

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

April 20-21, 2021

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAB – Citizens Advisory Board
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CRESP – Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation
D&D – Deactivation & Decommissioning
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer
DFO – Designated Federal Officer
DOE – US Department of Energy
DWPF – Defense Waste Processing Facility
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement
EM – (DOE) Office of Environmental Management
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board
EMAB – Environmental Management Advisory Board
EMCBC – Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center
EM-LA – (DOE) Environmental Management Los Alamos
EPA – US Environmental Protection Agency
ETTP – East Tennessee Technology Park
FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act
Hanford – (DOE) Hanford Site
HAB – Hanford Advisory Board
HLW – High-Level Waste
HQ – Headquarters
ICP CAB – Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board
INL (INL) Idaho National Laboratory
IWTU – Integrated Waste Treatment Unit
LFRG – Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Federal Review Group
NE – Nuclear Energy
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
Nevada SSAB – Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board
NNM CAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board
NNSA – National Nuclear Security Administration
NNSS – (DOE) Nevada National Security Site
NRC – US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
OLM – (DOE) Office of Legacy Management
OMB – The Office of Management and Budget
ORNL – Oak Ridge National Laboratory
OR SSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board
Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory Board
PFP – Plutonium Finishing Plant

Portsmouth – (DOE) Portsmouth Site
PPE – Personal Protective Equipment
PORTS SSAB – Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board
RCRA – Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
SC – (DOE) Office of Science
SNF – Spent Nuclear Fuel
SRS – (DOE) Savannah River Site
SRNL – Savannah River National Laboratory
SRS CAB – Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
TRU – Transuranic Waste
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WVDP – West Valley Demonstration Project

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Steve Wiegman, Chair; Shelley Cimon, Vice-Chair; Stan Branch, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO); Gary Younger, Federal Coordinator; Ruth Nicholson, Facilitator; Dana Gribble, Staff

Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board: Brad Christensen, Chair; Teri Ehresman, Vice-Chair; Danielle Miller, Federal Coordinator; Jordan Davies, Staff

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board: Frank Bonesteel, Chair; Anthony Graham, Vice-Chair; Barbara Ulmer, Staff; Jesse Sleezer, Navarro Strategic Communications Manager; Rob Boehlecke, DDFO

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Robert Hull, Chair; Joshua Madalena, Vice-Chair; Lee Bishop, DDFO; Menice Santistevan and Bridget Maestas, Staff

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: Shell Lohmann, Chair; Leon Shields, Vice-Chair; Melyssa Noe, DDFO; Shelley Kimmel and Sara McManamy-Johnson, Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Don Barger, Chair; Victoria Caldwell, Vice-Chair; Eric Roberts, Meeting Facilitator, Robert "Buz" Smith, Federal Coordinator; Jim Etheridge, Staff

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Bob Berry, Chair; Carlton Cave, Vice-Chair; Greg Simonton, Federal Coordinator; Julie Galloway and Cindy Lewis, Staff

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Gregg Murray, Vice-Chair; Jim Guille, Committee Chair; Amy Boyette, Co-DDFO; de'Lisa Carrico, Federal Coordinator; James Tanner, Staff

DOE Headquarters:

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

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

Mary Kruger, Director, Office of Regulatory and Stakeholder Engagement, EM

Joceline Nahigian, Director, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs, EM

Kelly Snyder, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Alyssa Harris, EM SSAB Federal Coordinator

Other Participants:

Jack Craig, EMAB Vice-Chair

David Kosson, CRESPP Principal Investigator, Cornelius Vanderbilt Professor of Engineering, Vanderbilt University

Kathryn Higley, Professor, Nuclear Engineering & Radiation Health Physics, Oregon State University

Michael Greenberg, Distinguished Professor and former Dean, Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy, Rutgers – The State University of New Jersey

MEETING MINUTES

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) Chairs and Vice-Chairs met virtually on April 20-21, 2021. Participants included EM SSAB leadership, EM Headquarters (HQ) leadership and staff, EM SSAB contractor support staff, and presenters. The meeting was also publicly livestreamed via YouTube. The meeting was open to the public and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Recordings of this meeting can be viewed at the following links:

[EM SSAB Chairs Meeting Day 1](#)

[EM SSAB Chairs Meeting Day 2](#)

Day 1

Opening Remarks

Mr. Eric Roberts, contractor support for the Paducah and Portsmouth Project Offices and meeting facilitator, welcomed all attendees and reviewed the ground rules and functionality of the virtual platform for the meeting. All meeting participants introduced themselves. Mr. Roberts explained that the entire meeting would be livestreamed and available on the EM SSAB YouTube channel.

Update from Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Todd Shrader

Mr. Roberts introduced the first speaker, Mr. Todd Shrader, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM.

Mr. Shrader began with recognizing the important service that the SSABs provide to the both EM HQ and the field. He said that the input and advice is valued by EM, and the amount of work and time commitment involved, particularly by the Chairs, is very much appreciated.

Mr. Shrader updated on COVID-19 and its effect on EM sites. Every week, all Federal agencies participate in a President's Management Council Meeting to discuss this issue. The Department remains on maximum telework for employees that are not conducting mission-essential work for on-site activities. The number of employees working on-site varies across the complex. As an example, sites with a support function, such as EM HQ or the EM Consolidated Business Center (EMCBC), are more suited to telework. Many EM sites have taken advantage of providing vaccines on-site, and employees also have access to the vaccine in their communities. The Department is encouraging its workforce to get the vaccine to control the spread and to support

reopening of EM sites. As of now, there is no change in the current posture of maximum telework, and it is unknown when that may change. The Department reviews the case rates per 100,000 people over a 2-week period, which is also the metric used by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Overall, case numbers are decreasing, although the Department feels that it is important to remain vigilant as there is a continued loss of life due to the pandemic. The Department issued a Workforce Safety Plan in early March 2021 and has reviewed all EM sites for compliance and requested exemptions.

Mr. Shrader noted that the new Administration has shown very strong support for the EM mission. Mr. Shrader and Acting Assistant Secretary for EM “Ike” White have had multiple briefings with U.S. Secretary of Energy Jennifer Granholm and Deputy Secretary of Energy David Turk, and both recognize the importance of the EM mission. The EM Program now is in direct report to Deputy Secretary Turk and remains in communication. Much of the focus of the Department is on the Administration’s priority of Clean Energy, although Secretary Granholm often mentions during interviews the importance of the EM mission and the cleanup of sites across the nation.

Mr. Shrader commented that EM has received strong support from Congress on its budget requests. The two main factors are EM’s successes in making progress and the strong support of the EM communities when Congressional members ask about EM’s performance.

Mr. Shrader commented on the EM Strategic Vision: 2021-2031 (<https://www.energy.gov/node/4808251>) released last week that outlines the next 10 years. EM issued its calendar year (CY) 2021 Priorities List (<https://www.energy.gov/em/downloads/em-cy21-mission-priorities>), and he touched on several items:

- Start up the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) at Idaho
- Complete demolition of Building X-326 at Portsmouth
- Infrastructure upgrades at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)
- Land transfers at Portsmouth and Oak Ridge for community use
- Complete processing of six (6) million gallons of tank waste at the Savannah River Site
- With completion of Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) last year, complete construction of the Tank-Side Cesium Removal system at Hanford with the goal of turning radioactive waste into glass by fiscal year (FY) 2023
- Complete Biology Complex demolition at Oak Ridge

He continued that not every EM site was on the list, but that is not an indication that the work is not important or would not be completed. For example, at the Area 5 Radioactive Waste Management Complex at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS), there is important work ongoing that is not on the list. Also, safety is not included as it is not concrete, although it is

paramount and woven through all EM activities. The EM Strategic Vision is a work in progress, and he encouraged any feedback to be sent to StrategicVisionFeedback@em.doe.gov.

Mr. Shrader remarked that EM HQ is working on solutions to ensure that a future workforce is in place to carry out the EM mission with a diverse pipeline of employees that reflects the diversity of America. He mentioned that there is a renewed effort connect with tribes, and Secretary Granholm participated in a Tribal Summit several weeks ago. EM HQ continues to work on these relationships and align EM activities with the President's priorities.

Mr. Shrader opened the floor for questions from the Chairs. Ms. Shelley Cimon (HAB) asked if EM is considering the funding of shovel-ready projects rather than larger ticket items, such as startups and operations. Mr. Shrader responded that EM HQ and the field sites have had conversations on what an infrastructure bill could include and its constraints. In the meantime, EM is looking at different work that can be completed in order to be ready when there is clarity and specific language available in an infrastructure bill.

Ms. Michelle Lohmann (OR SSAB) was interested in EM's thoughts on vaccination adoption and if there are any concerns with the long-term workforce stability relative to vaccination rates. Mr. Shrader responded that EM encourages its employees to receive the vaccine. There are areas where employees have had hesitancy, but there has been some turnaround for those who are now willing to receive the vaccine. EM continues to track and will take a closer look upon transitioning from maximum telework. In the current posture, there has not been an impact relative to EM activities.

Mr. Gregg Murray (SRS CAB) inquired whether EM has conducted any formal assessments on productivity or efficiency of employees on telework status. Mr. Shrader responded that nothing has been formalized, but there has been discussions and empirical observations. The vast majority of work conducted by EM HQ lends itself to telework. In the field, there is more of a need for employees to physically be on-site, which has slowed work. There are other offices, such as procurements, that have been more efficient while teleworking. In his personal opinion, Mr. Shrader added that there is some loss of efficiencies with brainstorming and the ideas that result, as it takes a more concerted effort to have conversations while teleworking, and that loss is not quantifiable. In the future, EM may conduct formal surveys that will inform the future government workforce.

Ms. Cimon (HAB) inquired whether EM is tracking the number of employees receiving the vaccine. Mr. Shrader noted that EM has data on the number of employees who receive the vaccine administered by on-site occupational medicine or employees who voluntarily report to the site when getting the vaccine in the community. EM is not collecting as part of a mandatory disclosure process; therefore, he cannot accurately report the number of the 33,000 EM

employees that have received the vaccine. Currently under the Emergency Use Authorization, the Federal government's position is not to make the vaccine mandatory for its workforce.

Chairs Round Robin

Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB)

Mr. Brad Christensen touched on two hot topics that the ICP CAB is focused on: the protection of the Snake River Plain Aquifer and the near-term safe startup of the IWTU, in which the ICP will process about 900,000 gallons of sodium-bearing high-level waste.

Mr. Christensen requested guidance on the repackaging of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) and progress on the eventual location for a repository. He reiterated the urgency and necessity for achieving long-term agreements with the federal government for shipping SNF out of Idaho. The ICP CAB's goals also include monitoring the imminent transition of its contractor, specifically as it relates to safety, worker retention, and sustained efficiencies. The ICP CAB continues to monitor its on-site waste, especially the transuranic remote-handled waste, as there is a desire to expedite shipments to the WIPP.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB)

Mr. Gregg Murray reported that the SRS CAB has conducted four meetings since June 2020 despite the pandemic, and the Board feels more comfortable with its virtual meeting capabilities. In February 2021, SRS CAB held a work plan meeting to coordinate its efforts for the year. As usual, the membership package was submitted in mid-August 2020, and a few revisions were required by EM HQ and a resubmission of the package. The SRS CAB's membership package has not been approved for almost eight months after its submission, resulting in only seven current members with 25 members normally. This has impacted the credibility and legitimacy of the SRS CAB, and he requested approval of its package in order to get back to work providing feedback to EM.

Mr. Mark Gilbertson, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM Regulatory & Policy Affairs, responded that EM HQ is aware of the status of the membership packages and the timeframes, and they are working with the new Administration on its responsibilities in regard to the SSABs and their importance to the EM Program. He acknowledged the frustration and noted that they are currently working to resolve the issue.

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (Portsmouth SSAB)

Mr. Bob Berry reported that the Portsmouth SSAB is anticipating the active work of demolition, excavation, and waste placement to begin after years of prep work. There have been many recommendations involved, and the Portsmouth SSAB is looking forward to this milestone event. The Portsmouth site is planning deactivation and decommissioning (D&D) of 40% of the X-326 Building this year with construction of a replacement building in the future.

Mr. Berry also discussed that the Portsmouth SSAB has concerns that a subset of the community continues to voice concerns over the safety of D&D and permanent waste placement and encourages DOE to build trust with all stakeholders.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB)

Mr. Don Barger discussed Paducah's success for its first shipment of depleted uranium oxide cylinders that were transported by a specially-modified rail car to Waste Control Specialists in Andrews, TX. There are 3,800 remaining cylinders to be shipped off-site.

Mr. Barger continued that a new electrical substation has been installed that allows for the dismantling, recovery, and recycling of materials from deactivation activities. This substation has allowed the Paducah site to operate off the country's power grid; therefore, allowing a greater percentage of the budget to be applied to remediation activities rather than maintenance costs. A dry hybrid fire suppression system, replacing a water-filled system that required supplemental heat, has reduced the operating costs for deactivation for Paducah's multi-year cleanup process.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)

Mr. Steve Wiegman commented on the success at the Hanford site that the most contaminated building, the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), has been reduced to slab on grade. The HAB has held a number of virtual meetings and have been successful in issuing five pieces of consensus advice despite the pandemic.

For FY 2021 priorities and beyond, Mr. Wiegman noted that the site is treating tank waste and continues waste removal from the old tanks. The HAB is concerned with the extended delay in treating high-level waste (HLW), and the membership would like to discuss contemporary issues, such as the impending interpretation of the HLW definition and how it will affect the site.

Mr. Wiegman concluded that the HAB is a very diverse board with an array of groups and individuals and will be adding members to include a broader perspective of the local population. The HAB will be focusing on hearing all voices and desires to pursue early involvement in the evolution of the 5-year plan and the 10-year strategic vision. The HAB will be increasing

education to its membership, primarily in technical and regulatory aspects so members will have a better understanding with more meaningful and actionable recommendations to the DOE as a result.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (OR SSAB)

Beginning with accomplishments and activities, Ms. Shell Lohmann stated that the OR SSAB continues to participate in discussions regarding the workforce/program shift at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) and Y-12 sites, resulting mostly from demolition activities and the wrap-up at the East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP). There is work planned for a groundwater cleanup effort at the ETTP, and the OR SSAB will be submitting a recommendation on this issue soon. Vital infrastructure improvement is ongoing for the Mercury Treatment Facility build-out for the next phase of cleanup in Oak Ridge.

Ms. Lohmann said that the OR SSAB has begun drafting of a recommendation on the budget, and has recently held its first virtual meeting, elected officers, and onboarded new members. A number of celebrations have been held around EM milestones, notably for the Vision 2020 completion, a major achievement at ETTP.

Regarding challenges, Ms. Lohmann reiterated that similar to other SSABs, there have been challenges recruiting new members during the pandemic, specifically meeting diversity targets. The OR SSAB has also experienced delays in the membership approval/renewal process.

Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board (NNM CAB)

Mr. Bob Hull presented the NNM CAB's activities/accomplishments topics, including submission of the FY 2021 membership package; transitioning to virtual full board and committee meetings; and the preparation, review, and submittal of three recommendations to EM Los Alamos (EM-LA). NNM CAB members have attended multiple meetings on the Consent Order, cleanup, and permit monitoring. Members also attended meetings with the State of New Mexico and other groups regarding cleanup activities at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, monthly EM-LA contractor Technical Working Group meetings, and the Waste Management Symposia.

Mr. Hull commented on various challenges due to COVID-19 restrictions that have eliminated opportunities for external interactions to identify potential new members, particularly recruiting the diversity requested by EM HQ. He continued that the NNM CAB has challenges balancing the priorities of the members with those of the state due to a lawsuit on the Consent Order between the State of New Mexico and DOE. The NNM CAB has also noticed delays in receiving approval for its membership package. Mr. Hull mentioned that additional time is now required

for the Federal Register Notice to hold a full board meeting, and he hoped that the 38-day requirement could be reduced in the near future.

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB)

Mr. Frank Bonesteel opened with the NSSAB's concern with the abilities and inabilities to continue operations during COVID-19 related shutdowns, and other imposed limitations, whether on the workforce or the acceptance of waste or cleanup activities. Lessons learned could be turned into best practices to assist with compliance, timelines, and budgets being met when access is limited.

Mr. Bonesteel noted that the NSSAB considers the greatest risk to be the possible contamination of groundwater and its subsequent consumption by the public, animals, or crops. EM currently has a rigorous program in place to model, measure, and track contamination. All groundwater contamination is within the NNSS boundaries or surrounding federally controlled lands and is expected to remain that way. The community's perspective is that protecting future generations from this contamination is paramount, and there needs to be a way to designate areas in which well drilling for public use of water should be clearly and permanently recorded.

Mr. Bonesteel concluded that the NSSAB is concerned with the historic preservation of former nuclear sites on the NNSS and the destruction of unique cultural resources and landscapes that have key value to communities. While EM has responsibility to clean up these sites, the structures have deep meaning to various communities and significant historic importance. The NSSAB requests a great emphasis placed upon preserving landscapes and sites when possible, and an expansion of digital options for landscape preservation.

With the conclusion of the round robin presentations, Mr. Gilbertson shared that EM values the ideas and input that the SSABs provided. The presentations from each of the SSABs are used by his office as a source for improving the EM Program going forward. He concluded that he looks forward to the ongoing conversations regarding the EM SSAB's charges during the meeting.

Public Comment

No written comments were received.

Update from EM Advisory Board (EMAB) Vice-Chair, Jack Craig

Mr. Roberts introduced Mr. Jack Craig, Vice-Chair for the EMAB. Mr. Craig explained that EMAB provides recommendations to the Acting Assistant Secretary for EM William "Ike" White (EM-1). The EMAB is currently comprised of 16 members with a diverse cross-section of

perspectives from across the Complex, including industry representatives, former regulators, community leaders, former federal employees, and university officials.

In June 2020, EM-1 gave the EMAB a charge to examine regulatory reform possibilities to streamline work within the Complex and increase the pace of cleanup by removing barriers and reviewing lessons learned across the complex. The EMAB formed three subcommittees that focused on five different areas: 1. Dispute Resolution, 2. Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)/Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Integration, 3. Risk-Based Decision Making, 4. Future Land Use, and 5. Points of Compliance and Levels of Protectiveness.

Mr. Craig continued that a report on the EMAB's observations and recommendations was submitted to EM and is publicly available on its website at [EMAB Reports and Recommendations - April 2021 | Department of Energy](#). He encouraged the SSABs to review the report as there are parallels between the findings and discussions during the meeting, specifically for ways that DOE and regulators can better partner together and use dispute resolution more effectively to remove bottlenecks when issues arise. The report includes recommendations on risk-based decision making and future land use to actively collaborate with the community and focus on getting input to ensure transparency in stakeholder involvement.

Mr. Roberts thanked Mr. Craig for his update and opened the floor for questions. Ms. Cimon (HAB) asked whether it was the intent to avoid new milestones by considering dispute resolution to determine the process for cleanup. Mr. Craig responded that the subcommittees reviewed current disputes that are ongoing at several sites. The EMAB concluded that using the dispute resolution processes already in place more effectively could possibly resolve some of the issues. He shared an example from SRS called a Core Team Process that has been effective in the past and has been successful in avoiding disputes. The EMAB drafted the report more generally, including examples for best practices, although did not focus on any specific regulatory issues regarding milestones.

EM Regulatory and Policy Affairs Update

Mr. Roberts introduced Mr. Mark Gilbertson, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM Regulatory & Policy Affairs (EM-4).

Mr. Gilbertson commented on the videos that were played during the break. The first video (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVydcSINxBw>) featured Secretary Granholm addressing a large audience during the Waste Management Symposia in March 2021 that set the tone for the new Administration and the importance of the EM Program to the Secretary. In the second video (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=noHfArxtzVk>), Secretary Granholm discussed the direction that the Administration is going in regard to climate action planning. Due in the May timeframe,

EM is working with the rest of the Department to develop a climate action plan that focuses on adaptation and resilience. This will help EM understand how they can build on past efforts at individual sites to advance goals such as rightsizing the transmission capabilities and converting the fleet to more electric vehicles. In July, EM is planning to build upon and rejuvenate a sustainability plan for the Department going into the future.

Mr. Gilbertson added to Mr. Shader's update that not only is the EM Program working on issues with COVID-19, but he also pointed out that there is a lot of work happening in the communities that are supported by DOE's national laboratories in tackling issues, such as fighting the pandemic.

Mr. Gilbertson elaborated on the Program's top five priorities and highlighted some of the significant milestones under each of these priorities:

1. Achieve Significant Construction Project Milestones
 - a. EM Successfully started up the Salt Waste Processing Facility
 - b. Began construction on the WIPP utility shaft
 - c. Completed Direct Feed Low Activity Waste construction turnover to commissioning
 - d. Completed demolition of the High Flux Beam Reactor at Brookhaven
2. Execute Key Projects that Enable the EM Cleanup Mission
 - a. Completed PFP Demolition at Hanford
 - b. Removed all remaining contaminated buildings at ETTP
 - c. Removed 11 million cumulative tons of debris from Moab
 - d. Began removing the remaining legacy buildings from the Energy Technology Engineering Center
 - e. Began demolition activities for the Pool Type Reactor at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
3. Reduce the EM Complex Footprint
 - a. Completed transfer of the Separations Process Research Unit to Naval Reactors. Mr. Gilbertson noted that EM is partnering with the Office of Naval Reactors to facilitate the D&D at their facilities in New York, Pennsylvania, and Idaho, by utilizing EM's expertise and contract resources to assist in executing cleanup using funding from the Naval Reactor program.
 - b. Completed transfer of the Tonopah Test Range to the Office of Legacy Management (OLM). Mr. Gilbertson elaborated that progress continues in the transfer of smaller cleanup areas to the OLM to steward sites for long-term monitoring and maintenance.
4. Award Contracts that Enable Accelerated Progress
 - a. EM awarded contracts to Hanford, Nevada Paducah, Savannah River National Laboratory
 - b. Partially completing new contracts at Idaho, Savannah River, and Portsmouth
5. Drive Innovation and Improved Performance
 - a. Completed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) analysis for the SRS Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) wastewater recycle waste stream
 - b. Issued an EM-wide Strategic Vision

- c. Issued program and project management policies that drive improved performance and risk management. Resulting from the pandemic, Mr. Gilbertson reiterated from Mr. Shrader's update regarding the action plan to drive improved performance and consistency across the sites.

During this time, Mr. Gilbertson commented on the importance of DOE's responsibility to maintain clear lines of communication and two-way information sharing. EM will consider the benefit of conducting virtual meetings in parallel with in-person meetings, as not all stakeholders have access to YouTube, webcasts, etc. The EM Program will use all tools available to drive success in strategic engagement.

Mr. Gilbertson expounded on some of the objectives included in the EM Strategic Vision: 2021-2031:

- Activities to maintain a safe, secure, and compliant posture for its workforce
- Radioactive tank waste stabilization, treatment, and disposal
- SNF and nuclear materials management and disposition
- Transuranic (TRU) and mixed low-level waste disposition
- Soil and groundwater remediation and its importance to communities
- Excess facilities D&D

Mr. Gilbertson expanded on the strategic initiatives included in the EM Strategic Vision:

- Safety and Security – utmost importance in all EM activities
- Program and Project Management/Acquisition – ensuring strategic processes in place and striving for improvement in all activities
- Regulatory – open and transparent interactions with regulators is hallmark to the Administration by promoting science in decision making
- Stakeholder Engagement – engaging with the tribes and communities; EM anticipating results of the EM SSAB meeting for lessons learned to incorporate into its activities
- Infrastructure – working with sites to understand current status and needs in order to be prepared to take action with the passing of an infrastructure bill
- Next-Generation Workforce – importance of developing a workforce that mirrors the diversity of America is a priority
- Innovative Approaches – leveraging the 17 national laboratories for innovations and insights; EM-1 instituted a National Laboratory Directors' Council in partnership with OLM to provide recommendations on a future technological development program
- Opportunities for Acceleration

Mr. Gilbertson reported that the Department, along with the country, is tracking per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), which has been used in waterproofing clothing. EM has sent out a survey to all its sites to assess current or past use of PFAS. EM will stay engaged with the community and federal and state partners for any potential regulatory actions, if any.

Mr. Gilbertson explained that his office is responsible for the Department's packaging and transportation, aside from the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) activities in this area. His office plays a large role in training first responders with over 1,400 people trained in 92 courses through the Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program in FY 2020. Following CDC controls, several of these courses were conducted virtually and plan on returning to in-person training when possible. Several shipments were supported by his office for the transport of waste to WIPP. In FY 2020, WIPP received 180 shipments and 300 shipments are expected this year.

In consultation with U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), EM is developing a Final Waste Incidental to Reprocessing Evaluation for Closure of Waste Management Area C at the Hanford Site, which explores the risk and best method for disposition of the waste. The EM Program is working with NNSA and the Nuclear Energy (NE) program to support Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) activities for the Surplus Plutonium Disposition Program and Versatile Test Reactor. EM is looking at implementation and improvements of a new rule regarding NEPA activities.

Mr. Gilbertson stated that EM is focused on the demonstration and disposition of waste at SRS and issued a Federal Register notice announcing intent to draft an environmental assessment on the commercial disposal of contaminated process equipment. The Program continues efforts to understand the possibility at the Hanford site, but no decisions have been made on exercising any of this authority.

Mr. Gilbertson touched on striving to maintain relationships and expand outreach during the pandemic with national intergovernmental groups, such as National Governors Association (NGA), National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL), State and Tribal Governments Working Group (STGWG), National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG), Environmental Council of States (ECOS), and Energy Communities Alliance (ECA). The ECA has hosted several webinars on HLW, and ECA and Energy Facility Contractors Group (EFCOG) have hosted webinars on future workforce challenges. He reiterated that EM looks forward to the SSAB's input on improvements with stakeholder involvement.

As mentioned earlier in the meeting, Secretary Granholm has participated in a DOE Tribal Listening Session with 40+ tribes to explore continued expansion and improvement with tribal relationships and ways to exchange information. He continued that EM also sponsors and supports a number of international activities across the world. Last week, a meeting was held in partnership with the United Kingdom and Canada to build and leverage shared experiences. Japan consulted with EM HQ before moving forward with the release of tritiated water in Fukushima. The Program also partners with the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with

Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) for ongoing and independent technical review and analysis from academia.

Mr. Gilbertson provided an overview on DOE reprocessing waste and SNF inventories. The DOE defense waste reprocessing locations are at the Hanford site, Idaho National Laboratory (INL), and SRS. These facilities are focused on reprocessing materials from SNF rods to isolate plutonium and uranium for the strategic stockpile. The West Valley Demonstration Project (WVDP) reprocessing waste was generated from commercial activities. The result of reprocessing created various radioactive waste streams that remain stored at the three defense facilities until a HLW repository is available.

Mr. Gilbertson continued by explaining the locations and scope of the various DOE and commercial waste disposal facilities. The NNSS is the only EM site that accepts off-site DOE waste. WIPP is prohibited to dispose HLW, and there is a request for a RCRA permit modification pending. DOE has HLW stored in four locations: SRS has about one percent of the inventory, INL and Fort St Vrain (managed by INL) has about 12 percent, and Hanford has 87 percent of the inventory by mass. The inventory at INL is required by its Consent Order to be converted from wet to dry storage by FY 2023, and EM is researching packaging and storage options. EM continues to explore the risks and locations for waste disposal. EM will join forces with the Administration and local communities for a path forward by making decisions in a science-based manner.

Mr. Gilbertson concluded that the protection of the surrounding communities and the environment are paramount to the Department. He restated the importance of working with communities and building relationships. He again thanked the SSABs and added that EM could not be successful without the Board's support and input. EM will continue to execute timely decisions and innovative solutions to reduce risk in the EM Program.

Mr. Roberts thanked Mr. Gilbertson for his presentation and opened the floor for questions from the Chairs. Mr. Hull (NNM CAB) asked for elaboration on the topic of long-term stewardship (LTS) and land transfers as it relates to tribal interactions. Mr. Gilbertson responded that EM is reviewing this at each of its sites. At Los Alamos, interactions with both the community and the Pueblos are complicated. EM continues to work with all parties to consider if land is available for potential transfer, the desires of the Pueblos and the community, and the needs of NNSA to conduct its critical national defense mission. At Hanford, EM is working with the tribes and the community to understand the historical and cultural implications regarding the Hanford REACH. The STGWG is very active in prioritizing LTS activities regarding cleanup included in the Seventh Generations Report and its follow-on report.

Ms. Cimon (HAB) requested an update for the final disposition of orphan wastes across the complex. Mr. Gilbertson answered that a working group of DOE organizations (NE, Office of Science [SC], NNSA, and EM) was convened to research the infrastructure required for the processing of nuclear wastes, both new and legacy. This working group is tackling these issues to ensure that the Department does not have any remaining orphan wastes that cannot be dispositioned in a safe manner.

EM Budget Update

Mr. Roberts introduced Mr. Steve Trischman, Director of Budget and Planning for EM. Mr. Trischman started by touching on EM's FY 2021 enacted budget for \$7.586B, which is divided into three primary accounts: Defense Environmental Cleanup (\$6.426B) Non-Defense (\$322M), and Uranium D&D (\$844M). Since FY 2016, the enacted budget has outpaced the request as an indication of Congressional support of EM's acceleration of the cleanup mission.

Mr. Trischman then walked through the three primary phases, including associated timelines, of the Federal budget process. EM is currently planning for its FY 2023 budget using guidance for higher level targets and internally reviewing the needs of each site. In September, EM will submit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for passback, finalization, and inclusion in the President's budget to be released in the February 2021 timeframe. Due to the transition, the President's release of the FY 2022 budget to Congress will occur in the May 2021 timeframe, although Congress's goal will remain to pass a budget bill in September 2021. The FY 2021 budget was passed in December 2020 and is mid-way through its execution. EM conducts mid-year reviews to determine if there are problem areas with any of the projects.

Mr. Trischman continued that each EM site develops an overall schedule for all its activities and projects and incorporates into a life cycle plan using a priority list based on funding needs. Prioritizations for a 5-year window for all sites are combined and reviewed by EM field managers and budget staff to develop an integrated priority list, which in turn is used to create an EM budget.

Mr. Trischman discussed the rules of engagement for stakeholders and EM sites. He noted the importance of keeping an open line of communication and keeping stakeholders apprised of EM priorities with an understanding of the analysis and resulting rationale for decisions made for a path forward. From a budget standpoint, there are opportunities for stakeholder input throughout the budget planning cycle, and this feedback is communicated and continuously used during the entire process. He reminded the SSABs that the actual site budget requests to DOE HQ become embargoed to anyone outside of EM federal employees indefinitely, therefore, all discussions are confined to prioritized activities and not to funding levels associated with these activities.

Mr. Roberts thanked Mr. Trischman for his presentation and opened the floor for questions. Mr. Hull (NNM CAB) asked what opportunities are currently available for providing input on the budget. Mr. Trischman noted that stakeholders can provide any feedback, especially for emergent issues for the FY 2021 budget currently under execution. For FY 2022, the budget is in the formulation stage and there are currently no significant opportunities for input. Although when released to Congress in the May 2021 timeframe, Congressional staff will consider stakeholder input. For the FY 2023 budget, some sites have had meetings with stakeholder groups, and there are opportunities for input until September 2021, particularly on projects or priorities that stakeholders want to influence.

Risk Communications Presentation by the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP)

Mr. Roberts turned it over to Dr. David Kosson to provide a brief background on CRESP. Dr. Kosson stated that CRESP was formed over 25 years ago in response to a National Academy of Sciences' study that recommended formation of an academic-based institution to work with EM and its stakeholders to support the advancement of the cleanup program nationwide. CRESP works with stakeholders and sites on a variety of concerns that range from very technical to social issues. CRESP leadership includes senior faculty members from a number of universities with expertise in ecology, risk communication, law, engineering, sub-surface science, disposal, and cleanup activities.

Dr. Kathryn Higley continued by elaborating on the elements of risk communication by providing two actual examples of communication efforts headed by CRESP for DOE EM. In the first example, she described a situation that CRESP was involved with at the Portsmouth site. This interaction resulted in two primary take-away messages for lessons learned. The first is that there are always going to be communication challenges. It is important to provide examples that are relevant to the community or determine whether there are other tools for risk comparison available to reach the audience more effectively. Also, consider whether the spokespeople are viewed as reliable and relatable by the community. The second is to determine what other factors may contribute to or complicate conversations, such as undercurrents within the community resulting from external issues.

In the second example, Dr. Higley touched on a situation that she was involved in post-event at the Hanford site. This incident provided the take-away message whether a better communication strategy instituted proactively by the site would have helped. There were a number of health and safety failures present, although the radiological impact was small. The result was a substantial delay in demolition activities. She noted that this is just an introduction with the message to be more thoughtful in the process of risk communications.

Dr. Higley reviewed a list of quick tips: Do's and Dont's that were a result of many years of practical experience:

- Bring empathy for the audience with you
- Be an honest broker – be truthful
- Try to understand the audience by preparing for their issues and listening to what they have to say
- Address their needs and concerns as much as possible
- Don't show off your knowledge and power
- Be prepared to occupy the hot seat
- Avoid canned presentations
- Be flexible and not judgmental
- Avoid jargon and overly technical presentations
- Come with a risk communication plan – one central theme and three to four subthemes connected to the central one

Dr. Michael Greenberg concluded that there are a number of supplemental slides included in the presentation for the SSABs to review and consider in developing a risk communication plan. He added that CRESP has an agreement with the Journal Risk Analysis for a special issue on the topic of risk communications that will be available in about a year. The issue will include associated academic articles and interviews of people trained in science and engineering who have had success in risk communication interactions with communities.

Mr. Bob Berry (Ports SSAB), Mr. Wiegman (HAB), and Ms. Cimon (HAB) elaborated on the two examples that Dr. Higley touched on in her presentation.

Mr. Roberts thanked Drs. Kosson, Higley, and Greenberg for the presentation, and opened the floor for questions. Mr. Don Barger (Paducah CAB) commented that much in the world is based on perceptions, and he inquired how to change people's perceptions. Dr. Greenberg responded that perception is heavily related to facts and probably even more related to trust. Trust is related to communication and the sharing of one's values, therefore, it is vital to be honest. Dr. Kosson added that it is important to listen to increase understanding to answer questions and address concerns of the community.

Mr. Hull (NNM CAB) commented on the importance of being proactive, rather than reactive, with messaging and getting in front of a potential issue, if possible. Even if the story is that there is no impact, it is still important to say so, so that it is not a surprise to the public if an issue should arise.

Ms. Cimon (HAB) remarked that she appreciates and embraces the fact that there is open communication in our country and across the world as we are all connected via phones, cameras,

social media, internet, etc. Although, it can also be a detriment in terms of communication, especially for risk, due to the potential for miscommunication and disinformation.

Mr. Roberts concluded the meeting with asking the Chairs and Vice-Chairs to review the slides and data sheets from the other SSABs for Charges #1 and #2 in order to spend more time discussing commonalities among the boards and/or items of interest during tomorrow's meeting. EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer (DFO) Ms. Kelly Snyder thanked the Chairs and Vice-Chairs for their openness and willingness to take on these charges. She thanked all the presenters and added that the CRESP team will be available during tomorrow's meeting for questions.

The meeting adjourned at 4:29 PM ET.

Day 2

Opening Remarks

Mr. Roberts welcomed attendees back for the second day of the meeting. All Chairs, Vice-Chairs, SSAB and EM HQ staff, and presenters introduced themselves, and wished Mr. Christensen (ICP CAB) a very happy birthday.

Charge #1 Presentations and Discussion

Mr. Roberts explained that virtual flipcharts for parking lot items, ideas, and path forward for both charges will be documented for future use by the committees. He continued that today's meeting will start with presentations from each of the SSABs on best practices and improvement opportunities for site outreach for Charge #1. After discussion, Mr. Roberts will ask for volunteers for a committee to develop a best practice white paper or similar product that the Department could use as a guide to augment existing outreach programs and set expectations for future outreach activities.

Paducah CAB

After reviewing the slides and data sheets developed by the other SSABs, Mr. Barger noted that each of the sites are in different stages of its life cycle, which makes them unique. In looking at the verbs, he noticed commonalities among the sites for the use of words, such as engage, educate, share, improve, reinstate, develop, provide, promote, and extend. These action words were used for how sites interact with its stakeholders and the public. He concluded that this recognizes the importance for EM to promote its successes across the complex.

SRS CAB

Mr. Jim Guille stated that the SRS CAB distilled a list of about 50 site outreach methods down to the top six: public and mission-related tours, meetings with Chambers of Commerce/Economic Development, public meetings, organizational presentations, information meetings, and news releases. From his experience, public tours have been the most powerful vehicle for generating interest in the community. The SRS recently produced a guided tour video that provides a sense of the scope and investment in the site.

Mr. Murray inquired what metric the SSABs use for success of an outreach method. Mr. Roberts noted the importance of this question and that it could be addressed in the final white paper.

NSSAB

Mr. Bonesteel opened that the NSSAB brainstormed several best practices including emphasizing the importance of the board's partnership and mutual cooperation with a diverse number of stakeholders from the community and intergovernmental agencies. Regarding technology, the NSSAB is an advocate of their YouTube channel in providing historical, informational, and educational videos to the public.

For improvement opportunities, Mr. Bonesteel continued that the NSSAB agreed on nine ideas. He said that he also reviewed the slides and data sheets for the other SSABs and concluded that all the ideas had value and should be considered. Mr. Anthony Graham added that public tours are a key component for sharing information with the community.

HAB

After reviewing the other SSABs materials, Mr. Wiegman reflected that there has been much progress regarding public involvement at EM sites in the last five decades. There is a vast amount of opportunity for the public to become involved and interact with government agencies, such as the Tri-Party Agreement. In fact, there are times that the public may be saturated with information. At Hanford, he shared that the public is concerned with getting back to some degree of "normalness" post-COVID-19, and he advised not making large changes right now.

At recent virtual HAB meetings, Mr. Wiegman noted that there is little interest by the public to provide comments, and when they do it is because of something that has gone wrong at the site. He continued that the SSABs need to consider communication and public involvement during normal operations separate from abnormal events. The credibility of the site is questioned if the response to an abnormal event is not executed strategically.

Mr. Roberts asked the SSABs to think about the outcome when the public is saturated with information and how to respond to normal versus abnormal events.

Ms. Cimon added that the list of public outreach activities at Hanford shows the tremendous amount of work remaining and the importance of preserving the institutional knowledge for future generations.

NNM CAB

Mr. Hull stated that the most effective avenues for providing information at EM-LA are site tours of the EM cleanup operations, digital newspapers, and quarterly contractor cleanup forums. For these forums, the EM contractor travels to multiple locations in northern New Mexico to provide information and receive feedback from the communities that includes NNM CAB members.

Mr. Hull noted that there are many ideas for improvements and highlighted reinstituting a newsletter and the effectiveness of combined committee meetings on alternate months of full board meetings. He concluded that using a hybrid model for conducting board meetings with in-person and virtual access could potentially improve participation in the future.

ICP CAB

Mr. Christensen commented on the challenges of sharing enthusiasm and interest with the public for the ICP CAB quarterly meetings. Best practices included videos/animations/diagrams; frequent contribution of feature articles in EM Update Newsletters; and press releases. He reiterated the importance of site tours and the idea of virtual tours. An improvement opportunity is to increase use of social media. Mr. Christensen communicated his interest in collaborating with other SSABs with similar activities to proactively leverage the experience and resources among the sites.

OR SSAB

Ms. Lohmann began with a best practice for use of social media as an effective recruitment tool and method to share progress on the EM mission, particularly for events celebrating recent successes. She continued that the public responds more readily to videos for project updates and education rather than written word. Another best practice is to host regular presentations by leaders to solicit input from the stakeholders, as it can be critical to gain community champions.

Ms. Lohmann commented on improvement opportunities that the OR SSAB continues to engage and initiate discussion with the public, although participation could potentially increase if meetings were held in local communities. She ended with two additional improvement

opportunities to provide a central location for ongoing coverage of major projects (both DOE and other) and develop a timeline of local projects that could be updated regularly.

Portsmouth SSAB

After listening to the other SSABs presentations, Mr. Berry stated that he did like the video aspect, and that the public would be interested if the videos were not too lengthy. He continued that he would like to explore the possibility for developing relationships with local schools and speaking to the student body on relevant EM topics. The students would then share information they learned with their families and in turn become more interested in site activities.

Ms. Snyder remarked that the Charge #1 presentations were very valuable to learn the different perspectives from the SSABs. One of the commonalities she noted is that the SSABs would like the public to be more engaged and look forward to the public at its meetings. Although, it is important to remember that low attendance does not mean that outreach failed or that the public is not interested. From the research gathered and presented, there are numerous outreach practices taking place at the sites. It is challenging to evaluate whether the communication and outreach are effective, as it is difficult to quantify.

Mr. Roberts pointed out some of the common themes for improving communication and outreach identified by the SSABs during the presentations:

- Need to be able to promote EM accomplishments effectively
- Use of common verbs
- Partnering/diversity/tours as “gateways”
- What happens at “saturation?”
- Communications during normal versus abnormal events
- How to spur the public’s interest?
- Cross-site activities
- Social media/videos
- Budget workshops

Mr. Roberts reiterated a number of items that the SSABs should remember going forward with the discussion for Charge #1. The cross-complex white paper for best practices should cover opportunities for improvement, and he suggested that the data sheets be included as an appendix in order to preserve the institutional knowledge for future use. The individual SSABs could consider providing a recommendation for improvements and enhancements for outreach at the local level. The EM SSAB could also discuss providing an EM-wide recommendation on improving communication and outreach across the complex. Additionally, the EM SSAB could research additional creative outreach products that could be considered by the EM Program. Mr. Roberts opened it up for discussion on a path forward for Charge #1.

Ms. Cimon (HAB) remarked that is imperative to reach out to the public to promote openness and dialogue. It is also important to hold these public outreach meetings in the various communities surrounding the sites. She noted that another crucial element to include in the white paper is transparency and how to quantify it. Ms. Cimon favored the idea of including core values, and the HAB has a succinct list that can be used as a model to develop programmatic core values. Vice-Chair Teri Ehresman (ICP CAB) echoed her comments and added that open houses are also an effective outreach method.

Mr. Roberts informed the SSABs that Mr. Gilbertson inquired whether there are cross-cutting issues, such as media or waste types, that a national outreach effort is needed to promote a unified message.

Mr. Hull (NNM CAB) shared that his site has begun hosting poster forums with relevant or cogent issues at the conclusion of public meetings. It is an opportunity for members of the public to engage with staff one-on-one and has been effective in promoting transparency and building trust. Mr. Wiegman (HAB) concurred that poster sessions have been successful at Hanford as it provides the opportunity for the public to discuss topics of interest with experts from the site, and a blended approach with meeting and poster session should be considered.

The following members volunteered to form a committee for Charge #1:

- Frank Bonesteel (NSSAB)
- Carlton Cave (Portsmouth SSAB)
- Victoria Caldwell (Paducah CAB)
- Fran Johnson (Paducah CAB)
- Teri Ehresman (ICP CAB)
- Shelley Cimon (HAB) – to contact the HAB’s Public Involvement Committee for additional volunteer(s)

Ms. Snyder informed the Chairs that members from their boards are welcome to participate on the committee for Charge #1 to ensure all sites are represented. Committee volunteers will receive an email to establish a meeting schedule and scope to deliver a draft white paper to be considered at the fall EM SSAB National Chairs Meeting in October 2021.

Public Comment

No written comments were received.

Charge #2 Presentations and Discussion

Mr. Roberts transitioned to Charge #2 and noted that the task has evolved as the end-states for some sites are in the next ten years and other sites have a much longer life cycle before cleanup activities will be complete. For ease in making comparisons, the SSABs were asked to use the current EM Strategic Vision: 2021-2031 to document expectations for how EM will interact with local stakeholders and communities to reach that vision. Mr. Roberts explained that each of the SSABs will begin by presenting their results.

NSSAB

Mr. Bonesteel walked through the NSSAB's top three suggestions for improving stakeholder interactions during the next ten years. Since the NSSAB values history and lessons learned, he elevated the idea to develop a site history and lessons learned compilation for posterity that accounts for developments throughout the mission life cycle, including the initial mission statement.

HAB

Mr. Wiegman requested that the HAB have earlier involvement in the development and communication of the EM Strategic Vision. The HAB would desire to get back into the "trust zone" for a real collaborative process as the strategic vision is assembled. He echoed that he liked the idea of lessons learned to reflect the level of risk reduction that has been achieved in past cleanup activities that could be applied to future activities. He commented that personally, he would like to see a more realistic expectation on the end-state for the Hanford site from the perspective of its large inventory of waste.

In the past, Ms. Cimon added, the HAB has received a site-specific 5-year plan. With the roll-out of the 10-year strategic vision, there has not been the opportunity for the HAB to engage with DOE and have conversations as a board on how to cross-reference the documents. She also expressed concerns on how to receive more information on the scope and timeline of the efforts for the various working groups, as this information could be used to inform the HAB regarding closure and the end-state for the Hanford site.

Mr. Roberts stressed the importance for the SSABs to understand the context and purpose for the EM Strategic Vision. Ms. Snyder encouraged the SSABs to participate in a webinar regarding the intent of the EM Strategic Vision: 2021-2031 on May 6, 2021. EM SSAB members with a question can submit them to her in advance for a response from EM-1 during the webinar.

NNM CAB

Mr. Hull focused on the NNM CAB's suggestion for holding EM life cycle cleanup vision public forums and inviting public participation. He restated that DOE and the state of New Mexico are in the midst of a lawsuit regarding milestones and targets. The state of New Mexico, DOE, and the constituency do not have the same vision for the site. In response, the NNM CAB stood up a Consent Order committee two years ago to understand and prioritize all stakeholder's desires for an end-state.

OR SSAB

Ms. Lohmann commented on the importance of increasing public input and educational opportunities regarding the specifics on projects. A key interest for the OR SSAB is expanding the workforce development, whether through contractors or DOE-directed activities. It is critical to ensure that the talent is available to complete the EM mission and to retain the trust of the community. Lastly, she touched on the importance of remediating the land and returning it to a condition suitable for beneficial use, when possible, whether it be for recreational, business development, or conservation. The citizens of the community have entrusted the OR SSAB to advocate for them the priority of future land use.

Portsmouth SSAB

Mr. Berry explained that the Portsmouth site is small in comparison with approximately 3,800 acres. The site has used life cycle baseline planning for the last few years and is scheduled to reach its final end-state in the next couple of decades. Cleanup activities include D&D of two of the three processing buildings in the next ten years, with activities starting at the third building. The excavation of groundwater plumes and unlined landfills will provide fill material for the on-site waste disposal facility. The Portsmouth site has already transferred one parcel of land with plans for another parcel this year, which will result in about ten percent of the Portsmouth site to be accessible to a local community reuse organization.

Paducah CAB

Mr. Barger commented that DOE is in the process of developing a video series on the groundwater success story at the Paducah site. Once the Paducah CAB can meet again in-person, members will share the successes with stakeholders using story boards. Going forward, much of the near-term cleanup activities is inside facilities, so the Paducah CAB is developing key metrics for stakeholders to identify success and progress of the safe removal of contaminants in process buildings being prepared for demolition. Historically, Paducah has a reputation for being financially savvy and a good steward of taxpayer dollars, although the site does not sacrifice in terms of safety or the environment. Local stakeholders are aware of these values, and the site has the community's continued support.

SRS CAB

Mr. Murray explained that the SRS CAB's input for Charge #2 was a response to the initial guidance and the time frame used is much broader than the revised guidance for the 10-year strategic vision. Although, the guiding principles are still applicable in terms of interacting with stakeholders through a variety of methods and tools in a collaborative and meaningful way to help surrounding communities take action to protect health and safety. He added that the SRS CAB will further discuss and process once a full membership is on board.

ICP CAB

Mr. Christensen began by stating that proactive, rather than reactive, communication would have had a meaningful impact when events at certain sites impact cleanup progress at other sites (i.e. WIPP). For milestone events, in-person participation by the EM administration would emphasize the importance of these achievements. Regarding a long-term repository, he stressed that ICP would prefer to be proactive in terms of planning for how and when SNF could be shipped in the future. Lastly, proactive involvement for the planning for the treatment of calcine waste is requested well in advance of the completion of the existing EM mission in Idaho.

Mr. Roberts thanked the Chairs for their presentations for Charge #2 and opened it up for discussion. He reminded that the Board is encouraged to establish a committee to develop a framework for combining the input from all the sites to enhance the usefulness of the EM Strategic Vision.

Ms. Cimon (HAB) shared that she would like to include the idea of transparency and to identify core or shared values among the sites and SSABs across the complex.

Mr. Wiegman (HAB) commented that EM's Strategic Vision is important to document progress, although it does not provide a sense of an end-state for the Hanford site for a number of reasons.

Mr. Gilbertson responded that Hanford is an outlier in the sense that its life cycle is decades into the future. EM chose to focus the EM Strategic Vision on a ten year period, because collectively it tells the best story for the entire EM Program in the most transparent manner. The EM Program also has sites, such as Moab, that may be completed in the next decade. The 10-year timeframe transcends the 3-year budget cycle and the 4-year window for an administration.

Mr. Wiegman (HAB) noted that Mr. Gilbertson's response was helpful and suggested that the EM Program retains the 10-year timeframe for consistency to alleviate confusion.

With the next printing, Mr. Hull (NNM CAB) suggested including a graphic, similar to the slide Mr. Trischman used for life cycle baseline with critical path. He also proposed including projects requiring a significant amount of funding in order to execute the next step in the cleanup process.

Ms. Snyder clarified that this is an opportunity for the SSABs to come together collectively to provide recommendations on improving the EM Strategic Vision for best practices, opportunities for improvement, recap progress during the past year, etc. The ultimate goal for the document is to be the best tool to effectively communicate to a variety of stakeholders, including Congress, intergovernmental organizations, SSABs, the public, etc.

From remarks provided by Mr. Christensen (ICP CAB) during his Charge #1 presentation, Ms. Cimon (HAB) reiterated that there needs to be a formal way of assessing the potential for overlapping missions across EM sites built into the strategic vision. She noted that it is a difficult process, but necessary in order to be successful and a good steward of public tax dollars. Mr. Wiegman (HAB) added that the lead sites concept was effective in the past for the strategic sharing of resources, approaches, employee expertise, and equipment across the complex.

Mr. Carlton Cave (Portsmouth SSAB) commented that EM successes across the complex should be included in the strategic vision. He also favored the idea of in-person participation of EM administration at milestone events as a means of keeping EM progress in front of the general public.

Ms. Cimon (HAB) asked that the SSABs think about sites not included in the strategic vision that have not yet been committed to and how to inform the public of these sites.

After listening to the discussion, Ms. Snyder stated that the SSABs could consider a recommendation to provide a document or series of documents to fulfill a particular stakeholder need for additional information that is separate from the EM Strategic Vision. Mr. Hull (NNM CAB) added that hyperlinks to websites or documents for this purpose could be added to the strategic vision.

Ms. Snyder asked the SSABs whether they were aware of the EM Strategic Vision prior to it being assigned as one of the charges. The Chairs provided feedback that it would be helpful to have additional lead time to review the document and stress its importance to the members in order to provide site-specific recommendations on improvements. Ms. Snyder responded that she intends to take an active role in informing EM HQ of the time constraints involved with holding a FACA meeting in an effort to get the strategic vision distributed earlier to the SSABs in the future.

Mr. Barger (Paducah CAB) stated that a commonality among the SSABs is workforce development and should be included in the framework.

The following members volunteered to form a committee for Charge #2:

- Shell Lohmann (OR SSAB)
- Shelley Cimon (HAB)
- Bob Hull (NNM CAB)

Mr. Roberts encouraged the Chairs to invite members from their boards to participate on the committee for Charge #2. Committee volunteers will receive an email to establish a meeting schedule and scope in order to deliver a product to be considered at the fall EM SSAB National Chairs Meeting in October 2021. Ms. Snyder thanked the SSABs for the feedback provided for both the charges and encouraged the Chairs to use the information to develop local recommendations.

DFO Snyder provided the upcoming calendar of events:

- EM Strategic Vision Webinar – May 6, 2021
- DOE Order 435.1 Radioactive Waste Management Overview for SSABs – May 27, 2021
- EM SSAB Fall National Chairs Meeting in Idaho Falls, ID – week of October 4, 2021
- EM SSAB Spring National Chairs Meeting in Paducah, KY – Spring 2022
- EM SSAB Fall National Chairs Meeting in Santa Fe, NM – week of September 5, 2022

DFO Snyder informed the SSABs that she continues to work to streamline the approval process of the membership packages. She reminded the SSABs of the importance to recruit diverse members that mirror the communities that surround the sites.

The Chairs and Vice-Chairs provided their final comments. Mr. Gilbertson thanked the Chairs and the Vice-Chairs for the very rich and important conversations.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 PM ET.