



*Many Voices Working for the Community*

# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

---

## *Monthly Meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board*

### **APPROVED May 14, 2025, Full Board Monthly Meeting Minutes**

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) held monthly full board meeting virtually via Zoom and in person at 1 Science.gov Way on Wednesday, May 14, 2025, at 6 p.m. Copies of referenced meeting materials are attached to these minutes. A video of the meeting was made and is available on the board's YouTube, [www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB/videos](https://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB/videos).

#### **Members Present**

Kris Bartholomew  
Mary Butler  
Laure Clark  
Harold Conner, Jr.  
Lauren LaLuzerne  
Harriett McCurdy  
Otto Merz

Charles Moore  
Melanie Rogers  
Tonya Shannon  
Michael Sharpe  
Kelli Thompson  
Tom Tuck

#### **Members Absent**

Raiyan Bhuiyan<sup>1</sup>  
Paul Dill  
Rosario Gonzalez  
Amy Jones

Noah Keebler<sup>1</sup>  
Mike Mark<sup>1</sup>  
Thomas McCormick

<sup>1</sup>consecutive absence

#### **Liaisons, Deputy Designated Federal Officer, and Alternates Present**

Erik Olds, DOE Oak Ridge Office of Environmental Management (OREM) Acting Manager  
Melyssa Noe, ORSSAB Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), OREM  
Roger Petrie, ORSSAB Alternate DDFO, OREM  
Kristof Czartoryski, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC)  
Samantha Urquhart-Foster, EPA

#### **Others Present**

Leah Alexander, OREM  
Emily Day, UCOR  
Scott Hutchins, DOE

Shelley Kimel, ORSSAB Staff  
Heather Lutz, TDEC  
Eileen Marcillo, TDEC  
Sara McManamy-Johnson, ORSSAB Staff  
Kelly Snyder, DOE  
Karen Thompson, OREM

1 member of the public was present.

### **Liaison Comments**

**Mr. Olds** – Mr. Olds gave members an overview of OREM activities since the last board meeting. He discussed demolition progress on hot cells at Oak Ridge National Laboratory's (ORNL's) Building 3026 and on the Alpha-2 facility at Y-12.

**Mr. Roger Petrie** – None.

**Mr. Czartoryski** – None.

**Samantha Urquhart-Foster** – None.

### **Presentation**

Ms. McCurdy introduced OREM's Karen Thompson to present on FY 2027 Budget Development/Prioritization Input.

Ms. Thompson began her presentation by directing members' attention to a spreadsheet that compares previous ORSSAB recommendations with OREM activities. She said she developed the spreadsheet in response to a request from ORSSAB members following the budget presentation she gave in 2024.

Next, Ms. Thompson gave members an overview of the federal budget process. She said each Cabinet-level department submits a budget to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which then consolidates those budgets and prioritizes them. That prioritized budget is then sent for the President's approval before being submitted to Congress. She then further broke down the process after the proposed budget reached Congress through to when the President signs the bill into law and OREM receives its budget.

Ms. Thompson said before all that happens, each individual office develops a budget. She said OREM maintains a comprehensive work plan that reflects all the priorities and work scope for the site for a life cycle. That life cycle is consistent with the site's federal facility agreements (FFAs) and gives an overall look at the work needed on the site. She said differences encountered between previously planned work and actual work are accounted for in the budget development process. She then described how OREM uses that comprehensive work plan to map out future work and prioritize the budget. She said the work is organized into four categories: maintaining safe and compliant operations, meeting regulatory milestones, enabling needed infrastructure, and continuing cleanup activities. After the site receives a planning target from headquarters, the plan is refined to fit within that target dollar amount.

She then discussed OREM's priorities, which include closure of East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP), demolition of excess contaminated facilities at ORNL and Y-12, building infrastructure to

enable cleanup (Mercury Treatment Facility (MTF) Outfall 200 and the Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF)), disposition of uranium-233 (U-233) material, disposition of legacy transuranic contact-handled (CH) / remote-handled (RH) debris and sludges, and maintaining and operating facilities at ORNL and Y-12.

Ms. Thompson next briefly discussed an extract from the FY 2024 Enacted budget, with an overview of budgeted amounts for example Oak Ridge projects, followed by a discussion on OREM's FY 2024 accomplishments and FY 2025 planned accomplishments.

Ms. Thompson concluded her presentation by discussing the current status of the federal budget and added that this is an opportunity for the board to provide input on the FY 2027 budget.

Board members asked the following questions:

- Ms. Rogers asked how contractors are selected.
  - Ms. Thompson said a cleanup contract usually takes several years, and her understanding of the process is that it includes a request for proposals, open bidding, and an evaluation board that uses pre-selected criteria during the evaluation process.
- Ms. Rogers asked if ORNL and Y-12 have people that can help OREM.
  - Mr. Petrie said they do not; ORNL and Y-12 are totally separate contracts that have a different scope and requires a different skill mix.
- Ms. Rogers then asked if the contractor were to go over deadlines or budget whether that would affect the contract.
  - Mr. Petrie said yes. If they get done early, it's good for them; if they get done late, it's bad for them. He said there's a very large process in place to evaluate that.
- Ms. Rogers asked about issues contractors may face obtaining workers.
  - Mr. Petrie said those considerations are entirely with the contractor. Mr. Olds said that relates to means and methods, and DOE avoids getting into that with its contracts. He said DOE describes what the objectives are and what needs to be accomplished under the contract and then assigns fees and incentives to ensure the work is completed.
- Mr. Conner asked what area the advisory board should focus on for a recommendation.
  - Mr. Petrie said one thing would be to look at the board's budget recommendations for the last several years and then look at OREM's budget over the last several years.
- Mr. Bartholomew asked if there is a number or percentage over the prior year as a parameter that OREM would need to stay within for its budget request.
  - Ms. Thompson said there's not, but having a sound plan has helped.

- Mr. Bartholomew asked how much more work could be planned if more money was requested.
  - Mr. Petrie said up to a point, but work force resources at some point become a problem. Mr. Olds said the budget process is flexible and it's helpful to have a list of priority work ready in case additional funding becomes available.
- Ms. Clark asked if money received could be carried over to the next fiscal year if the money can't be used for some reason during the year for which it's received.
  - Ms. Thompson said money could be carried over into the same fund category.
- Mr. Conner asked if the budget can be increased to facilitate reindustrialization to encourage growth associated with the nuclear renaissance in the area.
  - Mr. Olds said that process is already occurring, but it's not always a matter of adding to the budget because there can only be so much work in a given period of time in a given space. Mr. Petrie said work is almost completed at ETPP and almost all the property there is already transferred. Most of the focus now is at ORNL and Y-12, and neither of those are closure sites. The opportunity at Y-12, for example, is their mission is rapidly changing and they need more real estate. OREM's work will enable larger and more mission at Y-12, which should have basically the same effect for the community as private companies moving into ETPP.
- Mr. Tuck asked who property is transferred to.
  - Mr. Olds said the broad answer is that it's transferred to the community because there are different entities in the community, including the City of Oak Ridge's industrial development board and a community reuse organization, among other entities. Mr. Petrie said it's very dependent on what the property will be used for.
- Mr. Tuck asked for additional information about the process to market the property when it's available for reuse.
  - Mr. Olds said organizations such as the Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee (CROET) work nationally with companies that scout sites for industrial purposes.
- Mr. Tuck asked if CROET was the only community organization to receive some of the property.
  - Mr. Petrie said there were other organizations that could request the property and he described the process for how property is offered for transfer.
- Mr. Tuck asked how someone could find out how much property is available and how to obtain it if interested.

- Mr. Tuck asked if CROET was the only community organization to receive some of the property.
  - Mr. Petrie said as a government agency, there is not a lot of freedom to go out and recruit people to transfer the property to. He said it's not a simple process.
- Mr. Czartoryski asked if OREM was able to use some of the funding flexibility present in the FY 2024 Continuing Resolution.
  - Ms. Thompson said no new work may be started in that situation, so work continued on previously planned ongoing activities.
- Mr. Merz asked how contracting companies get compensated for increased costs when there is a continuing resolution.
  - Ms. Thompson said it is reflected in the amount of work done. Mr. Petrie said previous ORSSAB budget recommendations have included requests to account for inflation in the budget.

### **Public Comment**

- Public Comment #1 – Mr. Luther Gibson asked if there is a mechanism for an organization to submit input regarding the budget to consider.
  - Ms. Thompson said not that she was aware of.

Mr. Gibson gave public comment regarding the scope of ORSSAB's work plan, DOE budget justifications, EM SSAB chairs meetings, and Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) party correspondence. A copy of the full comments provided by Mr. Gibson is attached to these minutes. (Attachment 1)

### **Board Business/Motions**

- Mr. Bartholomew directed members' attention to the April meeting minutes distributed previously and asked if there were any corrections. Ms. Kelli Thompson, Ms. Rogers, and Mr. Merz said they were present but not shown as present in the list.

Mr. Bartholomew asked for a motion to approve the minutes as corrected to include Ms. Kelli Thompson, Ms. Rogers, and Mr. Merz.

- **5.14.25.1** Motion made by Mr. Moore and seconded by Mr. Conner. Motion passed.

### **Responses to Recommendations & DDFO Report**

Ms. Noe said there were no recommendations. She said there have been questions regarding the recommendation process, and that will be discussed during the next EM & Stewardship Committee meeting. She also directed members to additional information about the process in the meeting packet, and she gave a brief overview of the process.

**Committee Reports**

Executive – Mr. Bartholomew said the executive committee discussed changes to the meeting minutes approval process; a quorum is not needed to approve the meeting minutes unless there are changes needed. At that time, there would need to be a formal vote with a quorum. Additionally, there was discussion about upcoming officer elections.

The next executive committee meeting is June 4.

EM & Stewardship – The committee did not meet. The next EM & Stewardship Committee meeting is May 28.

**Additions to the Agenda & Open Discussion**

Mr. Petrie asked members about interest in members obtaining LSSO badges so members would not have to go through the process of obtaining badges for each separate tour throughout the years; these badges instead would be valid for one year. He described the process to obtain the badges. He said these badges would allow for some scheduling flexibility for tours.

**Action Items**

None

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the May 14, 2025, meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board.



Amy Jones, Chair



Harriett McCurdy, Secretary

June 11, 2025

Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

AJ/sbm

Public Comment to Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

Luther Gibson

May 14, 2025

I am Luther Gibson, former member and chair of the ORSSAB, retired DOE prime contractor employee, and Vice-President of the Coalition of Oak Ridge Retired Employees.

I continue to encourage ORSSAB to evaluate the scope of its work plan against the opportunities that exist not only to be briefed but to actually study and provide input on the issues. Other citizen stakeholders and local environmental review boards and organizations are having to spend more time on matters under purview of other agencies such as Tennessee Valley Authority and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as well as local governments. These matters include environmental impacts of new activities on real estate after it has been transferred from DOE.

Regarding the Federal and Department of Energy budget, as of preparation of this statement, detailed agency justifications to Congress are not available to understand current priorities and whether proposed funding is a reduction of actual work or an efficiency gain. The cost and schedule history and budget performance of uncompleted projects is also heavily documented in these justification volumes.

As you know, the Site Specific Advisory Board chairs meeting was recently held virtually. Based on the situation surrounding that decision, you might reconsider not specifically including funding of the SSABs as a priority in the budget recommendation. Regarding the presentations at the chairs meeting, I don't know any more than I read on the presentation slides. The Waste Information Management System maintained by Florida International University needs work. The remaining volume of CERCLA waste to be disposed of on the ORR decreased from 1.4 million cubic meters in 2023 to 320,000 cubic meters in 2024. That the program has not been updated to include EMDF as a disposal facility may be an issue, but all of it going to EMWMF was previously assumed without regard to capacity. Regarding the PFAS presentation, I'd like to know more about the extent of any problem in Oak Ridge and what it will take to address it.

I am also somewhat confused after reading the FFA party correspondence regarding transfer of Self Sufficiency Parcel 2 (SSP-2) as a clean parcel under CERCLA with two tracts separated by White Wing Scrap Yard. My reading of other Environmental Baseline Survey reports associated with clean parcel transfers is that the decision was based on adjacent areas requiring No Further Investigation (NFI). A time critical removal action is much different than a No Further Investigation.

Thank you for your time and attention as always.