

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

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**Aliante Station Hotel
7300 Aliante Parkway – North Las Vegas, Nevada 89084**

June 15 - 16, 2011

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AFRI – Applied Field Research Initiatives	EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
ARRA – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	EPI – Energy Parks Initiative
ASCEM – Advanced Simulation Capability for Environmental Management	EIS – Environmental Impact Statement
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act	FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act
CFO – Chief Financial Officer	FFCA – Federal Facility Compliance Act
CR – Continuing Resolution	FTE – Full-Time Equivalent
CRESP – Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation	FUSRAP – Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program
CPR – Construction Project Review	FY – Fiscal Year
D&D – Decontamination & Decommissioning	GAO – Government Accountability Office
DAS – Deputy Assistant Secretary	GTCC – Greater-Than-Class C
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer	HAB – Hanford Advisory Board
DFO – Designated Federal Officer	HEWD – House Energy and Water Development
DNFSB – Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	HIP – Hot Isostatic Pressing
DOE – Department of Energy	HLW – High-Level Waste
DOI – Department of Interior	HQ – Headquarters
DU – Depleted Uranium	IAEA – International Atomic Energy Agency
DWPF – Defense Waste Processing Facility	IFDP – Integrated Facilities Disposition Project
ECA – Energy Communities Alliance	INL – Idaho National Laboratory
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement	INL CAB – Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board
EM – Office of Environmental Management	IPL – Integrated Priority List
EM-1 – Assistant Secretary for the Office of Environmental Management	LANL – Los Alamos National Laboratory
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board	LASO – Los Alamos Site Office
	LES – Louisiana Energy Services Uranium Enrichment Plant
	LLW – Low-Level Waste
	LM – Office of Legacy Management
	LTS – Long-Term Stewardship

M&O – Management and Operating
MDA – Material Disposal Area
MLLW – Mixed Low-Level Waste
NGA – National Governors Association
NE – Office of Nuclear Energy
NNMCAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’
Advisory Board
NMED – New Mexico Environment
Department
NNSA – National Nuclear Security
Administration
NRC – Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NSSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory
Board
NNSS – Nevada National Security Site
OMB – Office of Management and Budget
ORNL – Oak Ridge National Laboratory
ORSSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory
Board
OSGR – Office of Groundwater and Soil
Remediation
Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory
Board
PGDP – Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant
PORTS SSAB – Portsmouth Site-Specific
Advisory Board
QPR – Quarterly Project Review
RCRA – Resource Conservation and Recovery
Act
RFP – Request for Proposal
RH-TRU – Remote Handled Transuranic Waste
ROD – Record of Decision
SC – Office of Science
SJTI – Superfund Job Training Initiative
SNF – Spent Nuclear Fuel
SNL – Sandia National Laboratories
SNM – Spent Nuclear Material
SSAB – Site-Specific Advisory Board
SRS – Savannah River Site
SRS CAB – Savannah River Site Citizens
Advisory Board
STOMP – Subsurface Transport Over
Multiple Phases
SWMU – Solid Waste Management Unit
SWPF – Salt Waste Processing Facility
TA – Technical Area
TAN – Test Area North
TCE – Trichloroethylene
TSCA – Toxic Substance Control Act
TPA – Tri-Party Agreement
TRU – Transuranic Waste
UGTA – Underground Test Area
UMTRCA – Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation
Control Act
USACE – United States Army Corps of
Engineers
U-233 – Uranium-233
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WTP – Waste Treatment Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Shelley Cimon, Alternate Member; Stacy Charboneau, DDFO; Pamela McCann, Federal Coordinator

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board: Willie Preacher, Chair; Mark Lupher, Member; James Cooper, DDFO; Robert Pence, Federal Coordinator; Lori McNamara, Contractor Support Staff

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board: Walter Wegst, Chair; Kathleen Bienenstein, Vice Chair; Donna Hruska, Member; Kelly Snyder, DDFO; Cynthia Lockwood, Alternate DDFO; Denise Rupp, Robert Gamble, Contractor Support Staff

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Ralph Phelps, Chair; Robert Gallegos, Vice Chair; Carlos Valdez, Member; Menice Santistevan, Contractor Support Staff

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: Ron Murphree, Chair; Steve Dixon, Member; David Adler, Alternate DDFO; Peter Osborne, Contractor Support Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Judy Clayton, Chair; Reinhard Knerr, DDFO; Robert Smith, Federal Coordinator; Eric Roberts, Contractor Support Staff

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Larry Parker, Vice Chair; Cristy Renner, Member; Joel Bradburne, DDFO; Greg Simonton, Federal Coordinator; Julie Galloway, Contractor Support Staff

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Donald Bridges, Chair; Gerald Wadley, Member; Karen Guevara, DDFO; Gerri Flemming, Federal Coordinator; Erica Williams, Contractor Support Staff

DOE Headquarters:

Catherine Alexander Brennan, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer
 Shirley Olinger, EM Associate Principal Deputy for Corporate Operations
 Joann Luczak, EM Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Budget
 Paul Dixon, EM Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation
 Christina Hymer, DOE Office of the General Counsel

Other:

Richland Operations Office: Cameron Salony
 Nevada Site Office: Scott Wade, Frank Disanza
 Nevada Department of Environmental Protection: Christine Andres, Tim Murphy
 Office of Environmental Management: Arnold Edelman, Mark Williamson
 Nye County: John Klenke, Bill Howard
 Clark County: Phil Klevorick
 Northwest Dynamics: Lori Isenberg

MEETING MINUTES

The Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) met on June 15-16, 2011, at the Aliante Station Hotel in North Las Vegas, Nevada. The Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) hosted the meeting. Participants included EM SSAB officers and members, Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and field staff, and EM SSAB Deputy Designated Federal Officers (DDFOs), Federal Coordinators, and contractor support staff. The meeting was facilitated by Ms. Lori Isenberg.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Ms. Catherine Alexander Brennan, the EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. PST. She noted that the meeting was open to the public and would be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). Additional opening remarks were provided by Dr. Walter Wegst, Chair of the NSSAB and Mr. Scott Wade, Assistant Manager for EM at the Nevada Site Office.

Presentation: EM Program Update

Ms. Shirley Olinger, EM Associate Principal Deputy for Corporate Operations, provided the Chairs with an update on the Office of Environmental Management.

A copy of her presentation is available online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/june11/EM%20Update.Olinger.pdf>.

The DOE Strategic Plan was released in May 2011. Objectives in the plan include EM's complete site remediation, the handling of tank waste, and the use of modeling tools.

The DOE Strategic Plan is available online at http://www.energy.gov/news/documents/DOE_StrategicPlan.pdf.

EM's Journey to Excellence Roadmap was informed by the DOE Strategic Plan. The goals outlined in EM's Roadmap include address both programmatic issues (goals 1-4) and business processes (goals 5-7). These latter goals will help EM effectively deliver on elected leaders' proposed visions for EM and help avoid confusion for staff and stakeholders. Additionally, Ms. Olinger highlighted similarities between DOE's Strategic Plan and the EM's Journey to Excellence Roadmap.

EM's Journey to Excellence Roadmap is available online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/pdfs/EM%20Roadmap%20Rev%200%20Dec%2017%202010.pdf>.

Ms. Olinger emphasized EM's commitment to improving project management. In comparison to other DOE programs, 97% of EM's projects have achieved an "acceptable" status based on dollar value and 89% were at an "acceptable" progress status, as of May 2011. EM's commitment to meeting regulatory obligations and milestones is the basis for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 budget request of \$6.1 billion.

Contract management and sustainable business processes are being developed to ensure that staff can manage contracts amidst greater, programmatic and political changes, such as changing administrations. EM is conducting complex-wide training sessions with the help of Mr. Jack Surash, Deputy Assistant Secretary (DAS) for Acquisition & Contract Management.

EM's Presidential budget request for FY 2011 was reduced by Congress from \$6 billion to \$5.633 billion. Funding originates from three specific allocations: defense clean-up, uranium decontamination and decommissioning, and non-defense clean-up activities. In FY 2012, EM's Presidential request of \$6.1 billion was reduced by the House Energy and Water Development (HEWD) Subcommittee to \$5.6 billion. This will be the new baseline for EM and reflects 2008 funding levels.

A funding reduction means that EM must devise new practices governing expenditures and contractor relations, and find ways to assist contractors to help them do more for less and in a shorter time frame. More effective partnering with contractors and providing them with DOE expertise to be effective is one approach. Prime contractors will be asked to identify opportunities to reduce activities that do not support the actual mission.

EM is examining program development and support to maximize expenditures with a focus on training, travel, and intern programs. This is balanced with contractor support at a level that maximizes the growth of the federal staff and the training of staff – things that are important to the Secretary. EM will also undertake fewer projects, all of which must have a clear scope and schedule. Site managers have assisted in this effort and what emerged was an EM corporate vision for 2020 that proposes completion of almost all legacy cleanups by that time.

Ms. Olinger concluded her presentation by identifying focus areas for the EM SSAB to pursue in FY 2012: Budget Priorities, Waste Disposition Strategies, and Public Involvement.

Discussion

Dr. Donald Bridges, Chair of the Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) asked for clarification of EM's organizational structure and the role of the Deputy Secretary.

Ms. Olinger explained that given the Deputy Secretary's level of engagement and experience in nuclear issues, EM, the Office of Legacy Management (LM) and the Office of Nuclear Safety will report directly to him. This will simplify the management chain and allow these offices to work even more closely together as the Department navigates the complicated and vital issues surrounding nuclear cleanup.

Dr. Bridges asked how EM will manage increasing program needs relative to potential budget shortcomings.

Ms. Olinger cited examples within the EM portfolio where sites were able to change their profiles by using innovative technologies to become more efficient. The Rocky Flats Site, for instance, found new ways to clean glove boxes as well as more efficient means to ship entire containers to a low-level burial site. Three-dimensional modeling and simulation across the

complex is also helping to reduce the contamination profile and demonstrates to stakeholders and regulators that effective measures are being taken even in a challenging budget environment.

Ms. Judy Clayton, Chair of the Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB), asked how the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant (PGDP) will be affected by EM's 2020 Cleanup Vision.

Ms. Olinger clarified that the Vision reflects only what is currently planned. EM is still evaluating future activities in the Paducah cleanup.

Mr. Ralph Phelps, Chair of the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB), stated that from a public perspective, footprint reduction results in available land. He asked how the turnover of federal land and potential reuse of facilities will be coordinated.

Ms. Olinger responded that the Asset Revitalization Task Force is managed by Mr. Dave Geiser, Director of LM. The Task Force has examined asset revitalization through measures such as nickel recycling, turning over land to surrounding communities, and working with Tribal governments on business development. A report on these issues will soon be issued to Congress.

Mr. Ron Murphree, Chair of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB), asked if the end state plan for EM's 2020 Cleanup Vision included work referred to in the facilities revitalization plan.

Ms. Olinger clarified that EM's concept for the 2020 Cleanup Vision does not include work referred to in the facilities revitalization plan. She explained that more than half of Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) is in EM's portfolio. The scope of work for FY 2012 and ORNL's vision is captured in an integrated disposition plan and does not include the scopes of work that will be turned over to LM in the future.

Ms. Susan Leckband, Chair of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB), noted that a high-level waste (HLW) repository does not seem to be captured in EM's 2020 Cleanup Vision and that it is something that should be a top priority.

Ms. Olinger pointed out that the EM Vision identifies places in the U.S. with high-level waste (HLW) to be dispositioned, for which there is no available storage repository. Not having a designated HLW storage repository will not prevent EM from completing its program goals.

Ms. Shelley Cimon, an alternate member of the HAB, commented that an interim storage facility is needed for the ultimate disposition of HLW waste as it could take too long to develop a permanent repository. She asked if Ms. Olinger could elaborate on the decommissioning and turnover of buildings and assets throughout the complex.

Ms. Olinger stated that there are some buildings in different parts of the complex that need end-state strategies. In Idaho, for example, the site is determining what material will be kept and what will come back to EM. ORNL's Integrated Facility Disposition Project has sought to characterize the end state of all materials and how some parts of the material may be reprocessed. EM is working with the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) and regulators at ORNL to select priorities for the next five to 10 years.

Ms. Cimon asked for clarification on how potential technologies and energy solutions are being evaluated to reduce the amount of long-term institutional costs. There is concern specifically about the Hanford pump and treatment systems and the evaluation of solutions for potential cost savings for the long-term.

Ms. Olinger noted that the Office of Technology and Innovation will address this subject on June 16, 2011, and is looking at several sites across the complex.

Mr. Steve Dixon, a member of the ORSSAB, inquired about EM's work with Congress and the provisions being made to include stakeholders in setting budget priorities.

Round Robin: Topics, Accomplishments, and Board Activities

The Chairs were provided an opportunity to share the current top three issues facing their sites as well as significant local board accomplishments and activities.

A copy of the presentation is available at

<http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/june11/Top%203%20Topics%20and%20Achievements%20by%20Site.pdf>.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) – Susan Leckband

- Solid Waste Burial Grounds
 - Hanford has 450,000 cubic meters of radioactive solid waste in unlined trenches
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Site-Wide Permit
 - Draft for review expected October/November 2011
- Potential Baseline Funding Reduction in 2012 and Beyond
 - Budget shortfalls may delay the needed retrieval of waste content

Accomplishments: The HAB produced an annual report in collaboration with DOE and Washington State University that is used at public speaking engagements.

Major Board Activities: The HAB recently held a workshop regarding solid waste burial grounds and began a public dialogue on tank closure.

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

- Blue Ribbon Commission's path forward for spent nuclear fuel and HLW
- Sufficient funding for completion of the site's accelerated cleanup plan
- Minimizing negative impacts to the cleanup project workforce

Accomplishments: The INL CAB provided comments to the Blue Ribbon Commission. The CAB is also working on an annual report and strengthening community outreach.

Major Board Activities: Members of the INL CAB attended the Waste Management 2010 and Long-Term Surveillance and Maintenance Conference.

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) – Walter Wegst

- Underground Test Area (UGTA) Groundwater Models
 - NSSAB has an ongoing interest in the results of technical analyses and encourages continued incorporation of peer review recommendation regarding UGTA
- Waste Disposition
 - There are no requirements or funding mechanisms within DOE to evaluate and disposition items that have historic or cultural value.

Accomplishments: The NSSAB's decision to address work plan items using a Committee-of-the-Whole with only a few subject-specific committees has proven to be effective. The combined approach has worked to increase member awareness of all Board activities.

Major Board Activities: The NSSAB has an annual work plan that features 12 tasks. Seven of these tasks were completed within the first six months of FY 2011. The remaining five tasks will be completed by the end of the year.

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

- DOE should provide funding in FY 2012 and beyond for Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) to meet completion of the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) Order on Consent
- DOE should expedite high priority cleanup work
 - Complete remediation of Technical Area 21
 - Remove transuranic (TRU) waste from Material Disposal Area G to support complex wide goal of 90% removal of TRU waste by 2015
- DOE should focus on continued development of an integrated site-wide Surface Water and Groundwater Monitoring Program to optimize execution of the NMED Order on Consent

Accomplishments: The NNMCAB transitioned the focus of its recommendations from characterization to end points (remediation and mitigation), including long-term stewardship and land transfer.

Major Board Activities: The NNMCAB continues its outreach to local communities and the Eight Northern Pueblos, one of which shares a boundary with LANL.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) – Ron Murphree

- ORSSAB has concerns for the site's current and future budget
 - Risks are not being addressed because of insufficient funding
- ORNL does not have a plan to mitigate risks associated with a potential contamination release, which could be complicated by ORNL's geology, climate, and proximity to the City of Oak Ridge

Accomplishments: The ORSSAB received 61 membership applications in the past year. The board now boasts a 22-member roster.

Major Board Activities: The ORSSAB sponsored a workshop to explain the FY 2013 budget to the public using a tool called the dynamic planning model, which allows DOE to run scenarios and determine funding profiles for current and outgoing years. The SSAB has also appointed a standing budget committee to look at these issues. The committee will seek to overlay a risk-based model with the dynamic planning model to generate a financial analysis of all projects.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB) – Judy Clayton

- Re-enriching Uranium Tails
 - Re-enrichment of the tails would provide a very cost effective return on investment
- Integrate a Future Use Plan with the cleanup strategy
 - Beyond its uranium enrichment or reprocessing capabilities, the PGDP has no further mission

Accomplishments: The Paducah CAB played an integral role in the public participation process with its involvement in the DOE Public Information Exchanges and the Waste Disposition Options educational workshop.

Major Board Activities: The Paducah CAB recommendations helped initiate a community-wide Future Use Study conducted by the Kentucky Research Consortium on Energy and Environment.

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

- Waste Disposition
 - The site is considering various options for its waste currently in storage including having it handled offsite at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS)
- Reuse of Real Property
 - Despite the site comprising just 5.6 square miles, there is significant interest in reuse and asset revitalization, such as reuse of the electric switchyard
 - Portsmouth is working with Ohio University and public stakeholders to identify future use of the site

Accomplishments: The PORTS SSAB recommended that DOE go forward with a broad-based community-wide end use study. In response, DOE supported Ohio University's Voinovich School in its efforts to engage the community and establish methods and opportunities for collaboration in the development of a future use plan for the Portsmouth Site.

Major Board Activities: The PORTS SSAB is developing a future use plan for the plant site.

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

- Effective utilization of H-Canyon
- Prioritization of site activities due to budget cuts
- Resolution of the legacy of nuclear weapons production at SRS by treating and disposing of liquid waste and closing tanks

Accomplishments: Several SRS CAB members attended a meeting of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future in Augusta, Georgia, on January 7, 2011.

Major Board Activities: The SRS CAB is working to increase public involvement by exploring vehicles for online communication and by revitalizing its Speakers Bureau.

Discussion

Ms. Olinger encouraged Mr. Richard Snyder, Chair of the PORTS SSAB, to work with the Paducah CAB and ORSSAB to identify cross-cutting cleanup issues.

Mr. Willie Preacher, Chair of INL CAB, suggested that a task force be formed to gather lessons learned so that the sites can share strategies. Waste characterization, for example, is a shared challenge for all of the sites [**Appendix A**].

Mr. Dixon asked Ms. Olinger about the funding timetable for The Office of Legacy Management, particularly data that shows a drop from \$2.5 billion to zero by 2050.

Ms. Olinger stated that funding is based on current “as-is” costs. She added that the “to-go” life-cycle costs and projections for 2051 are consistent with the current budget. Within a “to-go” range of \$185 - \$218 billion, if \$90 billion in actual costs is dropped then this is an excellent indicator for future planning. Many decisions are currently tied to the FY 2012 budget, and the funding timetable could change.

Mr. Murphree urged the PORTS SSAB members to look into Oak Ridge’s disposal of decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) materials.

Ms. Clayton asked why material from Oak Ridge, Paducah, and Portsmouth could not be reused.

Ms. Cristy Renner, a member of the PORTS SSAB noted that Portsmouth has looked into a smelting facility that can produce ingots for future use. The site could potentially take materials from Oak Ridge and Paducah and serve as a national recycling center for industrial uses.

Dr. Bridges emphasized that every site is interested in productive reuse capabilities. He suggested that EM make development of an asset revitalization plan a major focus.

Ms. Olinger informed the Chairs that a memorandum has been transmitted to the Secretary and EM will be briefing the Deputy Secretary this week explaining the reuse of nickel, for example. Dr. Triay and the Deputy Under Secretary are supportive of these efforts. However, a business case, including risk assessment, for the recycling of building materials needs to be made in order to make progress.

She explained that the current moratorium on the release of metals is due to past problems. Sending materials to landfills versus recycling can sometimes be more effective and less costly.

Ms. Brennan stated that the discussion regarding material characterization and end-use should be broad and not purely technical to ensure public understanding of the issues.

Mr. Phelps shared that the NNM CAB was able to diversify its membership by recruiting non-technical as well as technical members.

Dr. Wegst proposed that EM may be focusing too narrowly on reducing the footprint and not enough on reusing one-of-a-kind facilities.

Ms. Clayton commented that 1,200 people are employed at the PGDP and maintaining that facility could keep people employed and help DOE to generate revenue. It could also fill a void until the Louisiana Energy Services Uranium Enrichment Plant or some other technological process becomes operational.

Ms. Leckband noted that the HAB has offered advice to EM on retaining its trained workforce.

Presentation: EM Budget Update

Ms. Joann Luczak, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Budget, described EM's mission as a national responsibility and obligation to address cleanup of the Cold War legacy. Cleanup work involves radioactive wastes, so "safety" is a core value involving strong, line oversight on the ground with a goal of "0" accidents and incidents. EM must strive to leverage strategic investments in order to meet environmental compliance requirements and maintain cleanup momentum.

A copy of her presentation is available online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/june11/EM%20Budget%20Update.Luczak.pdf>.

EM's "to-go" life-cycle costs reflect tank waste stabilization, treatment, and disposal as its largest current priority. However, management of facilities D&D requires increasing resources. Since 1989, EM has made substantial progress in its cleanup mission with the number of states and active sites dropping from 35 to 11 and the number of sites, from 107 to 18. The HEWD subcommittee on appropriations in their review of the FY 2012 Congressional Request has proposed a \$5.6 billion operating level versus the request of \$6.1 billion. This reduction by the HEWD reflects an overall reduced allocation. EM's budget has three general categories: Defense Environmental Cleanup, Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup, and Uranium Enrichment Deactivation and Decommissioning Fund.

EM's FY 2012 budget submission at the \$6.1 billion request level will fund activities to maintain a safe, secure and compliant posture across the EM complex. Even with the potential for looming reductions for FY 2012, EM must continue to maintain cleanup operations and remain committed to goals such as tank waste management and treatment. The House Armed Services Committee on authorizations passed the National Defense Authorization Act for 2011, which requires that EM prepare an Annual Future Years Defense EM Plan for the budget year and no fewer than four succeeding years. Settling appropriations matters with EM and other federal government budget interests will require growing budget transparency, contract management transparency, and coming back to the Administration and Congress with more information about where things are headed. With this additional information, the Administration and Congress will have greater latitude to make concessions and finalize decisions.

Ms. Luczak described the timeline for the FY 2012 budget request submission that was made in February 2011 and embargoed between March and April 2011. April 1, 2011, marked the

initiation of DOE budget formulation with the sites for FY 2013-2017. EM-HQ sends five-year targets to the sites, and field managers and staff in the EM complex examine requirements in relationship to the visioning process under the Assistant Secretary's guidance.

At any point in time, EM must consider three budget cycles: currently, EM is finishing the execution of FY 2011, awaiting the outcome of marks on the congressional request for FY 2012, and proceeding with formulation of funding for FY 2013-2017.

Discussion

Ms. Clayton pointed out that the PGDP could close in May 2012, if DOE does not process the enriched uranium tails there.

Ms. Luczak noted that she would take Ms. Clayton's concerns back to senior management.

The Chairs agreed that the proposed schedule for providing stakeholder advice on budget matters needs to be longer.

Ms. Luczak took this as an action item and has committed to furnish, in the January 2012 timeframe, guidance covering the public's involvement in the EM budget request process. Currently, sites have just one week to transmit information to stakeholders and for the stakeholders to submit advice back.

Ms. Cimon asked about the final date for locking in the buyback of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds and expressed concern that contractors were not submitting bills on a timely basis.

Ms. Luczak noted that she would check with Ms. Debra Rucker on the date [**Appendix A**].

The Chairs reviewed the budget by state and noted a decrease in funding for Colorado in the FY 2011 Operating Plan from the FY 2011 Request; an increase for New Mexico from the FY 2011 Operating Plan to the FY 2012 request; and a decrease from the FY 2011 Operating Plan to FY 2011 the request for Washington DC [**Appendix A**].

The Chairs asked about a funding offset for D&D in FY 2011 and why this does not appear for FY 2012.

Ms. Luczak noted that FY 2011 was the last year that government contribution was required, and a proposal to reinstate the contributions must be authorized by Congress.

Presentation: EM Waste and Materials Disposition Update

Ms. Olinger provided the Chairs with an update on EM's waste management priorities and Mr. Arnold Edelman, from the Office of Disposal Operations, joined by telephone.

A copy of her presentation is available online at

<http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/june11/Waste%20Materials%20and%20Disposition%20Update.Olinger.pdf>.

Ms. Olinger addressed EM's goals for waste management: 1) to complete three major waste treatment projects, 2) to reduce life-cycle costs by up to \$43 billion, 3) to accelerate the cleanup of the Cold War legacy waste, and 4) to disposition 90% of TRU waste by 2015 (goal 3). EM is on target for goal 3, as FY 2010 was a peak year for disposing of TRU waste due to ARRA funding of TRU waste projects. EM is focusing on additional sites for cleanup this year with more ARRA funding, and the contracts that have been established in Washington, Utah, Tennessee, and Texas.

Inter-site shipping of TRU waste in FY 2011 is focused on cleanup of Small Quantity Sites by consolidation of their contact-handled TRU waste at Idaho. Other National TRU Program priorities are shipment from larger TRU sites such as SRS and INL. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) transportation system has demonstrated the ability to ship safely, and overall, to date; EM has transported TRU waste over 11 million loaded miles safely. (Oak Ridge has also revised its project plan to incorporate updated information on their waste inventory and improving its waste handling and shipment strategies. Currently, significant time is being spent separating low-level (LLW) and TRU waste, while building a backlog of TRU waste for future shipment campaigns.

Ms. Olinger agreed to provide shipping container specifications [**Appendix A**].

Ms. Olinger reported that the new mixed waste disposal cell was in place at NNSS in January 2011. The latest mixed/low-level waste forecast confirms that there is reliance on onsite disposal and overall total volumes for these waste types is declining.

The Waste Information Management System is available online at <http://www.emwims.org>

The public comment period for the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Greater-Than-Class-C Low-Level Waste (GTCC LLW) concludes on June 27, 2011. The draft was shared with Congress, and the final EIS should be completed in late 2012, after which there will be an opportunity for public comment. The total volume of GTCC waste analyzed was 12,000 m³ including both commercial waste, which meets the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) definition of GTCC waste, and DOE-like waste, which has similar characteristics but does not have a disposal path. To date, DOE does not have a preferred alternative for a GTCC waste-disposal site. The use of several locations is a possibility, depending upon evaluation of long-term potential human health impacts. The draft study found arid regions, such as Nevada and WIPP, may be conducive for disposal.

Mr. Edelman stated that there are two pieces of legislation that restrict the disposal of GTCC waste at WIPP. The Low Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1985 states that the facility must be licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The other – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act, as amended – states that the site can only handle defense-generated TRU waste. There is, however, a bill from Representative Steve Pearce (Republican – New Mexico) that may create an opportunity to ship the DOE-like non-defense generated TRU waste at WIPP. Mr. Edelman clarified that a commercial alternative, such as Waste Control Specialists, is not currently in discussion, as DOE did not receive interest when proposing this to the private sector in 2005 and thereafter. He also noted that the Yucca

Mountain site is not an option as the DOE views it as infeasible, as the project has been terminated.

Discussion

Ms. Cimon noted that Hanford is over its acceptable limits for waste. She asked that DOE consider a deep geological site.

Mr. Edelman noted that the Blue Ribbon Commission is examining the fuel cycle and that a geological alternative may be developed.

Ms. Olinger briefly reviewed the schedule for DOE O 435.1, Radioactive Waste Management.

EM SSAB Product Discussion

Dr. Wegst proposed that the Chairs consider supporting a recommendation that encourages EM to fund the disposition of items other than waste. The origin of this recommendation is a request from a Nevada municipality for one of two non-contaminated locomotives at the NNSS site. The city cannot afford the estimated \$80,000 to disassemble, move, and reassemble the locomotive, and it is estimated that costs to the site to remove and bury the locomotive would be \$70,000. The disposition of the locomotive is currently on hold pending DOE's decision on this matter. At this time, there is no EM policy or funding mechanism for relocating items with cultural or historic value to outside organizations that are unable to fund the transfer of these items themselves.

Mr. Dixon noted that an Oak Ridge locomotive was donated off-site and that a variety of items are given to local governments by the federal government. Other Chairs pointed out that funds should be available for relocating items of cultural or other value.

Mr. Phelps proposed that the Chairs consider supporting a recommendation that encourages EM to use rail transportation as much as possible as a substitute for truck transportation. The idea was previously proposed by the NNM CAB. Prior to any shipments, DOE should consult with all involved local communities where loading and unloading may occur, and provide information about all aspects of the shipments. Concurrence of local communities should be sought before any shipments begin. In addition, DOE should provide benefits to local communities where loading and offloading occur, such as jobs, rental of facilities, improvement of the transfer site, and improvement of local roads.

Mr. Phelps agreed to rework the recommendation for further consideration on June 16, 2011.

Product Development Summary

The Chairs reviewed the following topics for possible recommendations:

- Sustainability of the workforce
- Reuse of facilities
- Recycling
- Reanalysis of the goal of footprint reduction

- Determinations of worthy investments toward asset revitalization
- Expanding revitalization discussions

Discussion

Dr. Bridges urged EM to incorporate more science in its decision making regarding site future use.

Ms. Brennan noted that asset revitalization activities are now coordinated by LM and that EM is working with that office. She urged board members to be as specific as possible in recommendations about reuse of EM assets.

Dr. Wegst stated that asset revitalization is an EM-specific issue and not a LM issue. EM must anticipate that failure to address asset revitalization/reuse while reducing the footprint may result in the premature closure of sites or facilities that might have been reused and of benefit to the community.

Ms. Karen Guevara, co-DDFO for the SRS CAB, added that a report is being produced for the Deputy Secretary on the Asset Revitalization Initiative. She noted that the draft report will examine existing policies that govern the transport of personal and real property to communities, and that although this draft will not likely be distributed for public comment, LM solicited input from some stakeholder groups in its preparation. A second draft that will be made available for public comment will look at policy changes toward facilitating property transfers to public-private partnerships in order to support future goals, such as clean energy.

Ms. Leckband requested that the Chairs have the ability to review the first draft prior to their meeting October 20, 2011, to inform the EM SSAB's creation of recommendations for EM.

Ms. Guevara clarified that this action should not be characterized as an effort by DOE to get rid of EM facilities and that no steps are being taken to preclude future use of the facilities. The Asset Revitalization Initiative is looking at both reuse of land, facilities, and equipment.

Ms. Leckband offered to draft a recommendation that DOE and stakeholders, such as local communities, tribal governments, and the public, review these unique assets for their potential future use before they are gone forever.

Thursday, June 16, 2011

Opening Remarks

Ms. Brennan announced that the next Chairs meeting would occur on October 18 – 21, 2011, in Paducah, Kentucky and that a planning committee would be established [**Appendix A**].

The upcoming Chairs meetings are as follows:

- Hanford – Spring 2012

- Washington D.C. – Fall 2012
- Portsmouth – Spring 2013

The next Chairs bi-monthly teleconference will be held on September 19, 2011.

DOE-HQ News and Views

Ms. Brennan gave an overview of FACA.

A copy of her presentation is available online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/june11/FACA%20for%20Members.Brennan.pdf>.

Of the 993 chartered federal advisory committees, DOE has 22 committees. The EM SSAB is the largest federal advisory committee in the DOE and the oldest in the federal government. The total cost of all advisory boards in FY 2010 was \$386 million and in FY 2011, \$416 million. There are 2,000 full-time federal employees who have some responsibility for committee management.

Prior to the Congressional passage of FACA in 1973, many federally funded advisory boards had questionable record-keeping and membership practices. FACA brought management controls to these advisory boards. DOE relies on advisory committees to provide independent input on issues related to cleanup, including policy and budget priorities, and external influence, including any from DOE and its contractors, is not to be exerted on board deliberations and recommendations.

Ms. Brennan clarified that activities for the EM SSAB such as site tours are dependent on resource availability. Provisions must be made, for instance, for security and the number of attendees. Unlike regular, full board meetings, tours, other educational activities and purely administrative meetings do not have to be open to the public, but no deliberations of board business can occur. The Sunshine Act describes what meetings can be closed and promotes openness.

The composition of committee membership on advisory boards and the balance of interests represented continue to have the attention of Congress and the Administration. Legislation was submitted in the last two sessions of Congress that would require subcommittee meetings to be open, but that legislation was not brought to the floor. Cost escalation is also a concern, but cuts are not currently anticipated.

Under FACA, committee charters must be renewed every two years, and the efforts and value of the committees, evaluated annually. Required data submissions include the number of members, the number of both closed and open meetings, background on members, reports and recommendations. The General Services Administration also introduced a new requirement this year for federally chartered advisory boards and that is an annual balance plan that describes how the diversity of each board will be improved.

Ms. Brennan explained DOE's guidance for committees, including how EM identifies communities from which committee representation will be sought. DOE's definition of key

communities comes from the National Research Council and a General Accountability Office report on FACA. The EM SSAB does not require expertise for membership, but rather seeks community members who reflect the values and perspectives of varied community interests, such as civics, public health, education, environmental, business and others. Representation should also be sought for balance among gender, race and ethnic groups, relative to the demographics of an area.

EM site offices provide nominations for members that are reviewed by EM-HQ for balance and the avoidance of potential conflicts of interest. After reviews by the DOE Offices of General Counsel and the Executive Secretariat's Committee Management Office, the Under Secretary and Deputy Secretary, among others, the Assistant Secretary appoints members, through authority delegated by the Energy Secretary. Nominations can be rejected when the appropriate balance of interests will not be represented on the board. Contractors have also been rejected in the past because their position may represent a potential conflict of interest that would prevent their involvement in significant board matters. The reasons for the rejection of an applicant may not always be made public due to privacy issues.

DOE also has a process in place for filling unexpired terms caused by resignations or other reasons for termination. Site offices nominate someone for membership that DOE-HQ reviews with regard to advisory board balance and potential conflicts of interest. With concurrence from HQ, the local board DDFO then can fill the seat for remainder of the term and then later, if desired, nominate that same person for a full two-year term.

Presentation: EM Groundwater Update

Dr. Mark Williamson, DOE Project Manager for Capabilities for Advanced Simulation, presented on behalf of Mr. Kurt Gerdes, Director, Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation (EM-32) Research and Development Program.

A copy of his presentation is available online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/june11/Groundwater%20Update.Williamson%20for%20Gerdes.pdf>.

Dr. Williamson explained that his office has four programs with an ultimate focus on the application of research through Applied Field Research Initiatives (AFRI) and the Advanced Simulation Capability for EM (ASCEM). The Office of Technology Innovation and Development is overseen by Ms. Yvette Collazo.

The FY11 budget is around \$18 million with a significant amount going to EM-32. The office seeks to leverage scientific advancements in the department, industry, and academia.

Dr. Williamson illustrated the magnitude of the challenges with contaminated soil and groundwater by explaining that the amount of contaminated soil in the U.S. would fill Yankee Stadium 17 times and the amount of contaminated groundwater is equivalent to four days use of the U.S. water supply. To mitigate these challenges, the EM Technology Roadmap was issued in March 2008.

EM's Technology Roadmap is available online at http://www.em.doe.gov/pdfs/FINAL%20ET%20Roadmap%203-5-08_.pdf.

The National Academy of Sciences' advice on the EM's Technology Roadmap is available online at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12603.

Additionally, DOE Order 435.1 looks at a period of impact of 1,000 years whereas the NRC looks at 10,000 years. EM is examining extending the period to 20,000 years.

EM-32 has adopted goals identified by the National Academy of Sciences and is working to improve data presentations to ensure transparency and inform stakeholders of the office's activities. One of EM-32's goals is to reduce the financial burden to taxpayers and leverage the work being conducted by others through the ASCEM tool and other AFRIs. Each AFRI has specific challenges, yet EM-32 is trying to provide tools for use across the complex. This strategy seeks to support sites to meet their regulatory goals, while integrating ASCEM to help funnel research into applications.

The office's near-term technology goals are aimed at reducing the risks to human health by reducing contaminant flux and focusing on areas that need scientific understanding through predictive capabilities. From a long-term standpoint, EM-32's goals stretch out over a 4-10 year time period with an emphasis on integrating science with innovative technologies to reduce cost and time expenditures.

At the Hanford site work is underway that focuses on the deep vadose zone, a current and potential source of groundwater contamination. Imaging technology is being used to determine conductivity in the soil and identify the combinations of sand, other elements, and water contaminants residing there. These findings will lead to selecting appropriate remediation technology if testing can be conducted or if the site can leverage testing done previously elsewhere or in conjunction with other programs. An outcome is leveraging what is learned to support solutions at other sites.

SRS has a seepage basin that has been closed and covered. It is now looking at ways to manage underground plumes of contamination. At Y-12, mercury contamination is still being examined as the site looks at the remediation of mercury and industrial contaminants. EM-32 is trying to build a picture of sources, flow paths, and movement, and how to build a remediation strategy based on that information.

Dr. Williamson described the Groundwater and Soil Remediation Technical Assistance Program as being a useful tool for the sites. The program gathers a team of scientists to assess the contamination at a site and recommend cleanup strategies.

Discussion

Ms. Clayton pointed out that although DOE has spent approximately \$50 million to reach and capture pools of trichloroethylene (TCE) at the Paducah site, it has only recovered about 500 gallons. She was told that this is an area where improved scientific understanding is needed. Dr. Williamson noted that EM-32 is working directly with sites on models for TCE remediation and cleanup.

Ms. Leckband commented that EM-32's long-term goal number two ("Scientifically defensible actions to enhance regulator and stakeholder acceptance of attenuation-based remedies for metals and radionuclides") implies that EM must figure how to skew science to come to a conclusion.

Dr. Williamson clarified that this was not the intention. Scientific progress will dictate the path to better solutions and cost savings. The ASCEM, for example, is one tool to achieve better solutions as well as greater transparency.

Ms. Cimon commented that the HAB provided extensive comments on the draft of the EM Technology Roadmap and commented again in 2009, but that the Roadmap has since lost its relevance in the public eye. She suggested that it is important for DOE to hear multiple perspectives as it did during the deep vadose zone discussion at Hanford in spring 2011.

Dr. Williamson did not know about the status of the Roadmap, but assured the Chairs that significant outreach has accompanied the ASCEM.

Ms. Cimon asked that EM-HQ recognize the need for better integrating the public into the Roadmap updating process.

Dr. Bridges asked if numerous contaminants are looked for when EM-32 collects samples. Dr. Williamson responded that testing is not conducted on every sample for every type of contaminant; samples are archived and remain available for future testing. Leveraging others' collections and test results can be helpful.

Mr. Phelps suggested that the Chairs, who interface with the public, need to convey messages in a way that can be understood. One example is communicating to Northern New Mexico citizens about the groundwater characterization and monitoring systems that will allow corrective measures. He asked if messaging on groundwater and soil remediation can be drawn from other sites and if EM-32 can develop content to enable communication flow for the non-technical public.

Presentation: Advanced Simulation Capability for EM

Dr. Paul Dixon, the Multi-Laboratory Program Manager for ASCEM, provided the Chairs with an overview of the ASCEM tool.

A copy of his presentation is available online at <http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/june11/Advanced%20Simulation%20Capability%20for%20EM.Dixon%20and%20Williamson.pdf>.

ASCEM is an open source tool designed to inform scientists and build their confidence in what DOE is doing. It is an approach for standardizing certain kinds of modeling for better, more accurate assessments.

Advanced simulation capabilities are needed for problems that have great complexity, require better data and visualization capabilities, and that require greater probabilistic understanding. The same thinking that went in to the development of computers models that produce

simulations of explosions without doing the explosions, is informing the ASCEM groundwater modeling efforts. This standardized approach will provide a common computational interface and evaluation platform to understand the testing and procedures at each site.

ASCEM provides the ability to take individual sites and move them from primary data to a conceptual mode to examine uncertainty. It leverages recent advances in computing power to allow the system to run on both laptops and super computers to simulate a variety of physical and chemical processes. ASCEM will include ways to see plumes and growth over a span of time as it employs a two- and three-dimensional Google map-based interface. The data is contained in a public space and stored as historical data to inform future projections. This data is critical to quantifying uncertainty and to understanding what else needs to be analyzed that will make a difference in the model as well as public safety and health.

Dr. Dixon explained that the sites have varying amounts and kinds of data that have been collected and that the most helpful data may not have always been collected. ASCEM is a spearhead leading the way to better data collection. By using calculations and projections, users can trust that the system will provide fairly accurate predictions. This technology also contributes to validation testing of data.

ASCEM has the ability to make simulations out to 1,000,000 years, which can inform the public and scientific understanding, but because of unpredictability in some factors, it is difficult to simulate accurately beyond 10,000 years.

Feedback from the development of ASCEM comes directly from sites. The process is also informed by user inputs from DOE EM-HQ, Health Services, DOE Nuclear Energy, DOE Fossil Energy and the NRC. Dr. Dixon is starting to include the EPA, voluntary user groups, and others who develop programs similar ASCEM to advance the ASCEM toolset. Through further revisions based on recommendations, Dr. Dixon hopes that by 2013, ASCEM will be performing calculations to inform implementation measures.

One facet still being explored is development of a cloud computing capability. The concept would take underused supercomputing capabilities at universities and labs to allow high-performance computing to be conducted from anywhere.

Discussion

Dr. Bridges asked about site acceptance and use of ASCEM.

Dr. Dixon noted that EM released a memorandum that encourages sites to use ASCEM as a standardized tool for decision-making. EM discussions about the business model for ASCEM continue. Though parts of the system can be used now, it will not be an integrated system until 2013, and all of the quality assurance facets will not be built in until 2015.

Mr. Robert Gallegos, Vice Chair of the NNM CAB, conveyed concern from Los Alamos about contaminant transport via colloids, of materials including plutonium.

Ms. Cimon expressed concern about the disconnects between milestones and when the work would be done and said that the costs of ASCEM are not clear.

Product Development Summary

The Chairs revisited three recommendations presented on June 15, 2011, and editorial changes were suggested to each. The three recommendations were taken back to be voted on by the local boards, concerning authorizing funds for movement of historical/cultural artifacts, more rail transport of radioactive and hazardous waste, and review of unique assets that could be lost during cleanup.

Board Business

Mr. Preacher noted that the review of groundwater modeling needs to include the INL and the placement of caps at that site.

Mr. Phelps suggested that a wider variety of speakers be recruited for the next Chairs meeting.

Ms. Clayton strongly argued for more DOE leadership participation at Chairs meetings.

Dr. Dixon voiced discouragement that EM's senior leadership could not come to this meeting and interact with the Chairs.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

Ms. Brennan adjourned the meeting at 12:01 p.m. PST.

APPENDIX A

Pg. 11

The DOE Corporate Lessons Learned Database provides a central clearinghouse that allows ready access to and communication about collected information on a timely, unimpeded basis by all DOE elements. The database is available to the public and is used to collect and share lessons learned and best practices pertaining to all DOE activities.

The DOE Corporate Lessons Learned Database is available at <http://www.hss.energy.gov/sesa/analysis/DOEll/index.asp>

Pg. 13

Ms. Rucker confirmed that the availability of ARRA funds for buyback is contingent upon sites achieving savings and efficiencies from the original ARRA scope. To the extent that the majority of the original EM projects are scheduled for completion at the end of FY 2011, there is buyback scope that will be funded beyond that timeframe. Although there is no official “final date” for locking in buyback - the spending authority is legislated to end in FY 2015 and EM has positioned its projects for completion well ahead of that expiration. The July financial assessment reflects that ARRA cumulative payments are 98% of the payment plan - on target.

Pg. 13

Regarding Colorado, EM plans to use prior year uncosted balances to support Closure Administration activities in FY 2011. The main drivers behind New Mexico’s \$180 million increase are as follows: \$170 million for LANL to cover additional processing of TRU/MLLW, regulatory requirements needed to meet the 2015 completion date and \$10 million for Carlsbad to cover underground fan renovation, capital equipment purchases, road maintenance, facility modifications and construction, as well as upgrading fiber optic cabling. The main drivers behind Washington DC’s \$493 million decrease are as follows: \$436 million due to cover remaining governmental obligations under the Energy Policy Act of 1992 at \$33.7 million, \$13 million in Program Direction to expand reliance on Federal staff to execute professional project and program management activities that were previously performed by contractors, \$13 million in Technology Development and Deployment due to utilization of prior year uncosted balances to support FY 2011 activities; and \$4 million in Program Support due to a reduction in requirements for various environmental impact statement activities.

Pg. 14

Ms. Olinger provided the Chairs with the shipping container specifications on June 28, 2011. The RH-72B is a large, horizontal, stainless steel cylinder approximately 12 feet long and 42 inches in diameter. A large impact limiter, similar to a shock absorber, covers each end of the container to protect the unit in the event of an accident. A one-and-5/8-inch-thick lead liner provides additional shielding from gamma radiation. An outer thermal shield also protects the container and its contents from potential fire damage. The RH-72B container weighs about

37,000 pounds empty. The cask is designed to safely transport one remote-handled canister containing three 55-gallon drums of waste.

The CNS 10-160B is a cylindrical carbon steel and lead-shielded cask [with a wall thickness of 5 inches of which 1.875 inches is lead] designed to transport RH-TRU. It is transported in the upright position and equipped with steel-encased, rigid polyurethane foam impact limiters on the top and bottom. Gross Weight: Packaging and contents 72,000 pounds Capacity: Ten 55-gallon drums. Maximum Payload (lbs): 14,500. More handling and time required to unload. WIPP has two CNS 10-160B casks for their use.

The Transuranic Package Transporter Model III (TRUPACT-III) was designed for shipping large boxes of contact-handled TRU waste to WIPP. The TRUPACT-III is a rectangular package that measures 8'2" x 8'8" x 19'10.5". This new type of package would avoid the need to repackage waste in large boxes into smaller containers to fit into existing shipping containers. Use of this new packaging will eliminate repackaging of large box waste and will simplify handling, avoiding unnecessary radiation exposure to workers and the environment, and reducing the overall number of shipments to WIPP.

Pg. 17

The meeting date has been changed to October 20, 2011, and will be a video teleconference. The locations for upcoming meetings also have changed since the June meeting: Paducah, Spring 2012; Washington, DC, Fall 2012; and Hanford, Spring 2013.

APPENDIX B



DRAFT Agenda

EM SSAB Chairs Meeting

June 15 and 16, 2011

Aliante Station

7300 Aliante Parkway

North Las Vegas, Nevada 89084

DAY 1 – Wednesday, June 15, 2011	
8:00 am – 8:20 am	Welcome and Opening Remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Cate Alexander Brennan, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer ☐ Walt Wegst, Chair, Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board ☐ Scott Wade, Asst. Manager for Environmental Management, Nevada Site Office
8:20 am – 8:30 am	Overview of Meeting Lori Isenberg, Facilitator
8:30 am – 10:00 am	EM Program Update Shirley J. Olinger, EM Associate Principal Deputy for Corporate Operations
10:00 am – 10:15 am	Break
10:15 am – 12:00 pm	Round Robin (Chairs' Site Reports)
12:00 pm – 1:15 pm	Lunch (on your own)
1:15 pm – 2:30 pm	Budget Update Joann Luczak, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Budget
2:30 pm – 3:30 pm	Waste Disposition Shirley J. Olinger, EM Associate Principal Deputy for Corporate Operations
3:30 pm – 3:45 pm	Break
3:45 pm – 4:00 pm	Day 1 Product Development Overview Lori Isenberg, Facilitator
4:00 pm – 4:15 pm	Public Comment Period



4:15 pm – 5:00 pm	Day 1 Product Development and Summary Lori Isenberg, Facilitator
DAY 2 - Thursday, June 16, 2011	
8:00 am – 9:00 am	DOE-HQ News and Views Cate Alexander Brennan, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer, Office of Public Intergovernmental Accountability
9:00 am – 10:30 am	Groundwater Kurt Gerdes, Director, Office of Groundwater & Soil Remediation Paul Dixon, Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation
10:30 am – 10:45 am	Break
10:45 am – 11:00 am	Public Comment Period
11:00 am – 12:00 pm	Day 2 Product Development and Summary Lori Isenberg, Facilitator
12:00 pm – 12:15 pm	Closing Remarks and Adjournment