

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

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**Red Lion Hotel
1101 N. Columbia Center Blvd
Kennewick WA 99336
October 18-19, 2017**

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAB – Citizens Advisory Board
CBFO – Carlsbad Field Office
CD – Critical Decision
D&D – Deactivation & Decommissioning
DAS – Deputy Assistant Secretary
DFO – Designated Federal Officer
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer
DOE – US Department of Energy
EM – (DOE) Office of Environmental Management
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board
EPA – US Environmental Protection Agency
FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act
FY – Fiscal Year
HAB – Hanford Advisory Board
Hanford – (DOE) Hanford Site
HLW – High-Level Waste
HQ – DOE Headquarters Office
INL CAB – Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board
LANL – Los Alamos National Laboratory
LLW – Low-Level Waste
LM – (DOE) Office of Legacy Management
NMED – New Mexico Environment Department
NNMCAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board
NNSA - National Nuclear Security Administration
NNSS – Nevada National Security Site
NSSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board
OR – (DOE) Oak Ridge Site
ORP – Office of River Protection
ORSSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board
Paducah – (DOE) Paducah Site
Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory Board
PFP – Plutonium Finishing Plant (Hanford)
PORTS SSAB – Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board
Portsmouth – (DOE) Portsmouth Site
PUREX – Plutonium Uranium Extraction Facility
SRS – (DOE) Savannah River Site
SRS CAB – Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
TRU – Transuranic Waste
WCS – Waste Control Specialists
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Shelley Cimon, Vice-Chair; Kyle Rankin, co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Dawn MacDonald, co- Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Mark Heeter, Federal Coordinator; Tom Fletcher, Deputy Manager, Richland Operations Office; Jennifer Colborn, Staff; Dieter Bohrmann, Staff; Rebecca Holland, Staff

Idaho National Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board: Keith Branter, Chair; Kristen Jensen, Member; Connie Flohr, DOE; Jordan Davies, Staff

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board: Steven Rosenbaum, Chair; Frank Bonesteel, Vice-Chair; Ed Rosemark, Member; Kelly Snyder, Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Barbara Ulmer, Staff

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Gerard Martinez y Valencia, Chair; Stephen Schmelling, Member; Lee Bishop, co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Bridget Maestas, Staff

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: Dennis Wilson, Chair; Richard Burroughs, Member; Shelley Kimel, Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Renie Barger, Member; Jennifer Woodard, Deputy Designated Federal Officer; Buz Smith, Federal Coordinator; Eric Roberts, Staff

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Bob Berry, Chair; Carlton Cave, co-Vice-Chair; Julie Galloway, Staff; Rick Greene, Staff

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Earl Sheppard, Vice-Chair; Gil Allensworth, Member; Michael Mikolanis, co-Designated Deputy Federal Official; DeLisa Carrico, Federal Coordinator; James Tanner, Staff

DOE Headquarters:

Mark Gilbertson, Deputy Assistant Secretary (DAS) for Regulatory and Policy Affairs

Stacy Charboneau, Associate Principal DAS for Field Operations

Betsy Connell, Director, Office of Regulatory Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement

Michelle Sneed, Director, Office of Secretarial Boards and Councils

Steve Trischman, Director, Office of Budget and Planning

David Borak, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer

Karen Hill, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs

Jared Bierbach, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs

Alyssa Harris, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs

MEETING MINUTES

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) met on October 18-19, at the Red Lion Hotel in Kennewick, WA. Participants included EM SSAB officers and members, DOE staff, EM SSAB Deputy Designated Federal Officers (DDFO), 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 (FACA).

Day One: Wednesday, October 18, 2017

Opening Remarks

Mr. Eric Roberts, the meeting facilitator, called the Chairs Meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. PDT. He welcomed everyone and made introductions for DOE staff, contractors, and the Chairs.

Mr. Tom Fletcher gave opening remarks and a brief overview of the progress happening at Hanford.

Mr. Roberts reviewed the agenda and outlined some meeting logistics for the day.

EM Update

Ms. Charboneau sent Acting Assistant Secretary Jim Owendoff's regards as he was unable to attend this meeting. She discussed her history in the Tri-Cities and time working at the Hanford site. She stated that she appreciated being welcomed back to the Chairs' meeting again and she looked forward to the discussion.

Ms. Charboneau mentioned how the history of the Hanford site truly relates to everyone else's sites around the complex. She discussed the DOE-EPA dialogue and how it is a unique opportunity to talk about what the priorities should be across the complex.

Ms. Charboneau noted that today's discussions will help participants understand what the cleanup situation is at sites that are not their own. She discussed Mr. Owendoff's vision of the cleanup and how he believes that politics are local and so is site cleanup.

Ms. Charboneau discussed the National Cleanup Workshop in September. At the workshop, Mr. Owendoff made a point that budgets and resources are limited, so EM needs to do its best with the funds available. She added that there is an interest in understanding other sites' regulatory milestones and goals and integrating these across the complex. She noted that the money was divided up many years ago and the budget does not vary much from year to year. She stated that the budget has increased this year due to the new administration's support of the EM program. EM and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) have seen an increase in budget.

Ms. Charboneau stated that EM understands we have failing infrastructure in the complex. She discussed how this relates to EM's cleanup work. She added that 50-70% of a site's budget goes towards maintaining safe base operations and infrastructure, not cleanup activities.

Ms. Charboneau stated that many people who have worked for EM for many years have had good ideas about how to shorten our mission or reduce costs and Mr. Owendoff wants to hear these ideas. She stated that Mr. Owendoff is not afraid to communicate honestly and share his thoughts with decision makers.

Mr. Owendoff stated that all of the site managers will be talking to the stakeholders, regulators, and local officials including the Chairs to discuss the 45 day review proposals and receive input through an open dialogue.

Ms. Charboneau discussed regulatory reform and how this has been a priority for the transition and new administration. She noted the complexity of this issue. She emphasized the importance of remembering the costs involved in changing these regulations and requirements. She added that DOE needs to be responsible about proposed changes.

Ms. Charboneau referenced the recent white paper issued by the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) about waste disposition. She stated that some of the items being examined by EM are discussed in that document. She noted that while she does not agree with everything in the document, there are good ideas. She discussed her support for on-site disposal cells.

She discussed the Chairs' Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) specific recommendations and noted that shipments to WIPP started in April. She recognized that the Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO) is working very hard to keep the shipments coming to WIPP, which is a complex process.

She discussed above ground storage and the previous recommendation from the Board. WIPP is the key to showing that EM can manage a national repository. She stated that next month, the supplemental ventilation system comes online at WIPP which will allow continued expansion of WIPP especially into the West. She added that sites should not be concerned about the capacity at WIPP.

Ms. Charboneau noted progress across the complex since the last meeting, such as beginning nitrate salts remediation at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). She discussed the D&D challenges at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) at Hanford. She stated that temporary ventilation systems are in place to keep the area safe for workers and the environment.

Ms. Charboneau opened the floor to discussion.

Discussion

Mr. Gerard Martinez stated his concerns about the new approach to regulatory reform, noting that one size does not fit all. He discussed LANL's adjacent Pueblos and the cultural aspect of cleanup. He stated that waste cannot be stored onsite at LANL because of the tribal sacred sites that are on the lab reservation. He stated his belief that regulations exist for a reason, and that new discoveries are made all the time.

Ms. Charboneau stated that she wants to bring about a sense of responsibility across the department to assess these regulatory changes and determine if they add value to EM's projects.

Mr. Mark Gilbertson, discussed how EM must determine if it is appropriate to reclassify national security information across the complex. He added that this can be very costly, so it is important to ensure that there is a benefit.

Mr. Martinez discussed how the Board requested New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) to become involved with supplemental environmental projects, such as the WIPP route. He stated that some of the roads around Carlsbad have been damaged by the oil and gas industry and need to be repaired. He noted that this must be evaluated to see how this affects the safe delivery of transuranic (TRU) waste to WIPP.

Ms. Susan Leckband said she's very intrigued by the 45 day review. She mentioned the delay in getting the HAB's membership package through. She stated her belief that DOE can be overly prescriptive and she wondered if more site centric processes will be part of the 45 day review.

Ms. Charboneau stated that the phrase "regulatory reform" covers that as well, and when discussing regulatory reform, it also includes DOE's own orders.

Ms. Leckband wondered if there is something in place to prevent a delay of membership packages in the future.

Ms. Charboneau said, the HAB is unique, which required a lot of dialogue with the new administration.

Mr. Frank Bonesteel asked for some clarification on the regulatory reform effort.

Ms. Charboneau stated that those not familiar with the EM program are not necessarily familiar with how EM engages the public and the transparency required. She noted that the two biggest programs in DOE are NNSA and EM, but they are managed very differently. She added that EM has spent 25 years trying to grow that understanding and engagement because environmental cleanup is personal. She stated that decisions might make sense internally, but they still need to be discussed with stakeholder delegations.

Ms. Shelley Cimon stated that it was clear they would continue to be engaged on these subjects but that it was not clear how, because they don't have an understanding of the list of priorities.

She states that Deputy Manager Tom Fletcher will be discussing these 45 day review topics at the next HAB meeting.

Presentations: Chairs Round Robin: Chairs' Site Reports

The Chairs shared current issues facing their sites and significant local board accomplishments and activities.

Hanford Advisory Board – Susan Leckband

Ms. Susan Leckband noted that cleanup at Hanford will take decades and as such, the main issues do not vary much over time. She relayed the HAB's discussion regarding the potential of designing and building new tanks. The Board decided that there should be new safe storage capability.

Ms. Leckband noted that the HAB is concerned about what contamination may exist underneath PFP. She stated that the Plutonium Uranium Extraction Facility (PUREX) tunnel 1 collapse is an example of aging infrastructure that must be addressed. She added that tunnel 2 is much longer and contains more radioactive waste than tunnel 1. She then discussed the 324 Building's radioactive plume and the high potential for worker exposure during cleanup. She emphasized the importance of this project due to the building's proximity to the Columbia River.

Ms. Leckband stated that a constrained budget has limited the HAB's public involvement and transparency.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB) – Renie Barger

Ms. Renie Barger stated that the CAB is pleased with the successful meetings the CAB has had this past year, including educational sessions on topics such as groundwater contamination. She stated her concern that CAB members and the community will become less interested due to minimal visible changes to the plant over the next decade. The CAB is focused on continuing to provide meaningful input.

Ms. Barger stated that currently, the CAB is not using the traditional recommendation process since there is a lack of need for recommendations and the focus is very clear. She welcomed advice and suggestions from boards in a similar situation.

Mr. David Borak said that Ms. Barger's question is an interesting one. He discussed his desire to maintain the relevance and importance of EM's advisory boards. He stated that there is a desire to keep these boards, even if they are not providing as many recommendations; the community ties that the boards provide is of value to DOE. He noted that there is not a number of recommendations required by the boards, but that FACA does require the focus on these boards to be recommendations.

Ms. Barger stated that she would like to see the CAB continue to be a liaison and remain relevant.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory (ORSSAB) – Dennis Wilson

Mr. Dennis Wilson began his discussion by noting the SSAB's FY 2017 accomplishments such as the four recommendations submitted to DOE and the approval of two SSAB Chairs' recommendations. He noted that the priorities have not changed since last year. He stated that the primary mission is to support offsite groundwater monitoring. He added that their other main priorities are excess facilities disposition and future waste disposal capacity.

Mr. Wilson noted that there is a large discussion regarding where the new disposal site will be located. He stated that the ORSSAB is in agreement that the most efficient way to dispose of contaminated material is onsite.

Ms. Shelley Cimon discussed the HAB's previous recommendation of long-term stewardship funding to address any waste found after site closure. Mr. Mark Gilbertson encouraged those interested in how long-term stewardship is currently working at past sites to familiarize themselves with the Office of Legacy Management (LM).

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) – Steven Rosenbaum

Mr. Steven Rosenbaum began by highlighting the NSSAB's accomplishments. He stated that the Board's recommendations have an 85% acceptance rate. He stated that they are engaged with emergency planning programs and the revegetation of a closed cell at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS). He noted that the Tribal communities have been instrumental in providing insight to the land and botanical skills.

Mr. Rosenbaum discussed the Board's concerns with transportation such as the weak infrastructure of roads going south to WIPP. He discussed the DOE and US Department of Transportation joint interests. He encouraged further discussion of safer transport.

Mr. Gilbertson said that EM is proud of the safety record they have about this program. He suggested that transportation should be a future meeting topic to provide a broader briefing of what is happening in this realm.

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (PORTS SSAB) – Bob Berry

Bob Berry stated that he believes Portsmouth can be DOE's next great success in their cleanup mission. He noted that there are no longer technical or regulatory hurdles.

Mr. Berry noted that Portsmouth is making great progress on the 326 building and began prep work for the 333 building. He stated that they are moving forward with onsite disposal; this spring, Portsmouth will begin laying the liner for the first disposal site.

Mr. Berry thanked DOE for a full budget that enables them to move forward on these projects. He thanked Secretary Perry for visiting the site this year.

Ms. Leckband asked if there is a concern of groundwater contamination. Mr. Berry responded that there is not a concern about the contamination of rivers, but there are some concerns over where the new disposal sites are located and the potential for leakage into groundwater. However, he stated that DOE, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Ohio Department of Health have approved the plans.

Ms. Leckband asked if there are redevelopment plans in place for the site after closure. Mr. Berry responded yes, 80 acres of land should be transferred to the Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative this spring.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board – Earl Sheppard

Mr. Earl Sheppard noted that the Board has streamlined their meeting format to make participants more active rather than passive. He added that this has created a huge change in full board meetings.

Mr. Sheppard discussed the recommendations that the Board has submitted. Regarding the curation facility, the CAB recommended that DOE expand public tours of the curation center and work with local schools to establish a traveling curriculum. He noted that this recommendation was well received. Regarding the H-Canyon and the Savannah River Site (SRS) Spent Nuclear Fuel Program, Mr. Sheppard stated that the CAB recommended that DOE continue to make funding and maintenance of the H-Canyon a priority and release a decision on spent fuel.

Ms. Susan Leckband asked what pushed the Board to change their meeting process. Mr. Sheppard responded that the Board wanted to become more streamlined and efficient.

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board – Keith Branter

Keith Branter stated that the main priority of the Board is to keep the aquifer clean. In August, the Board submitted a letter to the Acting Assistant Secretary for EM urging acceleration of shipments to WIPP. In 2014, the Board sent a letter to the Secretary of Energy encouraging DOE to study an ongoing mission for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project.

Mr. Branter discussed the Board's priorities, which include monitoring progress on long-term milestones such as HLW and spent fuel, and continuing to act as a vital communication link between DOE and the citizens of Idaho. He added that more near-term priorities include starting the Idaho Waste Treatment Unit and increasing the number of TRU shipments to WIPP.

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board – Gerard Martinez Valencia

Mr. Gerard Martinez y Valencia stated that the Board has been focused on the groundwater cleanup to ensure that migration does not reach the aquifer. He stated that 50% of the nitrate salts at LANL have been remediated. They have also been focused on the most efficient and safe way to treat shipments and resume TRU shipments from LANL. He mentioned the wildfires surrounding Los Alamos and discussed the concerns about the necessary road improvements on the routes to WIPP.

Ms. Susan Leckband asked if there is emergency planning or training for wildfires. Mr. Martinez y Valencia responded that the LANL campus has evacuation procedures in place. He noted that the Board does not often meet in Los Alamos.

Ms. Shelley Cimon asked for clarification of waste criteria acceptance at Waste Control Specialists (WCS). He responded that there is a feasibility study being conducted on the drums similar to the 2014 incident. Ms. Stacy Charboneau added that DOE is still responsible for those drums, and they are evaluating them to be shipped to WIPP by the end of the calendar year. Mr. Gilbertson and Ms. Charboneau discussed the characteristics of the waste drums and the protocols DOE has for these. They also discussed waste shipment scheduling.

Ms. Charboneau said that she finds the Chairs' Round Robin to be very insightful and helpful. She added that HQ is supportive of addressing the Boards concerns. Mr. Gilbertson thanked the members for their service. He asked the boards to look at other sites for strategies and issues there. He asked them to let DOE know what information they need to do their jobs.

Mr. Martinez y Valencia said the Board would like to receive a presentation about route and transportation safety. Ms. Betsy Connell suggested that an LM briefing would be a good idea for the chairs.

Budget and Planning Update

Mr. Steve Trischman opened by stating that the budget request has been fully supported by the new administration. He described the budget process timeline. He stated that they are currently working on the FY 19 budget, and that all of the phases of the process can be happening at once. He noted that they are often looking several years in advance at EM's goals.

Mr. Trischman stated that the Office of Management and Budget has been provided extra briefing on certain issues such as tank waste at SRS and regulatory compliance milestones. Mr. Gilbertson and Ms. Leckband discussed reasons why the budget is not always on schedule. Ms. Connie Flohr stated that the last time the budget was on schedule was 2008. Ms. Leckband noted that it is a struggle for the boards to affect budget decisions when the information does not get to them in time.

Mr. Trischman summarized the highlights from the FY 18 budget. He noted that maintaining safe and secure posture uses nearly half of the budget. This includes maintaining roads and facilities and safety planning. Mr. Trischman also mentioned TRU shipments, a shaft project, and new ventilation systems at WIPP. At Hanford, there is continued cleanup in the river corridor.

Mr. Trischman noted that in FY 18 they were able to request \$225 million for excess facilities that were not already in the EM cleanup program. He referenced the previous years' requests and budgets, noting that making new requests can be difficult.

Ms. Cimon inquired about the Department of Defense excess facilities that have been transferred to EM. Mr. Trischman responded that these are not included in the \$225 million figure, only DOE facilities are included. Ms. Connell added that the Lawrence Livermore and Oak Ridge are the highest priority excess facilities residing in NNSA.

Mr. Trischman discussed examples of when funding might shift between sites, such as at sites with Gaseous Diffusion Plants funded by the Uranium Enrichment D&D fund. When Oak Ridge completes its demolition of the remaining Gaseous Diffusion Plant facilities at East Tennessee Technology Park, funds could be moved to Portsmouth and Paducah to accelerate cleanup at those sites. He noted that Gaseous Diffusion Plants are very costly to keep up while waiting for demolition.

Mr. Stephen Schmelling asked if there has been any change in the way the budget is formed with the new administration. Mr. Trischman responded that the new administration had to get the budget done very quickly, making it simpler, but this may change next year. Mr. Trischman and Mr. Gilbertson discussed the new administration's desire to reduce costs.

Mr. Wilson asked if a cost-benefit analysis is done to consider the ongoing maintenance costs vs demolition costs. Mr. Trischman responded that it is definitely considered when developing the budget.

Mr. Trischman added that a planning workshop was held regarding FY 19. The budget is positioned to be released in early February.

Mr. Trischman discussed the rising lifecycle costs and how it is explained by the cost of maintenance and security, new facilities that are transferred to EM, and other unexpected technical issues and costs. He added that High Level Waste (HLW) projects have created the most difficult technical challenges and cost increases.

Ms. Leckband asked if on-site interim storage of HLW is included in the liability calculations. Mr. Trischman responded that the storage and disposal costs are captured by DOE in the Environmental Liability estimate.

Mr. Gil Allensworth asked if the decisions regarding which sites get an increased budget are strictly political. Mr. Trischman responded that it depends, adding that DOE advocates for the sites to get as full of a budget as possible.

Ms. Cimon commented that it may be wise to have the chairs participate at the Intergovernmental Meeting.

Public Comment Period

Pam Larsen, Executive Director of Hanford Communities, discussed the November Intergovernmental Meeting. She encouraged the chairs to discuss the local boards' concerns with the site managers and local officials that will be attending this meeting.

Product Development Discussion

Mr. Earl Sheppard began the discussion of product development by talking about the logistics for the process. He stated that this program is here to help DOE-EM make the best decisions for the cleanup mission and human health and the environment. He encouraged members to control their emotions and to think about all the parties that are involved. He asked members to always keep the long-term goal in mind and use a tone which is conducive to a positive response from DOE. He asked the chairs to ensure their boards are viewed as assets, not liabilities.

Mr. Sheppard listed some qualities of good recommendations, suggesting that they should: help the cleanup mission, help the public perspective of the cleanup mission, align with DOE's path, list preferable outcomes, utilize core values, and be transparent.

The Chairs discussed unfavorable qualities of a recommendation, suggesting that they should avoid advocacy against DOE, redundant repetition of ideas, inflammatory statements, ultimatums, political commentary, and unclear content.

The Chairs discussed past recommendations that have been successful. Ms. Leckband gave an example of a flowchart that the Board produced that was very helpful with making decisions. Ms. Cimon encouraged bold recommendations if they consider what is best for the sites and future generations.

Mr. Roberts asked how the individual boards remain transparent. Ms. Cimon stated that the HAB has committees that must come to a consensus on their research and opinions for the ideas to go forward. She added that she views the HAB as a vessel for public discussion.

Ms. Leckband and Mr. Borak and discussed the possibility of 50/50 consensus on a recommendation. Ms. Leckband stated that the HAB will either drop the recommendation or have a round robin discussion and include DOE managers in the room to listen. Ms. Cimon emphasized the importance of background information in recommendations to inform the public.

Mr. Sheppard reminded the members to remain committed to their local board.

The following is a list of items developed from the discussion for created effective recommendations:

Things Needed for Drafting a Recommendation:

- Control emotions
- Think of everyone involved
- Be on the same page
- Keep an open mind
- Consider the long-term goal
- Tone is powerful
- Do the right thing

Qualities of Good Recommendations:

- Make sure it helps cleanup mission
- Does it help public perspective of mission
- Align recommendation with DOE path
- Proper grammar and word usage
- List outcomes are you seeking
- Utilize core values
- Clarity, concise, focus/DOE views as asset
- Product shows you've done your homework
- Transparency
- Good information
- Fundamental value connection included
- Correct your peers if you hear misinformation
- Recognize employees for money-saving ideas. Reinforces positive behaviors
- Timely respond to Agency request

Qualities of Bad Recommendations:

- Not oversight committee/as advisory board you are a consulting group to DOE
- No dominating person/personality
- Avoid advocacy against DOE
- Too many topics in one recommendation
- Don't take it personally
- Bad timing

No-No's:

- Extensive background information/make concise
- Avoid redundant repetitions of ideas
- Avoid unclear content/intent must be clear for all audiences
- Avoid in-actionable advice
- No dominating person/personality
- No inflammatory words or statements
- Don't assume members are the general public
- No personal attacks
- No ultimatums - don't back DOE into corner with threats
- No political commentary

Ms. Michelle Sneed introduced herself and thanked the HAB for hosting this meeting. She stated that she works in the Secretary's Office for Boards and Councils, which includes FACA committees. She emphasized that she looks forward to learning more about these boards.

Day Two: Thursday, May 11, 2017**DOE HQ News & Views**

Mr. David Borak noted that the recommendations from last meeting are currently in the review process by the Acting Assistant Secretary. He said that WIPP appreciates the EM SSAB's support for above-ground storage, but they are currently focused on ventilation to keep current operations running.

Mr. Borak encouraged the Chairs to consider the 45 Day Review and produce a recommendation that will showcase the uniqueness of the EM SSAB. He discussed the membership package approval process and the many offices that must approve all aspects of the package. He explained why the membership packages take a significant amount of time to approve, especially with a new administration. He added that regulatory reform is of great importance to this administration and there is a push for DOE advisory boards to focus on this as well.

Mr. Borak noted that he is working on the logistics to hold the next EM SSAB meeting at the WIPP facility.

Discussion

Ms. Susan Leckband and Mr. Borak discussed potential reform of the membership package approval process.

Waste Disposition Update

Mr. Gilbertson discussed a few personnel changes to the organization. Ms. Candace Robertson is currently working for the Deputy Secretary of Energy. Ms. Betsy Connell is now in EM-4.3, bringing a wide breadth of experience. Mr. Steve Trischman is in EM-5.11. Ms. Stacy Charboneau is the Associate Principle DAS for Field Operations in EM-3. Mr. Dae Chung is back in EM's Special Projects Office focusing on Hanford and ORP activities.

Mr. Gilbertson went into detail about infrastructure and facilities in EM. He stated that EM is not accepting any additional facilities until there is funding provided for Deactivation and Decommissioning (D&D). He added that EM's strategy with regards to excess facilities is to tackle them on a facility by facility basis. He said that EM is in discussion with the NNSA regarding cost effectiveness at Oak Ridge's Y-12 facility, noting that Y-12 is a high security situation, which can make D&D difficult. Mr. Gilbertson stated that EM is moving forward with the transfer of properties at the Oak Ridge site to some of the community organizations there.

Regarding D&D work, Mr. Gilbertson stated that EM is very proud of the progress being made at Hanford on the demolition of PFP. He encouraged the Chairs to visit the website, where they can see some of the progress being made. He added that the lessons learned here will be used at the SPRU facility in New York.

Mr. Gilbertson discussed the progress of grouting PUREX Tunnel 1 to prevent future collapses. He noted that the PUREX event spurred a reevaluation of facilities across the complex.

Mr. Gilbertson mentioned the ECA report and some of their recommendations. He noted that there are overlapping authorities that require substantial dialogue to accomplish any changes. He mentioned the EPA dialogue and regulatory reform work within EM and EPA.

Mr. Gilbertson discussed EM's collaboration with LM to support the update of the Closure for the Seventh Generation Report. He added that EM is also working on State and Tribal Government Working Group activities such as long-term stewardship missions and educating about this work. He informed about EM's efforts to monitor and ensure compliance of DOE Order 435.1 requirements at the disposal sites.

Mr. Gilbertson noted the progress at both large and small facilities. He emphasized the importance of on-site disposal to EM's mission. Regarding WIPP, he stated that the mine is designed to close off the waste after the salt creeps down, and Room 6 is currently undergoing this process. He added that emplacement rates aren't going to speed up significantly until the new ventilation system is in place.

Mr. Gilbertson discussed the EM SSAB's recommendation regarding above-ground storage. He stated that WIPP is constrained by the support from state regulators. He ensured that EM finds this recommendation useful, but there are limits to what can be done at the moment.

Mr. Gilbertson suggested a separate session on EM's packaging and transportation to elaborate for the Chairs. He stated that the majority of shipments are Low-Level Waste (LLW).

Discussion

Mr. Leckband and Mr. Gilbertson discussed the common missions of EM and LM.

Mr. Schmelling asked if disposition of new TRU waste is EM's responsibility. Mr. Gilbertson responded that NNSA is responsible for the packaging and characterization of the waste and EM is responsible for disposition.

Product Development

The Chairs did not produce a recommendation during this meeting. Ms. Leckband noted that this meeting has been very enlightening, adding that even without a recommendation, this meeting is a recognition that the discussion between the Chairs and the presenters is a product.

Ms. Renie Barger commented that the Chairs' devotion to their communities is impressive. She added that she finds it helpful to hear about issues at the individual sites. Mr. Carlton Cave echoed this sentiment.

Mr. Martinez y Valencia commented that the site tours are insightful and provide a unique perspective. Ms. Kristen Jensen added that being at Hanford allowed her to grasp the magnitude of the cleanup project and the diversity of needs at each site.

Closing remarks and adjournment

Mr. David Borak stated that the policies and procedures for the SSABs will be revised soon, and the discussion regarding recommendations will be very helpful during this process. He noted that next spring's meeting will be a crucial opportunity to work out some hard-hitting issues.

Mr. Roberts recognized members whose term limits are approaching and will not be attending the next meeting. These members include Ms. Renie Barger, Ms. Kristen Jensen, and Mr. Earl Sheppard.

Mr. Roberts and Mr. Borak thanked the Chairs and EM SSAB staff for their participation in the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. PDT.