

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

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**The Carson Center
100 Kentucky Avenue, Paducah, KY 42003**

April 18 - 19, 2012

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ARI – Asset Revitalization Initiative	INL CAB – Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board
ARRA – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	LANL – Los Alamos National Laboratory
CAB – Citizens Advisory Board	LLW – Low-Level Waste
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act	MLLW – Mixed 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	ORNL – Oak Ridge National Laboratory
DOE – Department of Energy	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
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	RH-TRU – Remote-Handled Transuranic waste
FY – Fiscal Year	SC – DOE Office of Science
GAO – U.S. Government Accountability Office	SNF – Spent Nuclear Fuel
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	U ²³³ – Uranium-233
INL – Idaho National Laboratory	WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
	WTP – Waste Treatment Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Tiffany Nguyen, Federal Coordinator; Sharon Braswell, Contract Support Staff

Idaho National Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board: Nicki Karst, Chair; Herb Bohner, Member; Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator; Lori McNamara, Contract Support Staff

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board: Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair; Art Goldsmith, Member; Kelly Snyder, Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Denise Rupp, Contract Support Staff

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Ralph Phelps, Chair; Carlos Valdez, Member; Ed Worth, Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Menice Santistevan, Contract Support Staff

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: David Hemelright, Member; Edward Juarez, Vice Chair; David Martin, Member; David Adler, Alternate Deputy Designated Federal Officer, Spencer Gross, Contractor Support Staff

Paducah Citizens' Advisory Board: Ralph Young, Chair; Judy Clayton, Ben Peterson, Kenneth Wheeler, Members; Reinhard Knerr, Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Eric Roberts, Jim Ethridge, Contractor Support Staff

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Richard Snyder, Chair; Shirley Bandy, Cristy Renner, Members; Greg Simonton, Federal Coordinator; Julie Galloway, Cindy Lewis, Contractor Support Staff

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Donald Bridges, Chair; Marolyn Parson, Member; Patrick McGuire, Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Gerri Flemming, Federal Coordinator; Erica Williams, Contractor Support Staff

DOE Headquarters:

David Huizenga, Senior Advisor, Office of Environmental Management
 Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Waste Management
 Terry Tyborowski, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Program Planning and Budget
 Catherine Alexander, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer
 Melissa Nielson, Director, EM Office of Intergovernmental and Community Activities
 Elizabeth Schmitt, Office of Intergovernmental and Community Activities

Others:

Bill Murphie, Manager, Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office
 Rick Greene, Restoration Services, Inc.
 Michael Schenkenfelder, University of Kentucky
 Joshua Robinson, University of Kentucky
 Chris Hayse, University of Kentucky
 Katherine VanHoose, University of Kentucky
 Lauren Gilliland, University of Kentucky

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Jennifer Jourdan, University of Kentucky
Taylor Steele, University of Kentucky
Nathan Owings, University of Kentucky
Mikaela Coston, University of Kentucky
Lindsey Elza, University of Kentucky
Margaret Clines, University of Kentucky
Trent Wakenight, Note Taker

MEETING MINUTES

The Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) Chairs met on April 18 – 19, 2012, at the Carson Center in Paducah, Kentucky. Meeting participants included EM SSAB officers and members, DOE Headquarters (HQ) and field staff, 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 Designated Federal Officer for the EM SSAB, called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. CST. EM SSAB representatives and all meeting attendees were introduced. Eric Roberts, the meeting facilitator, reviewed the agenda and logistical details.

Welcoming remarks were provided by Ralph Young, Chair of the Paducah Citizens' Advisory Board (CAB), Reinhard Knerr, DDFO of the Paducah CAB, and Bill Murphie, Manager of the Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office. Mr. Murphie also recognized the 50th anniversary of the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. He then introduced David Huizenga, Senior Advisor for EM.

Presentation: EM Program Update

Mr. Huizenga provided a brief overview of current issues being addressed by EM. Recently, he met with the House Appropriations Committee to discuss EM program activities, specifically, whether there are sufficient funds committed to legacy waste cleanup.

EM's Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 budget request came to \$5.65B. However, the House Appropriations Committee has recommended that the request be reduced by \$100M. EM's budget has remained relatively flat for the past two years. Although the \$5.6B level has allowed EM to meet its compliance needs and site-specific concerns, Mr. Huizenga reminded the Chairs that the program had originally planned for a level of \$6B. EM management is working with federal staff, contractors, and stakeholders to develop strategies for ramping down from the planned \$6B level to \$5.6B. EM needs to find ways to work more efficiently and continue make progress within these fiscal constraints.

Safety continues to be a high priority for EM. The Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) held a hearing on safety culture at Hanford on March 22, 2012, to address employee concerns over fear of retaliation for reporting safety issues to management. EM has made

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

progress with regard to these concerns, but there is still work to be done. Mr. Huizenga expressed his hope that EM will continue to build an environment where employees are comfortable voicing their safety concerns.

EM's contract and project management capabilities continue to improve. Mr. Huizenga referenced projects occurring at Hanford and Idaho, such as the pending start-up of the Sodium Bearing Waste Facility, as examples. EM is working hard to manage large projects responsibly. Mr. Huizenga met with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in mid-April to discuss EM's contract and project management efforts. GAO has included EM projects on its High-Risk List for several years due to recurring overruns in cost and schedule. EM has since made many improvements to its project management processes, and Mr. Huizenga wants to ensure that GAO is aware of all the good work that is underway.

Discussion

Dick Snyder, Chair of the Portsmouth SSAB (PORTS SSAB) asked Mr. Huizenga to comment on the Portsmouth site's budget and opportunities for metals and materials recycling. Mr. Huizenga acknowledged that Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 budget constraints will impact Portsmouth. He also stated that EM strongly supports recycling and in the coming weeks hopes to learn more about nickel recycling from the private sector. Technologies exist that can clean nickel for unrestricted use. EM wants to pursue those opportunities in order to produce jobs at a site and potentially secure additional revenue to support cleanup. Mr. Huizenga suggested that additional recycling opportunities may be available at Paducah and Oak Ridge. EM has engaged in discussions with the United Steelworkers Union regarding the potential for recycling other materials as well. Mr. Huizenga commented on future site use and shared that DOE's Asset Revitalization Initiative (ARI) is underway. The Portsmouth and Paducah sites are good examples of why it's important for DOE and local communities to start looking toward the future.

Christy Renner of the PORTS SSAB commented that while Secretary Chu is pushing for reindustrialization at the site, the Portsmouth community is concerned about budget cuts that will impact the current cleanup mission. The unemployment rate in Scioto County, Ohio – of which Portsmouth is the county seat – is at 17 percent. The community does not have nuclear concerns and hopes that accelerated cleanup and the integration of industry partners will help the site reach the previously announced goal of creating 3,000 new jobs. Extending the cleanup schedule will impact the community. Mr. Huizenga recognized the need to support opportunities for redevelopment while being sensitive to the political context. DOE has assets, such as uranium, that could potentially serve to alleviate shortfalls in the current budget environment, as long as sale of the assets will not cause disruptions in related markets.

Ralph Phelps, Chair of the Northern New Mexico CAB (NNMCAB), asked if studies were being conducted on expanding the use of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), and urged EM to support such efforts. Mr. Huizenga referred Mr. Phelps to Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste Management, as he is the best resource for information related to WIPP. Mr. Marcinowski serves on the DOE panel charged with reviewing the Blue Ribbon Commission's (BRC) recommendations. Mr. Huizenga said EM is proud of WIPP's

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

accomplishments. He stated that EM will work with Congress to explore the level of flexibility for expanding its uses. With regard to the possible storage of high-level waste (HLW) at WIPP, Mr. Huizenga explained that further scientific and technical bases are needed to identify safe and secure disposal options.

Susan Leckband, Chair of Hanford Advisory Board (HAB), shared that recent budget decreases have compelled Hanford employees and contractors to look for efficiencies, and wondered if DOE had a process in place that was not requirements-driven, but rather encouraged streamlining efforts in order to save dollars for cleanup. Mr. Huizenga shared that the Office of Health, Safety and Security recently instructed programs offices to identify duplicative efforts or things that did not benefit existing regulations. He invited the EM SSAB to share any ideas and noted that Terry Tyborowski, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Budget, would address this when she discussed DOE's strategic direction.

Don Bridges, Chair of the SRS CAB, voiced concern about EM continuing at a \$5.6B budget level, and specifically how that will impact the program's ability to meet regulatory requirements and Departmental goals. Mr. Huizenga noted that there is hope that the economy will pick up and the EM budget will shift back closer to \$6B at some point. However, in the meantime, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has instructed EM to continue planning for a flat budget. Mr. Huizenga also noted that the Secretary and the White House are working on a national energy strategy that includes nuclear power, reactors, renewable, and other energy resources. Solid investments in basic science are important.

Dr. Bridges suggested that the EM cleanup sites would be open to some type of development and expressed hope for investing more energy into reuse options. He suggested that DOE take advantage of the existing nuclear expertise at EM sites; this was supported by Ms. Renner who urged that current expertise not be lost. Mr. Huizenga stated that EM is being creative and is receptive to the sites' ideas regarding the role they can play in DOE's greater strategic vision. He also stated that he hopes the Senate Appropriations Committee will support EM's budget request, but acknowledged that EM will need to be prepared to continue managing with lower levels of funding.

Ms. Leckband commented on the ARI and discussions from several years ago about using existing technology to spur redevelopment. Mr. Huizenga noted that the ARI is still ongoing.

Mr. Snyder asked if budget reductions will impact fixed costs. Mr. Huizenga expressed that facilities will have to be safeguarded. A significant portion of EM's budget is needed to cover basic maintenance costs and to keep facilities ready to work. EM is looking for ways to use its facilities more efficiently.

Marolyn Parson of the SRS CAB asked if Congressional representatives know of redevelopment issues and concerns being discussed at local levels. Mr. Huizenga said he believes that representatives are focused on their districts and what is going on at home.

Nicki Karst, Vice Chair of the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) CAB, asked about the status of the BRC Report. Mr. Marcinowski explained that DOE has convened an internal working group

with representatives from different program offices to explore options for implementing the BRC recommendations. The results of working groups' deliberations will be delivered to the Secretary for review in June.

Ms. Leckband urged that despite potential budget cuts, EM's support for public involvement remain intact in order to gain input on issues that require citizen engagement. Mr. Huizenga shared that the FY 2014 budget is under development and agreed that public engagement is a relatively small investment with the potential to produce significant returns. This is a key time for communication, and Mr. Huizenga will work with Melissa Nielson, Director for the Office of Intergovernmental and Community Activities, to continue focus on this point.

Presentations: Chairs Round Robin: Chairs' Site Reports

The Chairs shared current issues facing their sites and significant local board accomplishments and activities. A copy of the Round Robin presentation is available at <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/Chairs%20Round%20Robin%20-%20Topics%20and%20Achievements%20FINAL.pdf>.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) – Ed Juarez

Since its inception, the ORSSAB has been committed to stewardship and asset reuse. Back then, an end-user working group produced two reports that led to a national workshop in 1999 and a commitment that stewardship be ingrained in EM's culture. Since then, the ORSSAB has worked site-specific areas of concern and is working with DOE on a geographic identification system (GIS) to show areas of remediated waste. In particular, there is interest in areas where contamination remains. The ORSSAB supports EM's continued commitment to stewardship.

In 2011, the ORSSAB produced a white paper entitled, "Balancing Environmental Challenges with the Complexities of the Oak Ridge Reservation."¹ The paper identifies complexities at the site that are known to many waste management professionals, but that were not widely publicized previously. Oak Ridge was chosen to support the Manhattan Project, and now confronts unique challenges for remediation and cleanup when coupled with high rainfall and site-specific geography.

The ORSSAB recommended that Oak Ridge use the white paper to help make a case for increased funding in its annual budget requests.

Mr. Huizenga shared that DOE is determining what to do with the K-25 North Tower and whether a small amount of money could be used to save the tower for commemorative purposes. The ORSSAB has recommended dismantling the tower, according to Mr. Juarez. The National Park Service made its own recommendations, but did not commit any funds for preservation. Ms. Leckband added that a non-profit organization was formed at Hanford for a similar effort to preserve the site's B Reactor. Kathy Bienenstein of the Nevada SSAB (NSSAB) shared that the

¹ <http://www.oro.doe.gov/em/ssab/Publications/EMChallengesandComplexity.pdf>
Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Nevada site's Atomic Testing Museum was originally privately owned, but is now a national museum.

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board (INL CAB) – Nicki Karst

The INL CAB is concerned that there is no clear path forward for spent nuclear fuel and HLW disposition. The BRC has recognized that a repository is needed and because they have a settlement agreement, the waste must leave Idaho by 2035. The road must be ready but the requirement cannot be met without knowing where the waste will go and in what form.

Mr. Huizenga explained that materials are being moved from wet to dry storage and that safety is probably not an issue for the next few years. Ms. Karst added that there are safety measures in place, but no details on what form of waste will be accepted in the future repository. Not knowing could have budgetary impacts if money is spent preparing a form that eventually would not be acceptable.

Hot isostatic pressing is an approach being considered, Mr. Huizenga added, and the facility would be modified for that. He recognized that a flexible approach is needed. This hinges on the BRC completing its report, then Congress staying focused and making decisions on next steps. Mr. Huizenga recognized that there is a 2035 deadline and critical decisions need to be made with regard to the Idaho settlement agreement.

A second concern of the INL CAB is that the EM budget will not maintain the accelerated pace of cleanup and reach the 2015 clean-up vision. The site has a skilled workforce already undergoing layoffs. The workforce will be lost due to proposed budget cuts. Ms. Karst urged restoring the budget now to save costs over the project's lifetime. Mr. Huizenga responded that this message is being conveyed to appropriators, OMB, and others, and that their response is to limit the proposed decrease to an approximately \$100M cut. He suggested a benchmark of success could also be to not receive a more drastic cut. He urged the EM SSAB to help communicate program accomplishments, such as the ARRA.

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) – Kathleen Bienenstein

U²³³ waste disposition is in the early stages and evaluations are taking place. The NSSAB is learning about waste acceptance criteria and has continued its interest in transportation and safe waste disposition. Different transportation routes to the site are being examined, especially in light of the informal agreement prohibiting transport through Las Vegas, Nevada. Additionally, California prohibits transport during certain times of the year and does not allow transport through Death Valley. The NSSAB has learned from the members' past experience regarding Yucca Mountain that transparent public communication is vital when it comes to transportation issues and is involved in DOE's public engagement efforts.

Mr. Huizenga commended the NSSAB for supporting the acceptance of waste from Oak Ridge, noting that the Nevada site's geology is more suitable for acceptance than Oak Ridge and saves considerable expense.

Dr. Bridges asked Mr. Huizenga to comment on blending down the U²³³. Mr. Huizenga noted that some of the down-blended U²³³ still needs to be processed and disposed of at Oak Ridge; however, some can be directly disposed of at Nevada.

Ms. Bienenstein reported on the addition of a student liaison position on the NSSAB. Local students from a high school in Clark County will have the opportunity to apply to serve on the NSSAB for two years. Ms. Bienenstein also shared that students from the West Career and Technical Academy are developing a Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) EM educational tool to help describe the site's mission and activities to the public. Academy students will assess their peers' knowledge of the site, and then develop and launch the educational tool based on feedback. The Academy has an outstanding engineering program. Participating students will give a five-minute report on their survey results and progress.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) – Susan Leckband

The HAB held a meeting in February 2012 to gather members' concerns about the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP). At issue with the WTP is the acceptance of safety concerns raised by employees, DOE staff, and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB). Two HAB committees are developing advice. WTP is the backbone of Hanford, and there are no alternatives under consideration for managing the more than 50 million gallons of waste. The HAB supports a safe and successful design and construction of the WTP. Public meetings such as the one in February have proven successful in the past, providing participants an opportunity to speak for two to three minutes on specific issues and concerns.

Mr. Huizenga remarked that EM needs to reaffirm the importance of cultivating an environment where employees can raise concerns without fear of reprisal. EM is also working on a way to address safety concerns that are directly related to technical issues; the program seeks to hear and address employee concerns, while also balancing differences of opinion and scientific evidence.

Ms. Leckband described the HAB and public's attendance at DOE meetings. The HAB's Budgets and Contracts committee has given input to DOE to aid public understanding of budget scenarios. At a meeting on March 13, 2012, the committee drafted advice on the site's FY 2014 budget request. The committee may develop additional advice in June and is working closely with DOE to promote publicly accessible budget information.

The HAB is preparing a white paper on the value of the board and how much of its advice is values-based. Ms. Leckband also noted that the HAB has not involved itself in land transfer yet, but remains focused on cleanup issues. Columbia River cleanup and WTP remain at the top of the HAB's priorities.

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

The PORTS SSAB believes that a metals and materials recycling program would result in tangible benefits for the community surrounding the site. The DOE Portsmouth Paducah Project Office is exploring reuse strategies with the Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative (SODI), a local redevelopment organization. SODI has supported upgrades to a steel industrialization

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

project that will result in an estimated 100 new jobs. Additionally, SODI has supported a sewer expansion project.

PORTS SSAB members are concerned about the current budget outlook and potential impacts to their site's decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) projects and other cleanup efforts. The local community is concerned that little progress will be made and that reindustrialization efforts will be delayed. Members have also expressed interest in recycling opportunities that could provide income, which would in turn benefit the local community. The community would like to work with the government and serve as a model for other sites throughout the complex.

Portsmouth must submit a compliant budget request each year; FY 2013 is no exception. West Valley and Portsmouth were the only sites to take a reduction in FY 2012, yet still meet regulatory requirements. However, if there is a \$100M cut to the EM program next year, the site will likely not meet its requirements.

Mr. Huizenga noted that Senator Sherrod Brown (D-OH) and others do not want this reduction to occur at sites in their districts; this is not an election issue but really a budgetary issue.

Ms. Renner shared that the Edison Center and Battelle are coming together to discuss recycling for many different areas. She also urged that the Paducah site's centrifuge capabilities be maintained so that this technology is available in the U.S. Mr. Huizenga commented that Mr. Murphie is working on that issue at Paducah and that the facility will be maintained while replacement technology is developed.

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

Priorities for the SRS CAB are liquid waste remediation and the spent fuel program. The first issue deals with the receipt of spent fuel at SRS without a disposition path. It seems that processing will not be done without H-Canyon. The SRS CAB would like to see fuel processed through the Canyon, but if it is not, then a disposition path needs to be identified.

Mr. Huizenga responded that there is a need to balance policy and budget issues to identify the most cost-effective approach as EM is still actively reviewing options.

Dr. Bridges noted the SRS CAB is also concerned about the effective use of H-Canyon. Members would like to see a specified process for the facility and equal focus on research and development (R&D) to support the national fuel cycle program. Research should focus on recycling on a national scale, Dr. Bridges clarified that this does not suggest nationwide processing.

Mr. Huizenga noted that the Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) is tasked with the national fuel cycle program and that there may be recommendations resulting from the Department's review of the BRC report. EM is actively discussing these topics and keeping an open mind on this issue.

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

The NNM CAB has recommended the accelerated removal of TRU waste from the Material Disposal Area G (MDA-G) site at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). In 2000, there was a fire that led to an evacuation of Los Alamos and that called attention to safety concerns at MDA-G. Another fire in 2011 brought attention to TRU waste.

The NNM CAB made three recommendations on accelerating TRU waste cleanup. This was followed by a letter from Governor Susana Martinez supporting the acceleration. As a result, the NNM CAB hosted a meeting between DOE and the State of New Mexico to discuss a framework agreement for acceleration. There are adjusted interim milestones, but they do not affect the end date at this time. Funds have been shifted to accelerate waste removal from MDA-G by 2014. An online performance-management tool provides public updates on progress.

The NNM CAB is helping to make these issues visible to the public; the NNM CAB is one interface for providing public information.

Mr. Huizenga shared that EM was encouraged by the Governor's support, and he thinks that the framework agreement has great merit. He hopes to see continued progress in the cleanup effort.

Mr. Huizenga's asked about the NNM CAB's position on the utilization of WIPP. Mr. Phelps shared that the Board has no formal position.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB) – Ralph Young

The Paducah site is facing changes and is not as far along in its cleanup mission as other sites. The Paducah CAB draws upon effective practices at other sites. The CAB's main issue is developing an integrated site strategy for future actions. Information collection will support future use ideas and a comprehensive site management plan.

The Paducah CAB would like to see the continuation of DOE's presence in the local community and reindustrialization at the site. Economic development professionals have not been engaged to provide input on marketing the site for future use as of yet. Recreational opportunities are also being examined in the context of future site use.

The Paducah CAB is also pushing for historical preservation and hopes to leverage the interest of local citizens who are passionate about preservation. Members are also interested in community engagement and helping EM and other stakeholders communicate.

Recent Paducah CAB recommendations have addressed such topics as tails re-processing, successful groundwater treatment, and communication on historical preservation. A recommendation on describing pro-nuclear activities at the site has also been offered, conveying the needs to promote the local workforce's specialized skills. A public workshop has been planned to address waste disposition alternatives and the desire to come to decisions that are equitable for the facilities and community. The Paducah CAB also seeks to keep nickel recycling alive and is able to draw upon similar actions taken at the Portsmouth site.

Mr. Huizenga commented that the tails re-processing issue is in development. He also asked if Paducah was working as actively on historical preservation as Oak Ridge. Mr. Young shared that Oak Ridge has been advising Paducah on this topic and that Oak Ridge's approach provided inspiration for preservation. Mr. Huizenga suggested that the Board look at Hanford's preservation efforts as well.

Discussion

Mr. Huizenga stated that the local EM SSAB recommendations are useful. He also noted that he found the Chairs' descriptions of local accomplishments very informative and will work with Ms. Alexander and Ms. Nielson to put that information to use.

Board Business

Mr. Huizenga recognized a number of Chairs who will complete their leadership terms before the next full EM SSAB meeting. The outgoing Chairs who were recognized included Judy Clayton (Paducah CAB), Mr. Phelps (NNMCAB), Mr. Snyder (PORTS SSAB), Walt Wegst (NSSAB), and Ron Murphree (ORSSAB). Mr. Huizenga also recognized the support staff at the sites and thanked them for the collective knowledge, input and expertise that they provide to the EM SSAB members and chairs.

Students from the University of Kentucky's College of Design provided brief remarks regarding a model of Paducah's Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The model depicts site contamination and allows the students to demonstrate their proposed strategies for cleanup and remediation.

Presentation: FY 2013 Budget Update

Terry Tyborowski, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Program Planning and Budget, gave an update on the FY 2012 enacted budget and the FY 2013 budget request. Her presentation is available at:

<http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/SSAB%20Chairs%20April%202012%20Tyborowski.pdf>

Ms. Tyborowski reported that on April 18, 2012, the House Appropriations Subcommittee will markup its legislation and vote on modifications. On May 3, 2012 the House Appropriations Full Committee mark was completed. The FY 2013 Congressional Request totals \$5.6B. Reductions were taken from defense environmental cleanup (-\$88.9M) and Uranium Enrichment D&D Funds (\$-17M). The Senate will conduct budget mark-ups next week.

Currently, EM is executing the FY 2012 budget and defending FY 2013 on the Hill. The hearing on April 17, 2012, went well. EM is currently developing its FY 2014 budget request. EM previously anticipated a budget of approximately \$6B for the coming years. However, based on the current environment, EM will need to continue to plan for a lower level of funding and manage its work under the proposed \$5.6B ceiling.

Ms. Tyborowski explained that the Budget Control Act of 2012 looked at overall government agency funding targets for 2012 and 2013 with a target of reducing costs by \$1.047T. There are

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

12 appropriation bills in need of approval, which will come in \$19B below the President's initial request. The longer it takes for the House and Senate to reconcile their budget markups, the greater the likelihood that there will be a Continuing Resolution (CR) in early FY 2013.

The FY 2013 budget process also includes a sequestration provision that will require all agencies to sustain a 10 percent cut as of January 1, 2013. This provision resulted from the inability of the Debt Super Committee to generate a feasible plan in 2011. The sequestration provision affects all agencies. For example, Department of Defense contractors are moving forward and considering ways to trim 10 percent from the approximately \$600B budget.

EM continues to build scenarios for a variety of fiscal conditions. Previous budget planning focused on requesting inputs from sites to plan for a budget of up to \$7B. Now, greater consideration is given to flat-lining budgets for the near future at levels around \$5.6B. Fiscal representatives for each site met at DOE HQ in early April to offer their input and propose solutions.

Ms. Tyborowski explained that approval of the FY 2013 budget request will not override the sequestration provision. Congress could pass these bills and secure a budget, but the 10 percent reduction still looms as current law. There is an opportunity this fall for Congress to change the January 2013 deadline. However, this is a lame duck session, and there is a possibility Congress might delay some actions until the new session begins in January 2013.

Overall, EM's appropriations for 2008-2010 exceeded its requests. However, in 2011 and 2012, the opposite occurred with the program sustaining decreases of \$382M and \$420M, respectively. Looking at 2014 and the potential for flat or declining budgets, EM faces uncertainty in planning decisions year-to-year. EM must focus on reaching out to sites, regulators, OMB, and Congress to clearly communicate the importance of its mission and to make the case for higher levels of funding. In a five-year snapshot, EM's planned work and funding targets exceed the projected budget by \$1B to \$3B per year.

In its FY 2013 request, EM has asked for sufficient funding to cover regulatory requirements; the program will do the same for FY 2014.

Ms. Tyborowski noted that the prospect of a CR is part of a familiar cycle. She remains hopeful that the budget situation will improve in 2015 and that Congress will see the negative impacts of budget reductions.

Presentation: Use of iPads for GIS

Ben Peterson of the City of Paducah informed EM SSAB members on how to use iPads to access GIS data to identify facility locations. iPad GIS capabilities are tools for site redevelopment discussions, providing users, including the Paducah CAB, with geographic and spatial context around buildings. Mr. Peterson noted that eventually the application will also include groundwater plume information and serve as a means to demonstrate movement.

Presentation: Waste Disposition Update

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Waste Management, gave an update on waste disposition priorities, accomplishments and goals for FY 2012 and 2013. His presentation is available at:

<http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/SSAB%20Chairs%20April%202012%20Marcinowski%20final.pdf>

Over the past year, the EM HQ organization was realigned into 1) business support offices, which perform corporate functions, and 2) mission units, which support cleanup activities at the sites. The three mission units include: the Office of Site Restoration, the Office of Tank Waste and Nuclear Materials, and the Office of Waste Management.

Mr. Marcinowski confirmed that EM will meet its compliance milestones in FY 2012. The budget request submitted for FY 2013 will also accommodate achievement of the enforceable milestones, but will make it difficult for EM to accomplish precursor activities necessary for continued success in out years. Mr. Marcinowski said there will be discussions with stakeholders about resource limitations and expenditures.

Despite fiscal challenges, EM has made significant progress with regard to its waste management activities in FY 2011 and 2012. WIPP continues to perform at a high level. EM received its first delivery of TRUPACT-III units and is working with the manufacturer to get the rest delivered to SRS as soon as possible. TRU waste shipments to WIPP have continued. The last shipment from a small quantity site will leave Sandia in May 2012.

EM has continued to optimize LLW and MLLW disposal options. NNSS has initiated operations at its new mixed waste disposal facility. Nearly 90 percent of EM's LLW and MLLW is disposed at the site where it is generated. The remainder is split between disposal at commercial sites and NNSS; this was split equal in 2011. Packaging requirements, shipment constraints, types of waste, and cost all factor into the decisions regarding where disposition takes place.

EM published its Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) LLW disposal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The most significant GTCC-like inventory for DOE is located at the West Valley Demonstration Project. The draft document generated roughly 5,000 comments that are currently under review. A number of disposal locations are being considered; the decision will also depend on consultation with Congress. EM hopes to have a path forward better defined later in the year.

EM recently published its first Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Determination for the melter unit that was used at West Valley, pursuant to DOE Order 435.1 (O 435.1); the program has not previously exercised this provision of O 435.1. The determination addresses how some waste streams can qualify as LLW even though they may have been part of a process that involved HLW. The determination document was made available for public review. This process is important to tank closures at Hanford, as it is the only regulatory framework available to guide the closure of Hanford's tanks.

Approval for the SRS Tank Farm Waste Determination is complete. Grout is being poured into Tanks 18 and 19; as of last week, this effort was nearly 10 percent complete. Another accomplishment at SRS is the movement toward a disposal plan for excess plutonium.

Mr. Snyder asked about the onsite disposal cell at Portsmouth. Mr. Marcinowski responded that the disposal plan for site waste has not been determined yet, pending the outcome of the siting process. Onsite disposal could save significant amounts of money, as opposed to sending waste offsite.

Start-up of the Sodium Bearing Waste Treatment Facility at Idaho is a priority for FY 2012. The identification of a repository and acceptance criteria may allow EM to directly dispose of the sodium bearing waste in its steam-reformed state, which would reduce resources needed for additional potential processing.

Regarding TRU disposition, Mr. Marcinowski shared that there is an urgency to characterize remote-handled waste streams in order to optimize the disposal capacity of WIPP and TRU waste shipments capabilities. Part of EM's focus for 2013 will involve ensuring that SRS, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), and INL, prepare sufficient TRU inventories to fully utilize shipping resources. There are some issues at the Idaho site, which have paused operations. Los Alamos' packaging operations are hitting their stride, which will enable meeting 2014 commitments. SRS is doing well with packaging.

Ms. Leckband commented that Hanford has prepared TRU waste for shipment and is concerned about remote-handled TRU (RH TRU). Mr. Marcinowski shared that there is a plan for Hanford's RH TRU, but it is not in the budget until 2015.

Mr. Marcinowski thanked the NSSAB for supporting the shipment and receipt of U²³³ from Oak Ridge. EM has entered discussions with the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection and the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, as well as Senator Reid's (D-NV) office to further explore the path forward for this effort.

EM is assisting in the development of Secretary Chu's response to the BRC report. DOE has initiated studies regarding the thermal effects of waste packages on a salt matrix. Mining activities are underway to prepare a test bed at the facility. Mr. Marcinowski mentioned that thermal tests were previously conducted in the northern end of WIPP, but ceased when the decision was made to limit the facility's acceptance to TRU waste. EM intends to go back and recover that data.

Mr. Marcinowski briefly covered EM's FY 2013 priorities and other waste management activities. EM has made a few commitments within the DOE in response to leadership's expectations. Specifically, EM issued an expression of interest regarding nickel recycling opportunities for the Portsmouth site less than one month ago. Technical proposals are expected by the end of the month and business proposals one month later. Depending on the technical evaluation, it is hoped that the National Environmental Policy Act process can begin in FY 2013 and public input can be gathered. This will inform determinations on how to proceed with recycling.

EM is also dealing with mercury storage and, at the request of Congress, is working to identify a storage site in light of the mercury export ban. Mercury is also an issue for the gold mining industry, as mercury is a byproduct of certain mining processes.

Discussions regarding updates to O 435.1 are still underway. EM wants to ensure that the Order sufficiently serves current needs at the sites and is as streamlined as possible. Ms. Leckband asked about the timeline for the review and how long the public will have to provide input. Mr. Marcinowski agreed to confirm the length of time for public input, but believes that it will be 90 days. Regardless of the level of public interest, Mr. Marcinowski suggested that a representative from DOE could still visit the HAB to explain the proposed revisions. Ms. Leckband said that the HAB would like that.

Mr. Marcinowski concluded his presentation with a brief update on the ARI. ARI is a DOE-wide effort housed in the office of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security and NNSA Administrator Tom D'Agostino. Cynthia Anderson serves as the lead for the initiative. She plans to host a workshop to discuss ARI opportunities and best practices on June 13 – 14, 2012, in Oak Ridge, TN. Mr. Marcinowski agreed to talk with Ms. Anderson to determine whether the workshop would be open to members of the EM SSAB.

Presentation: DOE HQ News and Views

Ms. Alexander described the review process for EM SSAB membership appointment/reappointment packages, noting that many boards have asked about this process. In 2012, thus far, six membership packages have been processed and appointment letters sent. Two more boards have packages awaiting final review and approval.

Ms. Alexander explained that the Office of Intergovernmental and Community Activities (EM 3.2), where she and the EM SSAB team are located, does not control how long it takes to move a package through the various review offices that include General Counsel, the Committee Management Office (CMO) in DOE's Executive Secretariat, and several other offices within DOE, before going for reviews and, finally, appointment letter signatures in the EM-1 (Senior Advisory/Assistant Secretary's) Office. EM 3.2 also does not set the review schedule, but has a role in package creation, ensuring it meets CMO content and formatting requirements, as well as facilitates the process for EM at HQ.

The DOE CMO requires that EM SSAB membership packages be submitted 120 days before an appointment letter is signed. Thirty days are added to that timeline for the draft stage of the process. Generally, 30 days is more than adequate, but can vary depending on how long it takes to get the package into the required form by the site and EM 3.2. The draft package is also submitted for preview to General Counsel, and sometimes, changes are required as a result of that.

Most packages are processed and appointment letters, sent by HQ within 50 days after official site submittal—a much shorter time than the 120 day requirement, which the CMO decided

upon to ensure that any potential review delays do not hold up the distribution of membership letters.

Although the process is may seem lengthy to members, it is very thorough and functions within a strict legal framework. EM 3.2 gets high marks from the CMO for the efficient and timely submission of its packages and the minimal amount of work required by other offices upon submission.

Discussion

Ms. Alexander clarified that DOE is responsible for the nomination and appointment of members. Ms Bienenstein expressed that local boards should have a say in who is appointed because they have a sense of who will be a good fit and will be able to work well with the other members. Ms. Alexander explained that DOE is not seeking simply to fill a seat but to identify someone who would be productive and bring different perspectives to the local board. Site demographics differ and balance of affected populations is important. She added that balance is site-specific; each site looks for people who represent a cross-section of communities, are from different job sectors and backgrounds, and have high interest in the cleanup process and willingness to learn.

Ms. Leckband asked if in the selection process, DOE may look favorably on an applicant if they have served on one of the local boards' subcommittees. Ms Alexander explained that it may give them some standing, but their ability to contribute to the boards' balanced representation is still a factor.

Public comment period

None

Discussion: Cross-Cutting Site Issues

Prior to the Chairs' meeting, each local board developed a list of cross-cutting issues of interest or concern to their members.

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) – Kathleen Bienenstein

The NSSAB has found value in learning about best practices and ongoing activities at other sites; her board's effort to understanding the Oak Ridge/NNSS U²³³ issue is an example. Ms. Bienenstein also shared an update related to the preservation of an old NNSS train that the local community hoped to acquire for commemorative purposes. DOE has agreed to donate the train to a local museum but financial constraints have delayed relocation of the vehicle.

The Chairs responded to Ms. Bienenstein's update by discussing effective practices for sharing information. A published guide that speaks to cases studies and actions, a SharePoint site, and white papers were mentioned. It was also suggested that everybody try to share cross cutting issues and successes that would be germane to other sites during the bimonthly Chairs calls.

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes

Position papers were suggested as a way to gather comments across the local boards on topics of common interest. The EM SSAB Chairs could pick the topic but sites could go through the process of hearings and public comment, and then producing products for public and media engagement. Information on groundwater management and a list of FAQs were suggested as two topics. The types of FAQs that might be useful are those that pertain to the DOE complex and specific issues at the sites.

Ms. Nielson asked the Chairs to think about how to produce these products by leveraging existing information and structures. Each site has a website containing white papers, points of interest, publications on sites' histories and activities, and other content. Some use Facebook and YouTube. It was suggested that the Chairs review each others' online content.

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

Mr. Phelps relayed that the NNM CAB remains concerned about adequate funding, HLW disposition, and the utilization of WIPP. Mr. Phelps sees these topics as cross-cutting issues for which sites might explore a common management approach.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (OR SSAB) – Dave Hemelright

Stewardship continues to be a topic of great importance. ORSSAB members are also interested in ensuring that commitments are being followed and that remediation is completed. The ORSSAB is interested in learning about the status of these issues at other sites.

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board (INL CAB) – Nicki Karst

Ms. Karst sees the successful treatment of INL's sodium-bearing liquid waste as a cross-cutting issue because it has been one of EM's major projects. The INL CAB looks forward to EM demonstrating effective management and completion of the project. Lessons learned may emerge from the project.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) – Susan Leckband

One of the HAB's suggested cross-cutting issues is the impact local boards will experience due to EM's reduced funding levels. This topic also includes strategies for finding efficiencies and eliminating superfluous expenses.

Ms. Leckband agreed that long-term stewardship is a cross-cutting issue. Clean-up happens incrementally and the HAB looks at every decision that involves public comment.

Discussion

Mr. Phelps noted that he attended a stakeholder meeting hosted by EPA in Fall 2011 and that some of participating agencies and groups shared information that could be helpful to the EM SSAB with regard to long-term stewardship. Ms. Alexander added that in addition to that

dialogue, Tish O'Connor from the EM Office of Environmental Compliance will continue providing information to the EM SSAB that addresses some long-term stewardship communication issues.

Ms. Leckband shared that the HAB has asked for long-term stewardship information to be distributed to the EM SSAB and will expand on this request in a future white paper. The HAB does not seek to create another process, however, but simply improve access to information.

The Chairs discussed an online portal for posting information and success stories on topics such as historical preservation to promote more cross-complex collaboration.

The CERCLA five-year review process is another topic with potential to provide lessons learned that can be shared among the individual sites. A recent fact sheet provided by Ms. O'Connor outlined this process.

The Chairs discussed drafting a recommendation related to the EM budget process. It was suggested that it might be useful to view the upcoming FY 2014 budget request within the context of cross-cutting impacts versus individual site priorities. Ms. Alexander stated that site input is useful at anytime, especially with regard to identifying impacts.

The Chairs emphasized the value local boards bring to the EM program by providing useful advice and service. Participants expressed hope that financial support for the local boards would continue. Ms. Nielson pointed out that as long as there is an EM SSAB, there is a legal requirement for DOE to provide sufficient funding.

The Chairs decided to develop two recommendations for consideration during the second day of the proceedings. The first will address the value that the EM SSAB provides EM, and the second will pertain to the EM budget process. Ms. Leckband and Ms. Karst volunteered to take the lead on drafting the first recommendation. Ms. Renner, Mr. Hemelright, Mr. Phelps, and Mr. Valdez volunteered to take the lead on drafting the second recommendation.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Ms. Alexander invited attendees to offer any comments

Mr. Pat McGuire, DDFO for the SRS CAB, expanded on comments regarding the potential impact of a 10 percent reduction in the FY 2013 budget, and wondered about what EM could achieve by spending extra dollars in the near-term in order to save on future costs. He agreed that the local boards can provide considerable input.

Ms. Alexander adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m. EST.

DAY TWO

Melissa Neilson, EM SSAB Alternate Designated Federal Officer and Director, EM Office of Intergovernmental and Community Activities, called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. CST.

Discussion of 2012 – 2013 EM SSAB Meeting Dates

The Chairs decided on the following schedule for EM SSAB Chairs' conference calls:

- Wednesday, June 6, 2012
- Wednesday, August 8, 2012

The dates and location for the Fall 2012 Chairs Meeting was not determined.

Discussion of EM SSAB Best Practices – Leveraging Public Involvement

Ms. Leckband shared a number of the HAB's best practices for public involvement.

HAB members represent a variety of communities and public service organizations. The board has established three standing committees, one of which is specifically dedicated to community outreach. Additionally, the HAB holds five full board meetings per year to allow for face-to-face engagement with the public and assists in ensuring that information is widely distributed to the public and outside organizations.

Ms. Leckband mentioned the League of Women Voters, the Heart of America Northwest, the Hanford Challenge, the Hanford Watch, and Physicians for Social Responsibility as examples of some of the organizations that participate on the HAB. All of the groups are non-profits and their members represent a broad and diverse spectrum of the public. The HAB also works with academia to inform their communication products and works to help the general public understand the impact of site decisions.

Feedback from constituents is channeled through the organizations represented on the HAB. Members also reach out to other groups to share information. Additionally, the site maintains a public speakers bureau that is available to keep the public well informed.

Only Ms. Leckband or the vice-chair speak on behalf of the HAB; when doing so, they represent the consensus view of the board. The HAB may assist other organizations by providing input in the development of informational materials, but does not create materials to inform their constituents. Members also help to ensure that public information is not "dumbed down," but rather modified to address specific concerns or made more accessible to different audiences.

Discussion

Mr. Phelps stated that he has attended Rotary Club functions on behalf of the NNM CAB. This has led to three new board members and helped with the communication of information relevant to the public.

Ms. Leckband expressed that the public needs to feel that they are engaged and that their input matters. In May 2012, the Leadership Tri-Cities will meet for Hanford Day and commit to a full *Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board – April 18 - 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes*

year of learning about issues in the community. HAB membership includes local government representatives, such as city mayors and council members who commit to sharing information with their constituents. Public attendance at HAB meetings can range anywhere from three people to 150 depending on the subject.

Mr. Young described the attention drawn to a DOE press release on groundwater plumes. Ms. Leckband commented that press releases and public meetings generate a lot of attention. Local reporters and journalists from National Public Radio frequently attend the site's public meetings. Ms. Nielson noted that there are rules about press interaction. When in doubt, Chairs are the only ones that should speak on behalf of a local board, but they should also work closely with their Federal staff and refer media to the Federal Coordinators or Public Affairs officials when possible. Several Chairs recommended that the members not seek out the media.

Ms. Karst commented on struggles to increase public attendance at INL CAB meetings. Both the Paducah CAB and HAB suggested contacting outside groups and attending their meetings to spread the word about the board. For example, the Paducah CAB and the PORTS SSAB work with the local Chambers of Commerce.

Mr. Hemelright shared that the ORSSAB has worked closely with DOE public affairs to promote public information and regularly participates in community events such as the Earth Day and Secret City festivals. The ORSSAB also meets with county executives and facilitates site tours and information about the SSAB. Additionally, the ORSSAB publishes a quarterly newsletter with information about board activities and members.

Discussion of Recommendations from EM SSAB

The Chairs reviewed the draft recommendations developed after day one of the proceedings. Draft recommendations will be taken back to the local board members for approval prior to submission to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for EM.

The first draft recommendation expressed the Chairs' desire for EM to maintain adequate funding for the EM SSAB and emphasized the value that local boards contribute to the EM program. Mr. Hemelright moved to accept the recommendation, Dr. Bridges seconded, and the recommendation was approved by the Chairs.

The second draft recommendation acknowledged the challenges associated with the current fiscal environment and urged EM to request funding levels that will allow all sites to meet their regulatory milestones, achieve cleanup progress, and continue to address health and safety issues.

In deliberating on the second draft recommendation, the Chairs discussed the need to recognize how a compliance-driven environment for funding requests may negatively impact sites without formal regulatory milestones. Ms. Renner, Mr. Valdez and Mr. Hemelright volunteered to work with Ms. Tyborowski's office to further explore this subject before finalizing a draft for the local boards' consideration. It was suggested that the revised draft recommendation could be discussed during the next Chairs' call on June 6, 2012.

Public Comment

Greg Simonton, the PORTS SSAB Federal Coordinator, expressed concern about having all local board members concur with the proposed recommendation regarding budget prioritization. If budgets are driven by regulatory agreements, those sites that are still in the process of setting formal milestones could be put at a disadvantage.

Board business

Ms. Leckband announced her term as HAB Chair will conclude in November 2012.

Ms. Nielson responded to a question about term limits for EM SSAB membership and confirmed that with fairly limited exceptions, an individual may only serve up to six years on their local board.

Closing remarks and adjournment

Ms. Nielson thanked the Chairs and local board staff for their participation. She adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m. CST.