
5.	6/12/13	Letitia O'Connor, DOE HQ Sue Smiley, DOE EM Consolidated Business Center	218: Recommendation to Develop a Fact Sheet on Site Transition at Ongoing Mission Sites	Stewardship			

## EM Project Update

ETTP	July	August
Zone 1 Final ROD	Regulators reviewing DOE responses to their comments on the D2 RI/FS.	EPA provided additional comments on the D2 Zone 1 RI/FS.
Groundwater Strategy	Groundwater Strategy document in preparation. Planning for last workshop on groundwater use restriction in August.	Workshop on Groundwater Use Restrictions was completed. Strategy was discussed with the EPA & TDEC at the Environmental Program Council Meeting.
K-25/K-27 D&D	Process pipe removal at K-25 is 99 percent complete and will be completed once mobile work platforms are installed in the final areas.	Process pipe removal at K-25 was completed and foaming of process pipe is 99 percent totally complete.
	Foaming of process pipe is 92 percent totally complete with three of the five remaining K-25 units completed.	Sixteen surge tanks were completed and mining of the loose material in the final tank was initiated.
	Removal of transite panels from the exterior of the Tc-99 area units is 55 percent complete.	Removal of transite panels from the exterior of the Tc-99 area units is 75 percent complete.
	The K-27 project completed Grip Strut installation for all nine building units. Grip Struts are for lifeline protection for workers.	
Zone 2 ROD	Filling of CNF below-grade sumps and dikes with flowable fill was completed with the exception of 3 areas (clarifier cone, discharge basins and dike, and the carbon column/air stripper dike).	
Remaining Facilities	Removal of the Central Neutralization Facility (CNF) west discharge basin floor was completed, and priming and painting of the discharge basins is underway.	Completed the removal of three sand filters, two carbon columns, and an air stripper from the CNF and the vessels shipped for offsite treatment and disposal.
	A draft PCCR for the decommissioning of the CNF was reviewed by EPA and TDEC.	Water sampling of the CNF discharge basins and clarifier got underway to support breach and release of rainwater.

## EM Project Update

ORNL	July	August
ORNL Central Campus Cleanout and Stabilization		The Exposure Unit 5 Soils & Slabs project completed removal of the 3550 slab and has completed waste shipments to the ORR Landfill. This project completes removal of the 3550 facility from the central campus area of ORNL.
ORNL Small Facilities D&D	The 4500 Gaseous System Reconfiguration and Stabilization project has mobilized the grouting contractor for duct stabilization of approximately 1,500 feet of underground duct.	The 4500 Gaseous System Reconfiguration and Stabilization project completed duct stabilization. Work on the remaining activity, removal of High Efficiency Particulate Air filters from 3106 filter pit is in progress, with four of the six filter banks removed. The project successfully completed a Project Peer Review with zero recommendations from the review team.
	Building 3038 stabilization activities are progressing, including electrical modifications to support long-term S&M. Removal and packaging of the hot cell manipulators was completed. Work packages, training, and other readiness activities are underway for fixative/fogging activities, installation of glove box port covers, and sampling of waste.	Building 3038 roof resurfacing is underway as well as the Building 3005 annex demolition. Installation of a new cover on the Hot Storage Garden is also underway.
ORNL Small Facilities D&D		Building 3038 stabilization activities are progressing. Electrical modifications are complete, as well as installation of glove box port covers and removal of combustible waste.
		Preparation activities commenced for the refurbishment of the F-1009 Dual Media Filter in Building 3608. The vessel was disconnected from the system and blind flanges are being installed.
U-233 Project		A meeting with Representative Dina Titus took place to address her concerns with the transportation and disposal of the Consolidated Edison Uranium Solidification Program material.
		Completed and submitted four of the six deliverables for the conceptual design of the downblending process the Processing Campaign.
ORNL S&M	The SAP for Characterizing Personal Protective Equipment, Dry Active Waste, and Miscellaneous Debris From ORNL Surveillance and Maintenance Project Population 7 was submitted to the regulators.	The SAP for Miscellaneous Process Inventory Waste Items was submitted to the regulators.
		The SAP for Analyzing S&M Project Removable Activity in Various ORNL Facilities was submitted to the regulators.
Molten Salt Reactor Experiment	The Disposition Plan for MSRE Waste Items Located in Melton Valley was submitted to the regulators.	



## EM Project Update

Y-12	July	August
Y-12 S&M		Two workshops were held to reach a consensus on a path forward for cleanup of the Y-12 Site and additional onsite disposal. The first workshop focused on the mercury strategy document and the second one focused on the current OREM landfill and the proposed future landfill.
Off-Site Cleanup/Waste Management	July	August
TRU Waste Processing Center	A workshop was held on Spray Leak Analysis to support the development of the Nuclear Safety Design for the TRU Waste Processing Center Sludge Buildout project.	The TRU Sludge Processing Facility Buildout team traveled to Hanford for a benchmarking trip which involved discussions and tours with the K-Basin Closure Project team, Waste Treatment & Immobilization Plant Project, and the Tank Farms Project.
		Installation of the new Non-Destructive Examination equipment to replace the unit that failed in May was completed.
		The Hot Cell outage was completed. Outage activities included numerous equipment upgrades and modifications.
TRU Waste Processing Center		The AM for Time-Critical Removal Action for the Sludge Test Area Buildout at the Transuranic Waste Processing Center was submitted to the regulators.
EMWMF		A Partnership Workshop was held on August 14 to discuss 1) EMWMF goals and waste acceptance, 2) use of the recreational use ambient water quality criteria for EMWMF discharges and 3) the elevated water levels at PP-01. A path forward for the water quality criteria was determined.
		Comment resolution discussions are continuing for the FY2013 PCCR
Remediation Effectiveness Report	The D2 draft Response to Comments was submitted to the regulators.	

## Abbreviations/Acronyms List for Environmental Management Project Update

AM – action memorandum

ARRA – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

BCV – Bear Creek Valley

BG – burial grounds

BV- Bethel Valley

CARAR – Capacity Assurance Remedial Action Report

CBFO – Carlsbad Field Office

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation  
and Liability Act

CEUSP – Consolidated Edison Uranium Solidification Project

CD – critical decision

CH – contact handled

CNF – Central Neutralization Facility

CS – construction start

CY – calendar year

D&D – decontamination and decommissioning

DOE – Department of Energy

DSA – documented safety analysis

DQO – data quality objective

EE/CA – engineering evaluation/cost analysis

EM – environmental management

EMWMF – Environmental Management Waste Management Facility

EPA – Environmental Protection Agency

ETTP – East Tennessee Technology Park

EU – exposure unit

EV – earned value

FFA – Federal Facility Agreement

FPD – federal project director

FY – fiscal year

GIS – geographical information system

GW – groundwater

GWTS –groundwater treatability study

IROD – Interim Record of Decision

LLW – low-level waste

MLLW – mixed low-level waste

MSRE – Molten Salt Reactor Experiment

MV – Melton Valley

NaF – sodium fluoride

NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act

NPL – National Priorities List

NNSS – Nevada National Security Site (new name of Nevada Test Site)

NTS – Nevada Test Site

ORNL – Oak Ridge National Laboratory

ORO – Oak Ridge Office

ORR – Oak Ridge Reservation

ORRS – operational readiness reviews

PaR – trade name of remote manipulator at the Transuranic Waste Processing Center

PCB - polychlorinated biphenyls

PCCR – Phased Construction Completion Report

PM – project manager

QAPP – Quality Assurance Project Plan

RA – remedial action

RAR – Remedial Action Report

RAWP – Remedial Action Work Plan

RCRA – Resource Conservation Recovery Act

RDR – Remedial Design Report

RER – Remediation Effectiveness Report

RH – remote handled

RI/FS – Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

RIWP – Remedial Investigation Work Plan

RmAR – Removal Action Report

RmAWP – Removal Action Work Plan

ROD – Record of Decision

RUBB – trade name of a temporary, fabric covered enclosure

S&M – surveillance and maintenance

SAP – sampling analysis plan

SEC – Safety and Ecology Corp.

SEP – supplemental environmental project

STP – site treatment plan

SW – surface water

SWSA – solid waste storage area

Tc – technetium

TC – time critical

TDEC – Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation

TRU – transuranic waste

TSCA – Toxic Substances Control Act

TWPC – Transuranic Waste Processing Center

U – uranium

UEFPC – Upper East Fork Poplar Creek

VOC – volatile organic compound

WAC – waste acceptance criteria

WEMA – West End Mercury Area (at Y-12)

WHP – Waste Handling Plan

WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

WRRP – Water Resources Restoration Program

WWSY – White Wing Scrap Yard

Y-12 – Y-12 National Security Complex

ZPR – Zero Power Reactor

## Travel Opportunities

Meeting/Event	Dates	Location	Reg. Cost	Website	Deadline to Submit Requests
<b>FY 2013</b>					
<b>Fall Chairs Meeting</b> (Attendees: Hemelright, D. Martin, Paulus)	Oct. 2-3, 2012	Washington, D.C.	none	<a href="http://emssabchairsmeetingoctober2012.eventbrite.com/">http://emssabchairsmeetingoctober2012.eventbrite.com/</a>	Aug. 23, 2012
<b>Perma-Fix Mixed Nuclear Waste Management Forum</b> (Attendees: Hemelright, Holmes, Kasten)	Dec. 10-13, 2012	Nashville	\$500	none	Oct. 25, 2012
<b>Intergovernmental Meeting with DOE</b> (Attendees: None)	Dec. 12-14, 2012	New Orleans			Oct. 25, 2012
<b>Waste Management Symposium</b> (Attendees: Hemelright, F. Martin)	Feb. 24-28, 2013	Phoenix	\$995	<a href="http://www.wmsym.org">www.wmsym.org</a>	Closed Nov. 15, 2012
<b>Spring Chairs Meeting</b> (Attendees: Hatcher, Hemelright, D. Martin, Staley)	April 23-25, 2013	Richland, WA	none	none	Jan. 24, 2013
<b>15th National Brownfields Conference</b> (Attendees: None)	May 15-17, 2013	Atlanta	\$125	<a href="http://www.brownfieldsconference.org/en/home">www.brownfieldsconference.org/en/home</a>	Jan. 24, 2013
<b>National Environmental Justice Conference &amp; Training</b>	April 3-5, 2013	Washington, D.C.	none	<a href="http://thenejc.org/?conference=national-environmental-justice-conference-and-training-program">http://thenejc.org/?conference=national-environmental-justice-conference-and-training-program</a>	March 5, 2013
<b>2013 EPA Community Involvement Training Conference</b> Attendees: Staley)	July 30-Aug.1, 2013	Boston	none	<a href="http://www.epa.gov/ciconference/index.htm">www.epa.gov/ciconference/index.htm</a>	June 20, 2013
<b>RadWaste Summit</b> (Tentative requests: Cook)	Sept. 3-6, 2013	Las Vegas	\$525	<a href="http://www.radwastesummit.com/index.htm">http://www.radwastesummit.com/index.htm</a>	July 23, 2013
<b>FY 2014</b>					
<b>Fall Chairs Meeting</b> (Tentative requests: Cook, Hemelright)	Oct. 15-17, 2013	Portsmouth, OH	none		Aug. 28, 2013

## Travel Opportunities

<b>Western Waste Site Tour</b> (Tentative requests: Cook, Hatcher, Staley)	Fall 2013	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Nevada Nat'l Security Site	none	none	
--	-----------	--	------	------	--

Shading indicates closed trips



**Summary of the 2013 Annual Meeting  
Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board  
Saturday, August 17, 2013, 8 a.m. to noon  
Holiday Inn, Pigeon Forge, Tenn.**

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) met for its annual planning meeting beginning at 8 a.m., on Saturday, August 17, 2013, at the Holiday Inn, 3230 Parkway, Pigeon Forge, Tenn.

The objectives of the meeting were to:

- Develop an increased understanding of and commitment to the goals of the board
- Evaluate the effectiveness and achievements of the board in FY 2013
- Begin development of the FY 2014 work plan

The meeting was facilitated by Jenny Freeman, Strata G. The agenda is attachment 1.

**Members present**

Jimmy Bell	Dave Hemelright,	Scott McKinney
Noel Berry	Acting Chair	Greg Paulus
Alfreda Cook	Bruce Hicks	Wanda Smith
Lisa Hagy	Howard Holmes	Scott Stout
Bob Hatcher	Fay Martin	
Mary Hatcher	Donald Mei	

**Members absent**

Carmen DeLong	Jan Lyons	Corkie Staley
Gracie Hall <sup>1</sup>	Belinda Price	
Jennifer Kasten	Julia Riley <sup>1</sup>	

<sup>1</sup>Student representative

**Others present**

Dave Adler, Department of Energy-Oak Ridge Office (DOE-ORO), Alternate Deputy Designated Federal Officer  
Jenny Freeman, Strata G  
Spencer Gross, ORSSAB Support Office  
Connie Jones, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), ORSSAB Liaison  
Melyssa Noe, DOE-ORO, ORSSAB Federal Coordinator  
Pete Osborne, ORSSAB Support Office  
John Owsley, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC), ORSSAB Liaison  
James Smith, member of the public

Mr. Hemelright opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking them for making the effort to attend. Ms. Freeman reviewed the objectives for the meeting and guidelines for how the meeting was to be conducted.

Ms. Noe introduced Mr. Berry, Ms. Hatcher, and Ms. Smith as new members to the board who were attending their first meeting.

## **Alternate Deputy Designated Federal Officer Comments**

Mr. Adler reminded board members what DOE expects from the board and he summarized current cleanup activities underway on the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR).

He said DOE looks to the board for advice and recommendations on basic questions regarding cleanup on the ORR, what areas of the reservation should be reserved for waste disposal, and how those areas should be protected in the future.

The main points of his review of current activities are in Attachment 2.

He began by saying that DOE's Environmental Management (EM) Program mission is to complete cleanup of the ORR with the goal of protecting human health and the environment of the area, making clean land available for future use, and ensuring DOE's ongoing missions at Oak Ridge National Lab (ORNL) and Y-12 National Security Complex.

Significant progress has been made since cleanup work began in 1995 (Attachment 2, page 3). The Oak Ridge EM Program has a number of challenges including a trend of declining annual funding, a number of diverse, complex projects, many regulatory commitments, numerous contractors, and ongoing DOE missions representing billions in investment (Attachment 2, page 4).

DOE EM is doing cleanup work at primarily three sites on the ORR at ORNL, Y-12, and East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP). Each site has its own program risks. At ORNL there are radiological risks with radioactive material stored near billions of dollars' worth of science investments. At Y-12 the risk is primarily environmental with the presence of hundreds of thousands of pounds of mercury in the soil and underneath old process buildings. At ETTP the risk is the cost of maintaining essential services while unused facilities are being demolished. Mr. Adler said about \$50 million a year is spent at ETTP to conduct essential services, such as security.

Mr. Adler said DOE is trying to approach cleanup at ETTP in a logical way by attacking the highest risk projects — those that cost a lot to maintain. Most of the K-25 Building has been demolished and the expectation is to have K-27 demolished in five years and the entire site finished in 10 years.

The completion of work at ETTP is a near-term goal for DOE, along with addressing mercury releases at Y-12, removing half of the uranium-233 inventory at ORNL and processing the rest, and continuing to process transuranic waste for eventual disposition (Attachment 2, page 7).

The longer-term strategic plan is to address remaining facilities at ETTP after work starts at other ORR sites. At Y-12 the long-term plan is to finalize site cleanup strategy, initiate characterization and preparation for building demolition, and decontaminate buildings after K-27 at ETTP is demolished. At ORNL the goal is to complete U-233 disposition and transuranic waste processing, and initiate cleanup of remaining facilities after work begins at Y-12.

Mr. Adler showed the overall cleanup schedule (Attachment 2, page 9). The plan is to have all cleanup finished in the early 2040s.

Mr. Hatcher said the budget graph on page 4 of Attachment 2 didn't reflect additional funding in 2009-11 from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Mr. Adler said Oak Ridge EM received \$750 million during that time that was used to accelerate and complete some projects. He said that is not likely to happen again.

Mr. Hicks said work at Y-12 seems to focus onsite and not offsite, such as mercury contamination in East Fork Poplar Creek (EFPC). Mr. Adler said the strategy is to clean up the sources of mercury releases. Mr. Hicks said a 1999 report indicated that the problem was from collection of mercury in the soil. Mr. Adler said there have been a number of studies on that. He said the probable explanation from exposure early on was from airborne releases. Today the most plausible exposure is through consumption of fish in EFPC (advisories are posted all along the creek warning against consumption of fish). But he said the new

priority is to reduce releases and be able to tear down old buildings. He said systems must be in place to capture mercury.

Mr. Stout asked if it was proper to spend money to try to reduce mercury releases. Mr. Adler said that is the kind of question the board should consider. He said mercury in fish in EFPC is at or a bit above levels considered safe. He said a new water treatment plant could cost 130-140 percent more than the current system to reduce mercury releases to the creek.

Ms. Cook asked if building a water treatment plant at Y-12 was a precursor to tearing down buildings. Mr. Adler said the plan is to achieve acceptable levels of mercury in the creek and be able to capture mercury releases during demolition of buildings.

Mr. Bell asked if any studies had been done when mercury left the site previously and if there were any effects on the community. He had no knowledge of anyone ever being harmed by mercury from Y-12. He wondered if there should be much concern about mercury releases and just deal with it if and when it happens.

Mr. Adler said that is another question to consider, but he said DOE must abide by regulatory requirements. Mr. Bell said regulations are one of the reasons why the problem is so expensive. He said over the long run a lot of money will be spent preventing releases that could be used in the near term to eliminate mercury at the source.

### **Board Mission and Accomplishments**

Mr. Hemelright reviewed the board's mission statement (Attachment 3) and board and committee accomplishments during FY 2013 (Attachment 4).

### **Board Operations**

Prior to the meeting Ms. Freeman emailed board members to receive input on board operations. She compiled a number of comments that fit into two general themes:

- Theme 1 – Interest in creating more participation from board members in board activities
- Theme 2 – Interest in helping the public accept the success of cleanup  
(Attachment 5, pages 1 and 2)

On the first theme and the first point about all committee members manage at least one issue, Mr. Hicks thought that was too confining; he didn't want members to be restricted to one issue. Mr. Osborne explained that the committees have individual topics or issues they address during the year. Committee members are encouraged to take a topic that interests them, do some extra research, and work with staff to find a presenter who can provide information to the committee. Committee members are not limited to the number of topics they can take as an issue manager.

Mr. Paulus said board members have various backgrounds and levels of knowledge. He wanted all members to get involved in the board's work. He wondered about a forum where each member could express his or her interests and determine what committee to join. Ms. Freeman said Mr. Paulus' comments related to the second point of Theme 1 about reaching to new members.

Ms. Cook pointed out that committees develop work plans and members have an opportunity to look at the topics and pick something that interests them to act as an issue manager or an assistant issue manager.

Mr. Adler said DOE's wish is to receive feedback from the community at large. The basic plans for cleanup have been laid out, but items remain where public input would be useful. He said DOE wants people to be interested in the larger picture of the big projects and to provide questions that are timely and important.

The question, he said, is how to get people engaged. He prefers not to require participation of board members at the committee level. Board members have already volunteered their time to serve on the board, and DOE is appreciative of any additional participation at the committee level.

Mr. Adler said DOE tries to pick people who represent a wide range of interests. DOE wants people to attend board meetings and listen and learn. He said there is value in committee participation, but people have other responsibilities and required participation is too much to ask. He said the board shouldn't 'over-worry' committee participation.

Mr. Hemelright agreed saying board members 'get out of the board what they put into it.'

Ms. Martin noted that non-board member participation is allowed at the committee level and there are public members who participate who are passionate about issues.

Mr. Stout encouraged newer members to learn about the issues but they shouldn't remain silent too long; they should speak up and become engaged in discussions.

Discussion moved to the Second Theme (Attachment 5, page 2), helping the public accept the success of cleanup.

Mr. Hatcher said there needs to be a continuing process of educating the public:

- What are the problems?
- What is being done?
- What has been done?

He said every opportunity should be taken to inform the public. He suggested contacting producers of locally produced television programs to try to secure appearances.

Mr. Paulus said word of mouth is a good way of providing information. He said members should always be ready to explain what they do. Ms. Smith said members should be careful what they say to avoid causing alarm.

Ms. Martin said the Chamber of Commerce is a good outlet for educating the business community about the board.

Ms. Cook said 80 percent of citizens know what took place in Oak Ridge and they know things are being done to clean up the ORR, but she asked how active the board should be in discussing what it does. Mr. Hemelright said DOE has a public relations office and the board needs to be careful about what is said without consulting with that office.

Ms. Martin suggested hosting more public meetings about specific topics.

Mr. Bell asked about contact with Knoxville News Sentinel writer Frank Munger. Mr. Osborne said he receives each month's agenda and he usually posts it on his blog.

Mr. Hicks said he had reviewed the DOE Public Involvement Plan, and he thought it was a 'disaster.' He said that is not what the public wants to see and won't 'wade through that bureaucratic mess.' He said the plan was 'inreach' and not outreach. He said DOE should be doing more like what the board's Public Outreach Committee is doing. Mr. Adler said the Public Involvement Plan is revised every three years and comments on how to make it better would be welcome.

Ms. Jones said a lot of information has been provided previously. She wondered if an overview of projects would be a way to get the public involved.

Mr. Mei wondered how many people actually look at the board's Facebook page and YouTube channel.

Ms. Freeman thought perhaps there should be more effort to publicize those sites.

Mr. Holmes said there should be a need for people to seek information. He said perhaps there should be a focus on a single issue. When all information on that issue has been considered thoroughly then a new topic is examined.

### **Work Plan Topics and Discussion**

Mr. Adler reviewed the priorities suggested by DOE, EPA, and TDEC that the board consider in FY 2014 (Attachment 6). The agencies suggested three common topics:

- Comprehensive groundwater strategy
- Strategy for addressing mercury at Y-12
- Sufficient waste disposal capacity on the ORR

TDEC additionally suggested a comprehensive discussion about the operation of the current waste disposal facility related to maximizing disposal capacity, which would be useful in operating a second facility. Input from ORSSAB would also increase public awareness of the issues involved with the on-site disposal of hazardous and radioactive waste.

DOE and EPA suggested completion of the ETTP Zone 1 Soils Record of Decision (ROD).

DOE suggested input on the FY 2016 DOE-ORO EM budget request to DOE Headquarters, an annual standing request.

Regarding sufficient waste disposal capacity, Ms. Jones said it was important to consider lessons learned from building and using the current EM Waste Management Facility in selecting a site for a new landfill. Mr. Adler said that included things like better waste segregation and volume reduction.

Ms. Cook asked about water going through the waste cells. Mr. Adler said that will be part of the discussion about the location of a second waste facility and how water and leachate will be handled.

Mr. Adler said the Zone 1 Soils ROD at ETTP refers to the release of about 1,400 acres of land surrounding the main industrial area of ETTP that is primarily unaffected. He said work is in the final stages of developing a proposed plan for the ROD, which will determine the final uses for the land and what the land use controls will be. Ms. Jones said the agencies are working through what has been done during an interim ROD for the site.

Ms. Jones explained that Zone 1 was to be addressed first because it has fewer concerns than Zone 2, the central industrial complex at ETTP. Work is now being done now to determine if the area is clean enough for release.

Mr. Adler said the intent was to address soil and groundwater at the same time, but because of groundwater problems it was decided to move forward with soils release for site redevelopment and groundwater will be addressed in the future.

Mr. Hicks asked about the status of disposing of U-233 from ORNL. Mr. Adler said the governor and other elected officials of Nevada have voiced strong opposition to having the U-233 shipped to the state and disposed at the Nevada National Security Site. DOE and the Secretary of Energy are working with Nevada to resolve the issue. He said the delay is costing DOE some money.

Mr. Hemelright asked if the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico could take the U-233. Mr. Adler said he didn't know if that has been considered.

Mr. Adler concluded his review of suggested work plan topics by saying DOE wants the board to work on these topics, but it's also important to keep the board updated on ongoing projects like the U-233 disposition, the processing and disposition of transuranic waste, the removal of the remaining hot cells from the old Building 3026 site at ORNL, etc.

He said he hopes better ways can be found for people to participate in committee meetings. He said the EM and Stewardship Committees are talking about consolidating, which would engage more board members at one time. He said since a number of board members have to travel some distance to Oak Ridge for meetings there is a possibility of engaging them through teleconference.

### **Committee membership sign up**

Mr. Hemelright asked the committee chairs to describe what their committees do. Following, he asked board members to express an interest in a committee. He said they can change later if they like.

While not everyone was ready to pick a committee, the list follows:

EM/Stewardship

Jimmy Bell  
Alfreda Cook  
Bob Hatcher  
Dave Hemelright  
Bruce Hicks  
Fay Martin

Public Outreach

Alfreda Cook  
Mary Hatcher  
Bruce Hicks  
Howard Holmes  
Scott McKinney  
Scott Stout

Board Finance & Process

Lisa Hagy  
Mary Hatcher  
Dave Hemelright  
Greg Paulus

**Presentation of Slate of Candidates**

Mr. McKinney, chair of the ad hoc Nominating Committee, presented a slate of candidates for FY 2014 officers.

He said all board members had been contacted to determine their interest in being an officer.

The slate of candidates includes:

Dave Hemelright, chair  
Bruce Hicks, vice chair  
Lisa Hagy, secretary

The candidates will be voted on at the September 11 meeting. Mr. McKinney said additional nominations will be taken from the floor at that time.

**Public Comment**

None.

**Closing Remarks**

Ms. Noe said since the annual meeting schedule had been shortened considerably from previous years she would like to receive comments from board members on this year's format.

Mr. Hemelright thanked everyone for attending and participating. He adjourned the meeting at noon.

Attachments (6) are available through the ORSSAB support office.

rsg



## Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

### TRIP REPORT

---

- I. Name of Traveler:** Coralie Staley
- II. Date(s) of Travel:** July 29, 2013 – August 2, 2013
- III. Location of Meeting:** Boston, Mass.
- IV. Name of Meeting:** EPA 2013 EPA Community Involvement Training Conference
- V. Purpose of Travel:**  
Education on current trends and innovative methods of community involvement in environmental protection
- VI. Discussion of Meeting:**  
  
Various sessions presented to inform and educate participants about EPA projects and activities that depend on community involvement and how the projects have progressed. Field trips to areas where community involvement is evident and successful in economically challenged communities, and also to areas where industry is cooperating and making effective changes in cooperation with EPA.
- VII. Significance to ORSSAB:**  
  
Many of the projects involve contamination and protection of the community.
- VIII. Names & Telephone Numbers of Significant Contacts:**
- IX. Action Items:**
- X. Traveler's Signature & Date:**

Signature: Coralie Staley

Date: August 26, 2013



## Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

### TRIP REPORT

---

- I. Name of Traveler:** Pete Osborne
- II. Date(s) of Travel:** July 30–August 1, 2013
- III. Location of Meeting:** Westin Waterfront, Boston, MA
- IV. Name of Meeting:** 2013 EPA Community Involvement Conference and Training
- V. Purpose of Travel:** To gather new ideas for community outreach
- VI. Discussion of Meeting:**

The purpose of this conference was to inform and train EPA staff as well as agency stakeholders and partners in best practices to enhance community involvement. In 2011, the training conference brought more than 450 community involvement practitioners together.

The three-day training conference featured plenary sessions with guest speakers; topical discussions; multiple 90-minute information sessions; three, four, and seven hour training sessions; and field trips demonstrating effective community involvement and cooperative conservation efforts in the Boston area. There was an evening reception that highlighted a poster presentation and technology demonstration session to showcase community involvement projects as well as new tools, technologies, and software. Throughout the training conference there were exhibits, a variety of networking opportunities, and evening activities that added value and fun to the experience.

The conference web site is located <http://www.epa.gov/ciconference/index.htm>.

This was without doubt one of the most efficiently run conferences I have attended. It was extremely well organized, and the conference materials were outstanding. The meeting venue was spacious and nice, and the range of sessions was outstanding, offering something for a wide variety of public involvement practitioners.

The sessions I attended, in addition to the plenary sessions and evening poster session, were focused on engaging diverse communities and innovative methods of outreach. They included topics such as “Meeting People Where They Are - The Importance of Targeted Communication,” “Getting Community Engagement Tools in the Hands of Practitioners,” “Revolutions Begin with a Spark: Rub Guerilla Marketing and Memes Together and Watch Your Outreach Catch Fire!,” “The Art of Community Engagement and Involvement,” and “The Moment of Oh! When People Are Ready to Make Decisions.”

Some of the sessions were very useful—others not so much, depending mostly on the presenters, but I did come away with some useful ideas that may prove helpful in reaching out to different segments of the population during future membership recruitment drives.



**VII. Significance to ORSSAB:**

The conference provided a valuable opportunity to learn from a variety of professionals about new public involvement practices.

**VIII. Names & Telephone Numbers of Significant Contacts:**

John Blakinger, Greg Ranstrom at [www.conceptscaptured.com](http://www.conceptscaptured.com).

**IX. Action Items:**

None

**X. Traveler's Signature & Date:**

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 9/3/13