

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

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**Holiday Inn Roswell
3620 N Main St
Roswell NM 88201
May 3, 2018**

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAB – Citizens Advisory Board
DFO – Designated Federal Officer
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer
DOE – US Department of Energy
DOT – US Department of Transportation
D&D – Deactivation & Decommissioning
ECA – Energy Communities Alliance
EM – (DOE) Office of Environmental Management
EMAB – Environmental Management Advisory Board
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board
EPA – US Environmental Protection Agency
FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act
FY – Fiscal Year
GTCC – Greater-than-Class-C
HAB – Hanford Advisory Board
Hanford – (DOE) Hanford Site
ICP CAB – Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board
LANL – Los Alamos National Laboratory
LLNL – Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
LM – (DOE) Office of Legacy Management
NAS – National Academy of Sciences
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
NNMCAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board
NNSA - National Nuclear Security Administration
NNS – Nevada National Security Site
NNSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board
ORSSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board
Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory Board
PORTS SSAB – Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board
Portsmouth – (DOE) Portsmouth Site
RWMC – Radioactive Waste Management Complex
SRS – (DOE) Savannah River Site
SRS CAB – Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
TRU – Transuranic Waste
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Shelley Cimon, Vice-Chair; James Lynch, co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO); Kyle Rankin, co-DDFO; Mark Heeter, Federal Coordinator; Jennifer Colborn, Staff; Echo Dahl, Staff

Idaho National Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board: Keith Branter, Chair; Trilby McAfee, Vice-Chair; Connie Flohr, DOE; Bradley Bugger, Federal Coordinator; Jordan Davies, Staff

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board: Steven Rosenbaum, Chair; Frank Bonesteel, Vice-Chair; Catherine Hampton, DOE; Barbara Ulmer, Staff

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Gerard Martinez y Valencia, Chair; Michael Valerio, Member; Roger Life, Member; Lee Bishop, DDFO; Bridget Maestas, Staff; Menice Santistevan, Staff

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: Dennis Wilson, Chair; Belinda Price, Vice-Chair; Shelley Kimel, Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Bill Murphy, Chair; Renie Barger, Member

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

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Gil Allensworth, Chair; Douglas Howard, Vice-Chair; Michael Mikolanis, co-DDFO; de'Lisa Carrico, Federal Coordinator; James Tanner, Staff

DOE Headquarters:

Mark Gilbertson, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory & Policy Affairs, Office of Environmental Management (EM)

Michelle Sneed, Director, Office of Secretarial Boards and Councils

Steve Trischman, Director, Office of Budget and Planning, EM

David Borak, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer, EM

Jared Bierbach, Contractor Staff, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs, EM

Alyssa Harris, Contractor Staff, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs, EM

MEETING MINUTES

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB or Board) Chairs met on May 3, 2018 at the Holiday Inn in Roswell, NM. 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).

Opening Remarks

Mr. David Borak called the Chairs Meeting to order at 8:32 a.m. MT. He welcomed all attendees and made introductions for the DOE staff, including Michelle Sneed, Director of the Office of Secretarial Boards and Councils. Ms. Sneed thanked the Chairs for inviting her to attend.

Mr. Borak introduced Mr. James Tanner, the meeting facilitator. Mr. Tanner reviewed the agenda and outlined meeting logistics for the day.

EM Update

A video message was presented from Assistant Secretary for EM Anne White. In the video, she introduced herself to the Board and emphasized her interest in hearing their local concerns and priorities. She stated that her top priority is to reinvigorate a completion mindset throughout the complex. She thanked the Chairs for their service and continued support of the EM mission.

Mr. Mark Gilbertson, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory and Policy Affairs, said that this has been an exciting time for EM, and he looks forward to the next several years of progress. He stated that the DOE Undersecretary for Science, Paul Dabbar, is committed to building innovation into the EM program. He added that there is an opportunity for the Board to help establish EM's vision moving forward.

Mr. Gilbertson began his presentation by recognizing that the EM program is the largest cleanup program in the world. He said that the current administration's support of the EM program is very encouraging, adding that this is demonstrated by the increased budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2019.

Mr. Gilbertson noted that EM's budget priorities in the FY 19 request include Savannah River's tank program, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant's ventilation systems, Hanford's Waste Treatment Plant, and Oak Ridge's Mercury Treatment Facility. He also highlighted the importance of tackling the C-400 building at Paducah to prevent groundwater contamination. He said that EM will continue progress on excess facilities at Y-12 and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) as proposed in the FY 2018 budget.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that EM has technology development efforts in the works and Mr. Dabbar has been an advocate for innovation in EM as Under Secretary for Science. He listed a current

example of EM innovation as RadPiper, a machine that will assist with miles of pipe investigation at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant.

Mr. Gilbertson began highlighting the major priorities at individual sites. He noted that each of the Board's priorities characterized in the Round Robin (see next presentation) are generally aligned with what EM considers top priorities. He described an issue at Savannah River in regards to the Salt Waste Processing Facility's startup; many of the necessary valves and parts are specialized equipment that is older and sometimes hard to replace. He also recognized the success of the Saltstone Disposal Units and showed support of spent fuel disposition at SRS.

Mr. Gilbertson went on to mention the continued pump-and-treat efforts at Hanford and the ongoing research of tank vapors. He noted the biggest challenge at Idaho is the startup of the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit project, which should start simulat runs in the next few weeks. He added that Idaho has also begun repackaging and characterizing transuranic (TRU) waste in preparation for disposal of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).

Mr. Gilbertson said that at Oak Ridge, the Mercury Treatment Facility continues to be a priority, which will help prevent mercury from leaving the site. He noted the continued progress of demolition at the East Tennessee Technology Park and the expansion efforts of an on-site disposal facility. In both Portsmouth and Paducah, he stated that Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride is continuing to be processed.

Mr. Gilbertson said that Los Alamos is working through the low-grade TRU waste and groundwater remedies. He mentioned Sandia's small groundwater monitoring program. He said that Nevada maintains operations for low-level and mixed low-level waste on-site disposition. He noted Moab's priority of excavation, transportation and disposal operations, as well as groundwater monitoring.

Mr. Gilbertson gave an update on the smaller sites, stating that the Separations Process Research Unit is completing demolition, the Energy Technology Engineering Center is conducting an analysis on groundwater in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory is cleaning laboratory facilities with groundwater contamination, the West Valley Demonstration Project is demolishing their main process building, and Brookhaven National Laboratory is working on mechanical ways to demolish a stack that has special requirements.

Mr. Gilbertson opened the floor for questions.

Discussion

Ms. Shelley Cimon, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB), asked how much money is allocated for a project like Brookhaven. Mr. Gilbertson responded that it is roughly \$20 million and they are currently working on a way to reduce this cost.

Ms. Susan Leckband, HAB, noted that the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) has panels concentrating on technology use at Hanford. She asked if this comes out of the EM budget. Mr. Gilbertson responded yes, there are three studies being conducted currently, and one of these is

funded by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) for plutonium disposition. He added that all of the studies are congressionally mandated with either EM or NNSA program funds. Ms. Leckband asked whether EM is required to utilize technology that has already been investigated if asked by NAS. Mr. Gilbertson responded that EM is not bound by the studies, but they will take the NAS committees' recommendations into consideration.

Ms. Leckband also asked if there is concern about the contamination level at the Portsmouth and Paducah sites after on-site disposal. Mr. Gilbertson responded that all materials with a higher radiological content are going to Nevada, but a lot of lower concern materials are appropriate for disposal on-site. He added that this is similar to what has been done at most of the other sites in the complex.

Mr. Doug Howard, Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB), asked if robotics are being considered for the future of EM cleanup. Mr. Gilbertson responded that robotics are being attempted where appropriate and where it makes sense for efficiency and speed of cleanup.

Ms. Cimon asked if projects like Brookhaven are potentially taking funds away from cleanup at the major sites as a political opportunity. Mr. Gilbertson responded that it is important to be aware of what is going on in all of the complex because there are ripple effects from lessons learned. He acknowledged that it is a large system and crosscutting issues are common and important when forming recommendations and making collective decisions. He also acknowledged that states with smaller sites have a very small percentage of the budget, and these state congressional districts are incentivized to support the EM program moving forward.

Mr. Keith Branter, Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB), asked if there is an effort to recycle metals in EM. Mr. Gilbertson responded that a number of sites have relationships with the communities and recycle clean materials; materials that have been in contaminated areas can be more challenging.

Dr. Bill Murphy, Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB), encouraged RadPiper to be implemented in the field as soon as possible to get feedback from contractors who will be using it. Mr. Gilbertson responded that the intent is to pass this technology on to Paducah as the workforce becomes more comfortable with it. Dr. Murphy asked who is developing the technology. Mr. Gilbertson said that it is a consortium of universities and other entities involved with the development of several robotic techniques that EM is researching. He noted that there is more robotics technology that has potential use in the program.

Ms. Leckband asked how to find a balance between spending on site maintenance and actual cleanup activities. She noted that Hanford is struggling with funds being directed towards keeping aging facilities safe. Mr. Gilbertson responded that each site is trying to reach that balance. He added that the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is exploring this at issue Hanford.

Mr. Bob Berry, Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (PORTS SSAB), commented that Portsmouth tried to promote recycling and one of the materials that could be cleaned was nickel. He said that it has been a valuable asset and has proved cost-effective to recycle. Mr. Gilbertson

noted that contaminated material can be used in the nuclear system if it can be guaranteed that it will stay in the system.

Ms. Leckband asked if there is interest in reinstating the Science and Technology Coordination Group, which consisted of members from each site who used or developed the technology and helped exchange information. Mr. Gilbertson said that there is an opportunity for this idea to be considered by EM.

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 (HAB) – Susan Leckband

Ms. Susan Leckband painted a picture of Hanford's landscape, with eight reactors along the river, processing plants that are being decontaminated and decommissioned, and new facilities being constructed to vitrify waste. She stated that each year Hanford does not get enough funding to meet the Tri-Party Agreement milestones, even though the amount allocated is enormous. She acknowledged that Hanford needs budget increases each year. She noted that the unexpected discovery of a highly radioactive plume underneath Hanford's 324 building took a toll on their budget. She said that the Plutonium Finishing Plant has widespread contamination and worker safety concerns.

Ms. Leckband conveyed the HAB's concerns about public education and community involvement. She said that they have requested additional HAB meetings around the region, since it is a regional board.

Mr. Mark Gilbertson asked about the HAB's concerns about infrastructure. Ms. Leckband responded that it is a priority, but less of a priority than the things just discussed. Ms. Cimon stated that the reality is Hanford needs \$4 billion to meet milestones.

Mr. Dennis Wilson asked if members of the HAB are going to places throughout the region to promote public involvement. Ms. Leckband responded that members that belong to organizations and have public-speaking engagements around the region. She added that lack of funding for those organizations has inhibited the flexibility to continue these activities.

Mr. Gil Allensworth asked why tank waste issues are still occurring at Hanford. Ms. Leckband responded that Hanford's waste is unique and a higher magnitude than any other site. Mr. Steve Trischman said that at the Savannah River Site (SRS), the liquid waste treatment system began construction in the 1990's, and this system is now being built at Hanford, where they are running into problems with pretreatment due to the unique nature of Hanford's waste. Mr. Gilbertson added that not all high-level waste is the same at each site.

Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB) – Keith Branter

Mr. Keith Branter said that the ICP CAB holds meetings around the state, and at each meeting, the main concern is always keeping the Snake River aquifer clean. He stated that the Advanced Mixed-Waste Treatment Facility recently finished retrieving and repackaging 65,000 cubic meters of TRU waste from Rocky Flats to reduce the volume of drums being sent to WIPP. He said that on April 11, an exothermic reaction happened inside of a TRU waste drum and was contained and investigated.

Mr. Branter said that the Idaho Waste Treatment Unit should be starting up soon with 900,000 gallons of waste to treat. He said that near term, they are increasing the number of shipments to WIPP.

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

Mr. Steven Rosenbaum said that a fluid analysis study was conducted that represents the evolution of the site transitioning from cleanup to long-term stewardship. He stated that the Nevada cleanup is estimated to be 12 years from completion in 2030.

Mr. Rosenbaum discussed the Board's concerns with transportation such as the weak infrastructure of the southern route to the NNSS RWMC (Radioactive Waste Management Complex). He noted that there are two population clusters on the route and any incident can have a disruptive effect on the community. He said that he has attended DOE transportation and public safety forums and while the safety record is strong, continued due diligence is important. He emphasized the importance of the Department of Transportation (DOT), state DOT and DOE working together. He encouraged more discussion and movement toward safer transport.

Mr. Mark Gilbertson mentioned the National Transportation Stakeholders Forum meeting taking place the first week in June. He encouraged anyone with specific concerns to reach out to their site.

Ms. Shelley Cimon asked if the State requests funding from DOE for transportation upgrades. Mr. Gilbertson responded that DOE does not have a special fund for upgrades to the interstate transport system.

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNM CAB) – Gerard Martinez Valencia

Mr. Gerard Martinez y Valencia stated that the transition to the new Management and Operating contractor is complete. He stated that there is a continued focus on groundwater cleanup and the CAB is committed to a safe and efficient cleanup. He said that the remediation of nitrate salts shipped from LANL at the Waste Control Specialists site in Texas has been completed. He noted that this meeting is helpful to find out what the other sites are prioritizing and what their progress is.

Mr. Martinez y Valencia emphasized the importance of wildfire mitigation and his concern about the threat to Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). He said that New Mexico is still

monitoring and controlling surface water. He also noted that the implementation of Order on Consent is almost complete. He suggested an assessment of all routes into WIPP, noting a sink hole near the southern route to WIPP that the State is currently investigating.

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

Dr. Dennis Wilson began by noting the importance of the ORSSAB representing a wide range of communities, as the site affects a large region. He said that the Board has been working on a budget workshop presentation for a public outreach opportunity. He recognized Ms. Shelley Kimel for being instrumental in maintaining the Board's Facebook page, which benefits recruiting efforts. He said that the tours related to excess contaminated facilities and future waste disposal capacity have been a great learning tool for both new and old members. He noted that the Board maintained a presence at the Waste Management Symposia, National Environmental Justice Conference & Training, and the DOE National Cleanup Workshop.

Dr. Wilson stated that groundwater is a key focus for this year's recommendations, adding that a recommendation has been accepted by DOE concerning the offsite groundwater assessment and examination of potential offsite plume mitigation pathways. He noted that excess facilities is a large focus for the Board and they are preplanning for the next level of demolition on Y-12.

Dr. Wilson said that another recommendation from the Board was to ensure the future waste disposal capacity, which is coming to a positive conclusion. He said that DOE will be issuing a formal report in the near future.

Ms. Leckband commented that Oak Ridge has been a model for public outreach. Dr. Wilson responded that they are trying to reinvigorate their public outreach, as they have been more active in the past. Ms. Leckband said that the HAB does not have the budget for more public outreach, so everything is on a volunteer basis. She said that several members of the Board do their own outreach, as well as the Washington State Department of Ecology. Ms. Belinda Price, ORSSAB, commented that the ORSSAB does not have a budget for public outreach.

Mr. Gerard Martinez y Valencia asked if mercury can be recycled and used in the energy industry similar to nickel. Mr. Gilbertson stated that the mercury at Oak Ridge is not contaminated, which poses a regulatory problem. He said that there is a regulatory process in place for contaminated mercury, but not for uncontaminated mercury. He said that a workshop is coming up next week in Washington, D.C. that will focus on handling uncontaminated elemental mercury. Dr. Wilson noted that the storage and handling of nickel has become a major budget item and concern at Oak Ridge.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB) – Bill Murphy

Dr. Bill Murphy recognized the "silent phase" that Paducah is going into due to lack of major changes or news at the site after C-400 Deactivation & Decommissioning (D&D) completion. He said that the next 10 years will be dedicated to characterizing uranium and analyzing groundwater. He said that there will not be much visible activity to the public and the Board

remains engaged where they can. He noted that they are dependent on continued EM budget support, similar to the rest of the complex.

Mr. Martinez y Valencia asked for an update on the status of Paducah's plume migration. Dr. Murphy responded that over the past decade there has been significant progress. He noted that after the ground beneath C-400 is investigated, they will know how to better approach the issue.

Ms. Leckband asked if the Paducah CAB has been tasked with considering land reuse or reinvestment. Dr. Murphy responded no, DOE has collaborated with University of Kentucky and other organizations to study this issue extensively. He added that they have done public surveys and cost analysis assessments.

Ms. Leckband asked if the reduction of employees at Paducah will cause an economic downturn. Dr. Murphy responded that the Board is trying to remain engaged and aware of all implications.

Dr. Wilson asked if a permit needed to be enacted for drilling underneath C-400 to occur. Dr. Murphy responded that an agreement exists that is being discussed with regulators currently. Mr. Gilbertson added that there is a special challenge with the uranium enrichment centrifuge that makes this situation complicated.

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

Mr. Bob Berry stated his Board has a “next generation mindset”. He emphasized their focus on exploring new technologies to increase worker safety and efficiency. He said that they would like to see some of the site's empty space become a technology center for research and development of robotics technology.

Mr. Berry added that he would like to see an expansion on the successful radiation technology program for site employment. He said that site redevelopment is also a top priority, with the first land transfer set to occur early this summer and a second in the works. He said that funding needs to be maintained to make Portsmouth DOE's next success story as a closure site. He noted that a faster completion saves DOE millions of dollars, if not billions.

Mr. Berry said that Portsmouth is no longer using the barter program, which helps keep their finances stable. He said that a Record of Decision, through an effort between DOE, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the State of Ohio, will dig up plumes and take down landfills to use as fill dirt for the new waste disposal site.

Ms. Cimon asked for details regarding the land transfer. Mr. Berry said that the Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative will now control 60 acres. Ms. Cimon asked if the DOE Office of Legacy Management is consulted first. Mr. Gilbertson responded no. Mr. Berry noted that the land was previously an airstrip and was never contaminated. Ms. Renie Barger, Paducah CAB, asked if there was ever discussion about the land being a recreational area. Mr. Berry responded no.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) – Gil Allensworth

Mr. Gil Allensworth began by discussing Savannah River's budget issues related to pensions. He said that it is causing a strain on the operating budget for the mission. He said that a SRS CAB subcommittee was formed to explore options and develop recommendations on how EM can balance the demands of cleanup scope and pension obligations. He said that the CAB meets all around the region and has a recommendation that will be voted on at their next meeting.

Mr. Allensworth discussed the debate the CAB had over the past 14 months regarding German spent fuel that could potentially come to SRS. He said that this is the most public interaction that the CAB has received in some time. The CAB voted to oppose the spent fuel coming to SRS.

Mr. Allensworth said that this uncomfortable vote caused the CAB to purchase an anonymous voting system, which has been working splendidly. He noted that there are much less unanimous outcomes and members can now vote with less peer pressure.

Mr. Allensworth said that ground is being broken on the Saltstone Disposal Unit, and although it is massive, they will need another six of them.

Ms. Leckband commented that Hanford went through a similar situation regarding pensions, and phased pensions out for employees hired before a certain date.

Ms. Cimon asked about the distribution of the German materials. Mr. Gilbertson said that Germany is paying for the US to conduct research on the materials, but DOE has not committed to accepting the material. He said that once processed, the amount of waste is actually very small.

Budget and Planning Update

Mr. Steve Trischman, Director for the Office of Budget and Planning, introduced himself and reviewed the topics to be covered. He described the phases of the budget process, including highlighting timeframes for stakeholder involvement. He noted that currently the omnibus has been approved for FY 2018, but while they are waiting for the release of funding for the year, increments would be released every 30 days. He showed a budget calendar, stating that his office is always working on multiple portions of the budget at the same time.

Mr. Trischman stated that the administration has been supportive of EM's work, as evidenced by the budget requests. He noted that much of the \$706 million plus up in FY 2018 will be carried over into FY 2019. In his presentation, he displayed a breakdown of how these funds will be distributed, including technology development. He described the plan for Liquid Waste Operations at Savannah River as the Salt Waste Processing Facility comes into full operation, and how it raises the SRS budget. He said that there are roughly 100 million gallons of liquid waste to be pretreated over the next 10-15 years.

Mr. Trischman gave a status update on the FY 2019 request, stating that initial Congressional marks are anticipated in June. Regarding the FY 2020 budget, he said that a field planning workshop took place to begin formulation.

Mr. Trischman discussed the estimated cost of EM's Environmental Liability and noted that it is 1% of the total liability in the federal government. He explained that the estimate has increased over the past few years primarily due to liquid waste treatment project delays. Also, the Liability will increase as new excess facilities are added to the EM scope from other DOE Program Offices.

Mr. Gilbertson encouraged the Chairs to come to their sites with any questions and interact with them regarding budget concerns.

Discussion

Ms. Cimon commented that Congress needs more information regarding the actual cost of cleanup to make informed decisions. She encouraged EM to work on this messaging and to utilize the boards for their influence.

Dr. Wilson asked if the Tri-Party Agreements have ever been renegotiated. Ms. Leckband said there is a complex process for any changes to the agreement.

Mr. Howard asked if it would be beneficial for the site managers to go before Congress, since they are the owners of the issues. Mr. Trischman responded that the site managers do get a chance to speak directly with Hill staff in individual site briefings.

Ms. Leckband asked for a description of the technology development that is being funded by the carryover budget. Mr. Gilbertson responded that Mr. Rod Rimando of EM is the lead for the Technology Development Program and he works with the sites on their specific technology needs.

Waste Disposition Update

Mr. Mark Gilbertson reviewed the key priorities of the program. He discussed the regulatory reform efforts happening in EM. He said that one of the key efforts includes streamlining NEPA actions through a new policy. Recognizing that most NEPA actions originate in the field, EM has tasked the field to identify the resources it needs to implement NEPA and to provide its recommendations on delegations of approval authority from EM-1.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that a decision has not yet been made regarding the recommendations provided in the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) report *Waste Disposition: A New Approach to DOE's Waste Management Must Be Pursued*. He added that Ms. Anne White is very knowledgeable in this area. He discussed the effects that reclassification of high-level waste may have on WIPP.

Mr. Gilbertson noted that EM continues work on the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the disposition of depleted uranium. He described the test bed—a three gallon sample of treated, stabilized Hanford tank waste that is being researched further.

Mr. Gilbertson said that EM has submitted a report to Congress regarding disposal alternatives for Greater-than-Class-C (GTCC) low-level waste. He highlighted the permitting issues at WIPP and Waste Control Specialists waste monitoring. He also highlighted the new D&D projects coming up at LLNL, Y-12 Biology Complex, and Idaho National Laboratory.

Ms. Cimon asked how many excess facilities are coming under EM. Mr. Gilbertson responded that EM does not accept any excess facilities that they do not have the funding to demolish.

Mr. Gilbertson went through the FY 2017 packaging and transportation highlights, stating that that the National Transportation Stakeholder Forum will take place the first week of June; members of the complex will be in attendance.

Discussion

Ms. Leckband asked if there is any program associated with road upgrades or maintenance. Mr. Gilbertson said that EM works with states to update them on when a shipment will be coming through and analyze whether the roads are appropriate for shipments. He noted that DOE relies on DOT to maintain the quality of the roads.

Dr. Wilson asked if the field has the resources for NEPA reviews, since some reviews would be conducted at the site level. Mr. Gilbertson responded that most NEPA documents are initiated and developed in the field. He said that they went to the individual field offices and asked them to provide a self-assessment to determine what would be delegated to them. He said that they will use corporate resources if the field does not want the authority.

Dr. Wilson also asked how NEPA streamlining is measured and what feedback is provided. Mr. Gilbertson responded that there needs to be a culture change, which is hard to measure. He noted that the ultimate test is the quality of the documents produced. He said that they have been more concise and easier to understand than in the past, which is a success.

Dr. Wilson asked how Congress had the expertise to ask for an investigation of GTCC low-level waste. Mr. Gilbertson said that the Hill has identified EM as an entity that can explore these options and perhaps there will be some congressional language that may clarify directions for the disposition of this material.

Mr. Frank Bonesteel asked if the average shipment is considered overweight. Mr. Gilbertson said no. Ms. Cimon and Mr. Gilbertson discussed the balance between packing as much radioactive material into drums and worker safety risks.

Mr. Bob Berry asked if EM is considering ways to expand WIPP's life, such as renegotiating ways of counting volume. Mr. Gilbertson said that Congress established the volume of record and they could change it.

Mr. Michael Valerio, NNM CAB, asked what other facilities are sending compacted material for the sake of space conservation. Mr. Gilbertson noted that EM is examining opportunities to use a super compactor for other waste streams.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Norbert Rempe, a geologist and former WIPP employee, introduced himself and began discussing radiological protection standards. He expressed the opinion that DOE's internal regulations and radiation standards are overly cautious compared to international standards. He noted that two papers were published last year by the Carlsbad Environmental Monitoring and Research Center stating that WIPP ventilation is not necessary. He encouraged the Board to look at the dose chart on the DOE Office of Science website. He left a copy of a CD with background information on this material.

Recommendation Development Discussion

Mr. Martinez y Valencia described the draft recommendation that the NNM CAB crafted regarding the ECA report and reclassification of waste. He noted that this recommendation still requires NNM CAB approval, which is likely to happen at their next meeting on May 16th. He also noted that the recommendation points out the lack of empirical data and clear definitions in some important areas of the report. Consequently, he said, they recommend that DOE undertake a comprehensive analysis of what implementing the report could mean for the sites and surrounding communities.

Mr. Allensworth thanked Mr. Martinez y Valencia for bringing this to the meeting. He said that the SRS CAB has a pending recommendation that is very similar. The Chairs agreed to develop a recommendation similar to that of the draft NNM CAB recommendation

Mr. David Borak reminded that voting "yes" here is not to support the recommendation, but to bring it back to their respective boards. Mr. Bonesteel suggested that they accept the recommendation as is to take back to their boards.

Mr. Borak said that taking the time at this meeting to go over the wording of the recommendation and make sure that each Board would accept the way it is worded has value. Mr. Tanner echoed this sentiment and said that the less changes that are made at the site-specific level, the more efficient the process will be when crafting one collectively in the fall.

Ms. Belinda Price asked if DOE has any feedback on the ECA report or this recommendation. Mr. Gilbertson said that they have gotten congressional direction to research what this would mean for the sites.

Mr. Allensworth commented that SRS is most interested in the reclassification of TRU waste. Mr. Martinez y Valencia suggested that the plan of action should be to get more information

about the report's lingering questions and what DOE wants to actually enact. Then, the Board can break it down into several recommendations.

Mr. James Lynch, HAB, suggested that the Board looks at this from a very high level at the crosscutting topics affecting all sites. Ms. Price asked if the Board wants DOE to review the report or to reevaluate definitions of waste. Mr. Martinez y Valencia responded that they want a little of both. He asked Mr. Gilbertson if this recommendation would help DOE. Mr. Gilbertson said that there is already an analysis happening, but if the Board would like to be involved with it, then it will be helpful.

The Board suggested wording changes to the draft recommendation, after which Ms. Leckband said that she feels comfortable taking this back to the HAB. Mr. Bonesteel made a motion to accept the recommendation. Dr. Wilson seconded the motion. The Board voted unanimously to take this draft to their respective boards for approval.

Mr. Borak asked the Chairs to please ensure that the CABs vote on the recommendation at their next meeting. He encouraged them to call with any questions or concerns that the members may have.

Ms. Leckband drafted a welcome letter to Assistant Secretary Anne White. She asked if anyone had any edits to the letter and the Chairs discussed edits. The Chairs agreed to send the letter forward.

Mr. Martinez y Valencia described some common topics that have come up as potential recommendations, which are transportation routes, water treatment and mitigation, excess facilities, liquid waste, and worker protection.

Closing remarks and adjournment

Mr. David Borak stated that the next Chairs meeting will be held in Washington, D.C. in conjunction with the EM Cleanup Workshop on September 11-13. He said that there might be training on best practices as a Chair. He added that the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) will also be meeting during these dates, and it is a chance for the members to attend an EMAB meeting.

Ms. Leckband asked if this would be a one-day meeting, and Mr. Borak responded yes.

Mr. Gilbertson encouraged the Board to stay informed with the EM Update newsletter.

Mr. Borak noted that public outreach is not a direct activity of the Board; the Board's purpose is to provide recommendations. Ms. Leckband said that the HAB has made it very clear to members that the Chair speaks for the Board and not for DOE, regulators, or tribes. Mr. Borak acknowledged that point and encouraged the Chairs to work with their staff on how to help speak for the Board at events.

Mr. Borak offered FACA training for any boards that feel they need it. He thanked the contractor support from Headquarters and New Mexico, and Mr. Tanner for facilitating at the last minute. He encouraged everyone to fill out their meeting evaluation form.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:27 PM MT.