

**ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD
to the
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**Public Video Teleconference
Hosted by the U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW – Washington, D.C. 20585**

October 20, 2011

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ARI – Asset Revitalization Initiative	
ARRA – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	INL CAB – Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board
CAB – Citizens Advisory Board	LANL – Los Alamos National Laboratory
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act	LLW – Low-Level Waste
CH-TRU – Contact-Handled Transuranic Waste	NNM CAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board
D&D - Decontamination & Decommissioning	NSSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer	OMB – Office of Management and Budget
DNFSB - Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	OR – (DOE) Oak Ridge Site
DOE – Department of Energy	ORNL - Oak Ridge National Laboratory
DOE-HQ – Department of Energy Headquarters	ORSSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board
DWPF – Defense Waste Processing Facility	Paducah – (DOE) Paducah Site
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement	Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory Board
EM – DOE Office of Environmental Management	PORTS SSAB - Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board
EM SSAB – DOE Office of Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board	Portsmouth – (DOE) Portsmouth Site
FY – Fiscal Year	RH-TRU – Remote-Handled Transuranic Waste
GTCC – Greater-Than-Class C	SRS – (DOE) Savannah River Site
HAB – Hanford Advisory Board	SRS CAB - Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
Hanford – (DOE) Hanford Site	TRU – Transuranic Waste
HLW – High-Level Waste	WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Shelley Cimon, Alternate Member; Pamela McCann, Federal Coordinator; Stacy Charboneau, DDFO; Cameron Salony, Richland Office of Communications and External Affairs

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board: Willie Preacher, Chair; Nicki Karst, Vice Chair; Jim Cooper, DDFO; Lori McNamara, Contractor Support Staff

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board: Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair; Kelly Snyder, DDFO; Cynthia Lockwood, Alternate DDFO; Denise Rupp, Contractor Support Staff

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Ralph Phelps, Chair; Carlos Valdez, Vice Chair; Nick Maestas, Member; Manuel Pacheco, Member; Karen Erickson, Contractor Support Staff; Menice Santistevan, Contractor Support Staff (participated by telephone)

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: Margaret Owen, Chair; Edward Juarez, Vice Chair; David Martin, Member; David Hemelright, Member; Fay Martin, Member; Dave Adler, Alternate DDFO; Pete Osborne, Contractor Support Staff; Spencer Gross, Contractor Support Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Ralph Young, Chair; Margaret Morgan, Vice Chair; Buzz Smith, Federal Coordinator; Eric Roberts, Contractor Support Staff

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Richard Snyder, Chair; Val Francis, Vice Chair; Joel Bradburne, DDFO; Greg Simonton, Federal Coordinator; Julie Galloway, Contractor Support Staff Support Staff; Cyndi Lewis, Rick Green, Contractor to Office of Environmental Management; Contractor Support Staff

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Donald Bridges, Chair; Rose Hayes, Member; George Snyder, Member; Cleveland Latimore, Member; Harold Simon, Member; Patrick McGuire, DDFO; Gerri Flemming, Federal Coordinator

DOE Headquarters:

David Huizenga, Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management

Tracy Mustin, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary

Candice Trummel, Chief of Staff, Office of Acting Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management

Joann Luczak, Senior Advisor to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning & Budget

Dave Geiser, Director, Office of Legacy Management

Cynthia Anderson, Lead for DOE Asset Revitalization Initiative

Melissa Nielson, Director, EM Office of Public and Intergovernmental Accountability

Catherine Alexander, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer

Doug Tonkay, EM Office of Disposal Operations

David Borak, EM Office of Public and Intergovernmental Accountability

Michelle Hudson, EM Office of Public and Intergovernmental Accountability

Connie Lorenz, EM Office of Environmental Compliance
Elizabeth Schmitt, EM Office of Public and Intergovernmental Accountability
Debra Rucker, EM Office of Chief Technical Officer
Steve O'Connor, EM Office of Packing and Transportation
Elizabeth Maksymonko, e-Management
Chuck Thomas, e-Management

Others:

Tom Clements, Friends of the Earth
Alicia Dressman, Private Citizen
Norman Mulvenon, Private Citizen
Mike Nartker, Weapons Complex Monitor

MEETING MINUTES

The Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) met on Thursday, October 20, 2011, via teleconference hosted by the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Environmental Management (EM) in Washington, D.C. Participants included local board officers and members, DOE Headquarters (HQ) and field staff, and EM SSAB Deputy Designated Federal Officers (DDFOs), Federal Coordinators, and contractor support staff. The meeting was open to the public and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Catherine Alexander, the EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. EST.

Presentation: EM Program Update

David Huizenga, the EM Acting Assistant Secretary, welcomed participants. He remarked on the importance of continuing consistent communication and outreach with stakeholders, especially at the local level where the EM SSAB is EM's primary interface with communities. The Cold War legacy cleanup relies on partnership with stakeholders like the EM SSAB, he said. Other points made by Mr. Huizenga are as follows.

EM's mission and priorities remain unchanged. The program has made tremendous progress over the past two decades. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) accelerated EM's work even more, specifically with regard to facilities decontamination and decommissioning (D&D), and soil and groundwater remediation projects. Already reduced by 66% percent in FY 2011, EM's physical footprint will be is expected to be reduced by 69% by FY 2012.

Within the Department of Energy's management structure, the EM organization was recently moved to the Office of the Undersecretary for Nuclear Security. This move positions EM within an organization concerned with nuclear safety and technologies and that conducts work at several EM sites.

Mr. Huizenga thanked the EM SSAB for its input from local communities to help EM define its budget priorities and determine funding allocations. In addition, Mr. Huizenga encouraged the EM SSAB to continue providing input on identifying significant budget priorities and waste disposition strategies. He also asked the members to advise EM on how to enhance communication with the public and the sites.

Mr. Huizenga concluded his remarks and introduced Tracy Mustin, the EM Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, who commented on her visits to Hanford and the Savannah River Site (SRS) and upcoming visits to other sites.

Discussion

Ralph Young of the Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB) inquired about the level of flexibility that sites would have in managing the remaining ARRA funds and work. Mr. Huizenga replied that the funding will stay on the original contract. He noted the ARRA funding has been very effective. EM will plan the closure of spending over the next 18 months to enable a smooth transition.

Willie Preacher of the Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board (INL CAB) noted that agreements need to be honored and that the ARRA funding has helped. DOE and local contractors are helping ARRA employees find new work following lay-offs. He invited the Assistant Secretary to visit INL in November 2011 to meet with a tribal community near the facility and tour the reservation.

Susan Leckband of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) cited accomplishments made with ARRA funding, and noted that there is concern over the loss of next-generation workers due to the completion of ARRA funded work. She also expressed concern about the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's (WIPP) continued availability and capacity for long-term remote-handled transuranic waste (RH-TRU) and contact-handled transuranic waste (CH-TRU) shipments. Lastly, Ms. Leckband extended a site visit invitation to Mr. Huizenga.

Presentation: Chairs' Round Robin

The Chairs shared current topics of interest for their local boards along with recent accomplishments and activities. A copy of the presentation is available at <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/oct11/Presentation%20-%20Top%20Three%20Topics%20and%20Achievements%20by%20Site.pdf>.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board – Ralph Young

- Support for the DOE Asset Revitalization Initiative
- Support for the reuse of assets at the Portsmouth facility (i.e. re-enrichment of uranium tails, reuse of nickel, and asset recovery for long-term D&D)
- Integration of interdependent decisions for future site use

Accomplishments: Completed successful transition to new CAB leadership and added seven new members.

Major Board Activities: Established a 2011-2012 work plan; established milestones for 2012; continued implementation of a focused subcommittees approach; and increased public engagement to support future site use decisions.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) – Don Bridges

- Receipt of additional research reactor spent nuclear fuel and continued long-term storage of existing inventories with no known, approved disposition path
- Effective utilization of H-Canyon
- Prioritization of activities to better position sites to effectively use financial resources in case potential budget cuts materialize
- Lack of a federal repository for nuclear waste disposition and storage

Accomplishment: Members participated in non-CAB meetings and conferences to build their knowledge and to increase the public awareness of the board's activities.

Major Board Activities: The SRS CAB continues to expand its public outreach and recently held community meetings with visitors from the United Kingdom Nuclear Decommissioning Authority.

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) – Kathleen Bienenstein

- Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
- Greater Than Class C (GTCC) EIS

Accomplishments: The NSSAB reviewed and provided comments on the two aforementioned EISs. Additionally, the board submitted eight recommendations to NNSS in FY 2011; six were fully accepted and two were partially accepted.

Major Board Activity: Five new board members were added to the NSSAB on October 2, 2011.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) – Margaret Owen

- The short-term budget will not adequately address the radiological risk at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), the environmental risk of mercury, and life-cycle risk at the East Tennessee Technology Park
- The Oak Ridge (OR) reservation is within city limits and represents a potential environmental risk to the community

Accomplishment: The ORSSAB issued its 200th recommendation and finished the year with 207 total recommendations.

Major Board Activities: The ORSSAB established an EM Budget & Prioritization Committee to work with DOE in developing budget scenarios. The board also added nine new members with three more to come and new leadership.

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board (INLCAB) – Willie Preacher

- Sufficient funding is needed to meet the deadlines associated with INL's accelerated cleanup plan

- Urgency to address the paths forward for spent nuclear fuel, high-level and TRU wastes
- Ensuring workforce reductions do not compromise project milestones, performance, or safety

Accomplishments: The INL CAB sent letters with comments on the DOE budget and GTCC, and a welcome to Mr. Huizenga. The INL CAB has supported the DOE Idaho site and continues efforts to improve communication and outreach efforts. An outreach brochure is being produced.

Major Board Activities: New board members are being identified. The CAB has very active meetings and is reviewing cleanup activities. A site tour of the Environmental Breeder Reactor II will occur to observe D&D work.

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (PORTS SSAB) – Richard Snyder

- Working with the DOE and contractors to plan on-site disposal cell size and location for waste disposition and accumulated waste from the D&D process
- Budget shortfalls and completion timelines for D&D
- Future use plans for the site with an eye on transitioning to non-EM use of the site.

Accomplishment: The Board developed a comprehensive recommendation for DOE that recommended siting assessment of future Onsite Disposal Cells sites (OSDCs) Site D and Site C for their suitability for a potential CERCLA cell.

Major Board Activity: Members participated in the DOE Science Alliance for high school students.

Hanford Advisory Board – Susan Leckband

- Review of the RCRA site-wide permit and structuring public workshops
- Record of Decision issued for burial grounds and the suggested need for more characterization and removal of plutonium for disposal offsite
- The 2015 site vision and solid waste burial grounds

Major Board Activity: The HAB is working with DOE, the Environmental Protection Agency and the State of Washington Department of Ecology on a tri-party agreement for community relations that will incorporate public values; the plan must be functional for the agencies and relevant for the public.

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) – Ralph Phelps

- Sufficient FY 2012 funding for Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) to meet completion of the New Mexico Order on Consent.
- Expedite high-priority cleanup work, such as TA-21 remediation and removal of TRU waste
- Continued development of an integrated site-wide Surface Water and Groundwater Monitoring Program, to optimize execution of the Consent Order

Accomplishment: A June 2011 public forum on surface and groundwater conditions drew 65 public attendees.

Major Board Activity: A strategic initiative is underway to increase membership up to the authorized level of 27 members.

Presentation: 2012 – 2013 Budget Update and ARRA Closeout

Joann Luczak, Senior Advisor to the EM Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Budget, and Debra Rucker, Program Manager for the Chief Technology Officer, presented the FY 2012-2013 budget update and details on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) closeout. A copy of Ms. Luczak's presentation is available at: <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/oct11/Presentation%20-%202012-2013%20Budget%20Update%20and%20ARRA%20Closeout.pdf>

Ms. Luczak underscored three significant elements of the EM mission: 1) the cleanup of legacy waste is a national responsibility, 2) safety is a core component of that mission, and 3) the cost to perform EM's mission will increase over time. She added that EM's partnerships with stakeholders matter now more than ever before.

Among EM's priorities, radioactive tank waste stabilization, treatment and disposal account for 38 percent of the EM budget. Currently EM's "to-go life-cycle cost" ranges between \$185-\$218B. In the future, EM will need to find efficiencies and cost savings strategies in order to deal with declining resource levels. From a compliance standpoint, the program has developed sophisticated relationships with its regulator and stakeholder partners. The challenge going forward will be to work with those partners to balance regulatory obligations and reprioritize expenses, thereby optimizing the use of the EM's resources.

Ms. Debra Rucker reviewed a number of achievements EM accomplished under the ARRA. ARRA's \$6B funding resulted in the completion of work that would have cost nearly \$13B in future years. EM plans to spend any remaining ARRA funding through a buyback program wherein funds will be directed back to the sites and contractors, originally designated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Regarding the base program, Ms. Luczak provided an overview of EM's recent funding history and explained that its budgets have become level. EM submitted a request of \$6.13B for FY 2012. However, based on the House and Senate mark-ups, EM expects that figure to be reduced by \$480-489M. At the time of the meeting, the government was operating under a Continuing Resolution for FY 2012 that ran through November 18, 2011. EM plans to promote its past successes, specifically those associated with the ARRA, in order to make a case for strong budgets now and in the future.

Lastly, Ms. Luczak reported that the FY 2013 EM budget request was submitted to OMB in September. OMB's pass back was expected in late November.

Discussion

Ms. Luczak clarified that EM's FY 2011 operating level is approximately \$5.7B. Regarding the future, deficit reductions will be challenging and it is anticipated that Congress will want to have

control over the size and level of cuts and have a negotiated outcome rather than allowing automatic cuts to occur.

A member of the INL CAB voiced a desire to send letters to encourage the maintenance of current funding levels and the need for additional funding for footprint reduction.

Ms. Luczak noted that the FY 2012 request would allow sites to continue to make progress on meeting enforceable compliance milestones.

It was urged by a member of the NNM CAB that EM continue to focus on WIPP within its strategic goals as it is an end point for TRU waste disposition; budget projections permit for the maintenance of feeder operations but need to sufficiently address WIPP support.

Presentation: Waste Disposition Update

Mr. Douglas Tonkay of the Office of Disposal Operations presented an update on waste disposition priorities and accomplishments. A copy of his presentation is available at: [http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/oct11/Presentation%20-%20Waste%20Disposition%20Update%20\(Updated\).pdf](http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/oct11/Presentation%20-%20Waste%20Disposition%20Update%20(Updated).pdf)

EM has continued to make progress on its waste management priorities. The active treatment of radioactive waste is occurring at the Hanford, Idaho and Savannah River sites. For example, the SRS Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) has treated more than 3,000 cans of waste and set a production record in FY 2011 of 264 cans. At Idaho, construction was completed on an integrated waste treatment unit that should be in operation soon. The Office of River Protection at Hanford is overseeing accelerated construction of the Waste Treatment Plant.

DOE remains committed to storing HLW and spent fuel in a safe manner and to resolve compliance issues until a repository is available. At the Secretary of Energy's request the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) is developing recommendations and has an interest in EM's storage plans. The BRC's report is due in January 2012. Any recommendations made in the report would require Congressional and regulatory action in order to be implemented, if DOE so decides. The greatest risks relative to spent nuclear fuel storage have been addressed by repackaging waste situated along the Columbia River and moving it into dry storage at Hanford. DOE experts see no near-term impacts for HLW storage periods of 50 years or more. DOE will continue to implement measures to safely manage spent fuel and continue discussions with stakeholders.

Currently WIPP is the only geologic repository for TRU waste in the world. As of October 22, 2011, WIPP will have received 10,000 shipments and transported more than 12 million miles total. Most sites with small amounts of legacy TRU waste (called small quantity sites) have had their legacy waste disposed at WIPP. There are still a few more small quantity sites with legacy TRU waste and they are scheduled to be completed FY 2012, but the majority of small quantity sites have been completed. EM has a goal to dispose of 90% of all legacy TRU waste by the end of 2015.

A suite of DOE-operated disposal facilities and some in the commercial sector are available for mixed low-level radioactive waste (MLLW) and low-level radioactive waste (LLW). The Nevada Nuclear Security Site Area 5 is the regional disposal facility, as it accepts waste from DOE sites without disposal facilities. NNSS has the capability to accept LLW and MLLW that does not meet commercial-site waste acceptance criteria at the EnergySolutions, Utah facility. Another commercial facility will soon come online in Texas that is owned by Waste Control Specialists. The support of commercial facilities for treatment and disposal of LLW and MLLW is critical for EM, given the increase in waste generated by ARRA projects.

Mr. Tonkay reviewed recent waste-related accomplishments, highlighting completion of the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit at Idaho; strategies to reuse some of the materials and waste inventory; new national treatment and disposal contracts; and the publication of the draft EIS for GTCC LLW waste disposal, final EIS for mercury storage, and the draft Nevada site-wide EIS. Fiscal challenges influence planned waste-related accomplishments and may require changes to current plans. Transparency is important given the changes in policy and marketplace that affect radioactive waste disposal. Continued partnership with stakeholders, including the public, regulators, agencies and industry, will facilitate future options for EM LLW and MLLW treatment and disposal.

Discussion

A member of the SRS CAB asked if shipping GTCC LLW waste to WIPP is viable and if that would enable EM to accomplish its shipment goals. Mr. Tonkay indicated that the WIPP option is being evaluated in the EIS, and EM has received positive comments on the draft GTCC LLW EIS from New Mexico, which will be taken into account.

In response to a question about the capabilities of the new commercial facility in Texas versus NNSS, Mr. Tonkay stated that DOE has not decided to utilize the Federal Waste Facility being constructed in Texas by Waste Control Specialists. Waste Control Specialists decided to construct the Federal Waste Facility as part of their business plan without any commitment by DOE on its use. Any decision by DOE to use the facility would be through the competitive procurement process. The Waste Control Specialists Federal Waste Facility is a separate facility from their new disposal facility serving the Texas Compact. The Federal Waste Facility is licensed for Class A, B, and C LLW and MLLW disposal as is NNSS, but it cannot accept classified waste, as does NNSS. There are other specific license conditions on waste acceptance at the Waste Control Facility, which is regulated by the State of Texas. Under Texas law, use of the Waste Control Federal Waste Facility by DOE would require DOE to accept ownership of the closed facility upon decommissioning. The Waste Control Specialists facility may offer a future alternative to disposal at NNSS should it be compliant and cost effective.

A member of the SRS CAB asked if EM could identify the location of stored depleted uranium and recover it from burial grounds at NNSS. Mr. Tonkay believes NNSS has waste tracking and record-keeping systems to identify the location of disposed depleted uranium. There was a comment from SRS regarding their position regarding disposal of HLW and spent fuel at Yucca Mountain, and Mr. Tonkay offered to pass SRS's concerns along to DOE officials with spent fuel responsibilities.

Mr. Tonkay confirmed for the HAB that the Tank Waste Closure EIS is planned to be issued in calendar year 2012. A member of the HAB also inquired about WIPP, seeking assurance that it will be open long enough and have capacity to accept TRU waste from Hanford. Mr. Tonkay confirmed that EM is aware that Hanford is a long-term customer for WIPP.

A member of the HAB asked about EM's plans for public meetings to solicit comments on DOE Order 435.1 and asked if one was scheduled at Hanford. Mr. Tonkay indicated that planning is not far enough along to know the locations for upcoming public meetings.

In response to a question from a member of the NNM CAB, Mr. Tonkay shared that the final GTCC EIS will likely be issued in Spring 2012.

Presentation: Asset Revitalization Update

David Geiser, Director of Legacy Management (LM), and Cynthia Anderson, Lead for the Asset Revitalization Initiative (ARI) Task Force, provided an update on the ARI. A copy of their presentation is available online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/oct11/Presentation%20-%20Asset%20Revitalization%20Initiative%20Update.pdf>.

DOE has a long history of asset revitalization that includes transferring and dispositioning waste, engaging the private sector, and opening its sites to support the missions of other federal agencies and the private sector. The challenge for the ARI is finding ways to go about reuse more efficiently and more effectively in the future. A range of opportunities exists for future site use, and DOE-HQ will support the sites in setting parameters and vision for asset revitalization.

DOE's ARI vision reaches out to 2020, at which point the Department will be composed of approximately 20 primary sites. The vision is that each site will operate in a sustainable manner with a modern, adaptable and efficient infrastructure, and collaborate with multiple federal agencies. Public-private partnerships will thrive through investment and job creation opportunities, and local communities will be connected to and advocate for sites.

Mr. Geiser outlined six strategies identified by the ARI task force for achieving the 2020 vision.

- *Accelerate the current shift to multiple site uses and users.* Collocation of multiple federal agencies and commercial partners can take advantage of DOE infrastructure and trained workforce.
- *Transform the workforce to meet future needs.* As federal and contractor workers finish overseeing and conducting cleanup, DOE needs to supply data on projected changes in site missions in order to retain expertise.
- *Revitalize by partnering with non-DOE entities.* To revitalize DOE's infrastructure with limited federal funding, the Department must partner with federal agencies, local governments, community reuse organizations, and public utilities, and attract resources from the private sector.
- *Revitalize to promote DOE's national goals for clean energy and energy security.* Investment in sites and communities can help achieve national goals for clean energy and energy security.

- *Streamline transfer processes to take advantage of private sector opportunities.* Reduce delays in land transfer by projecting when land/infrastructure will become available and what it can be used for, and having transition plans ready to implement.
- *Promote cooperation among program offices.* Successful asset revitalization will require unprecedented programmatic cooperation and synergy.

The ARI task force led to the creation of the ARI and Ms. Anderson was designated to lead the effort, reporting to Undersecretary D'Agostino. The task force has also issued three recommendations:

- *Create and support a cross-cutting "Phase II" effort within DOE.* The cross-cutting team would be responsible for driving actions, implementing future recommendations, and ensuring an integrated DOE-wide approach to revitalization.
- *Engage stakeholders to generate ideas and accelerate positive outcomes.* This represents a shift from passive input-gathering to active planning, outreach, and execution.
- *Compile lessons learned from completed projects in order to replicate successes.*

Ms. Anderson remarked on the DOE stakeholders' interest in land reuse and job creation as evidenced by the successes EM had recently achieved through its Recovery Act Program and footprint reduction efforts. She went on to list a number of ongoing and planned communication tools and outreach activities that her team will deploy to promote the ARI, such as social networking, town hall meetings, and targeted briefings for different constituencies. The task force also will develop a website to share information with local communities and feature an optional subscription service for updates.

With regard to a near-term path forward for the ARI, Ms. Anderson reported that planning is underway for discussions in early 2012 to identify assets and address lease authority and easement issues at the sites. These discussions will likely include DOE officials, developers, investors, and stakeholders such as the EM SSAB members.

Ms. Anderson concluded her presentation by recounting early wins for the ARI. In particular, she mentioned reindustrialization proposals at the Portsmouth and Paducah sites; interest in property transfer at Oak Ridge and SRS; solar power development at NNSS; land transfer at Hanford; and a methodological approach to reuse being undertaken at LANL in conjunction with the local county and city governments. Ms. Anderson also pledged to be an advocate for the sites and to facilitate greater site-HQ interaction.

Discussion

A member of the INL CAB asked how ARI is applicable to sites with ongoing missions. Furthermore, the board wanted to know how tribal rights were taken into account. Mr. Geiser and Ms. Anderson noted that ARI is seen as a Department-wide effort and not just a legacy issue. The task force did not delve into individual tribal rights at Idaho, but recommended a wealth of input and made broad and high-level recommendations, while recognizing that each site has its own unique stakeholders and issues. The INL CAB was assured that tribal rights will be taken into consideration.

Regarding nickel recycling at Portsmouth, Ms. Anderson shared that discussions had occurred with the Under Secretary and that efforts were being made to advance the concept.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Tom Clements from Friends of the Earth commented that South Carolina's conservation community is concerned that future mission associated with asset revitalization at SRS would include the transfer of nuclear waste to the site. He noted that 20 groups representing 50,000 citizens were protesting the movement of waste to SRS and the state. Mr. Clements shared that he was told by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that any small prototype reactors at SRS would need regulation. He also attended a Blue Ribbon Commission meeting and relayed the opinion that the BRC would not support the current political push for reprocessing to occur at SRS.

Mr. Norman Mulvenon, a former member of the ORSSAB, expressed concern that LLW is being shipped to Oak Ridge from other places for commercial processing. Mr. Mulvenon believes this will be an issue with the Tennessee Department of Energy and Conservation. Regarding the budget at OR and that at other sites, Mr. Mulvenon would like to see funding more fairly distributed. He commented that work with a new contractor at the OR site is going well and that the contractor commented in a recent presentation that it could tear down the remainder of a building at the site within its budget of \$191M. Mr. Mulvenon told the EM SSAB that OR has a lot of nickel and that he would like to see it put to use. Lastly, he commented that long-term stewardship is an important issue at OR and that the site is at the forefront for establishing storage as a primary goal.

Discussion of Products

Members of the SRS CAB proposed that the Chairs develop a product recommending that GTCC materials be shipped to WIPP. The proposal was supported by the representatives who were present, but it was noted that such a recommendation may not garner consensus. Representatives from the HAB expressed concern that the acceptance of GTCC waste at WIPP would negatively impact its schedule and storage capacity for RH-TRU. WIPP's operations are tied to the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act, as amended, by Public Law 102-579, and legal requirements that dictate the capacity to expand.

Ms. Alexander suggested that the SRS CAB draft a proposal for the Chairs' consideration if this is a recommendation that it would like to pursue.

Board Business

The next bimonthly EM SSAB Chairs' call will be held on December 7, 2011, at 3:00 p.m. EST.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Ms. Alexander adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m. EST.

APPENDIX A

**ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC
ADVISORY BOARD CHAIRS MEETING**

Thursday, October 20, 2011	
11:00 am – 11:45 am*	EM Update , Acting Assistant Secretary David Huizenga
11:45 am – 12:30 pm	Chairs' Round Robin
12:30 pm – 1:00 pm	2012-2013 Budget Update and ARRA Closeout , Joann Luczak, Special Assistant to Deputy Assistant Secretary
1:00 pm – 1:15 pm	Break
1:15 pm – 1:45pm	Waste Disposition Update , Doug Tonkay, Office of Disposal Operations
1:45 pm – 2:15 pm	Asset Revitalization Initiative Update , Cynthia Anderson, Lead, Asset Revitalization Initiative; David Geiser, Director of Legacy Management
2:15 pm – 2:30 pm	Public Comment Period
2:30 pm – 3:00 pm	Chairs' Discussion of Products

*All times are Eastern Time.