



*Many Voices Working for the Community*

# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

---

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

### **Approved June 11, 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, June 11, 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  
Rosario Gonzalez  
Amy Jones  
Noah Keebler

Lauren LaLuzerne  
Harriett McCurdy  
Otto Merz  
Charles Moore  
Michael Sharpe  
Kelli Thompson

#### **Members Absent**

Raiyan Bhuiyan<sup>1</sup>  
Harold Conner, Jr.  
Paul Dill  
Mike Mark<sup>1</sup>

Thomas McCormick  
Melanie Rogers  
Tonya Shannon  
Tom Tuck

<sup>1</sup>consecutive absence

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

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

#### **Others Present**

Morgan Carden, OREM  
Emily Day, UCOR  
Abby Hill, OREM  
Shelley Kimel, ORSSAB Staff

Heather Lutz, TDEC  
Eileen Marcillo, TDEC  
Sara McManamy-Johnson, ORSSAB Staff  
Alexandra Shenk, OREM  
Sarah Springer, UCOR  
Michael Vestal, OREM

1 member of the public was present.

### **Liaison Comments**

**Mr. Petrie** – Mr. Petrie gave members an overview of OREM activities since the last board meeting. He began by informing members that OREM Acting Manager Erik Olds was appointed as permanent manager. Next, he discussed demolition progress at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), property transfers at East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP), and an upcoming visit by the EPA regional administrator.

**Mr. Czartoryski** – Mr. Czartoryski said the cleanup in Oak Ridge is receiving a lot of recognition. He said he recently attended a meeting of the Federal Facilities Task Group and Oak Ridge was prominent in the remarks from people from DOE headquarters.

**Ms. Urquhart-Foster** – Ms. Urquhart-Foster said EPA will be signing the final record of decision (ROD) for ETTP Zone 1 groundwater next week.

### **Presentation**

Mr. Bartholomew introduced OREM's Morgan Carden and Michael Vestal to present the meeting's topic, Risk Reduction Activities at ORNL and Y-12 National Security Complex (Y-12).

Ms. Carden began by giving members an overview of cleanup at Y-12, including background, process steps, and key projects – including those completed, those currently underway, and those planned for future activities. Completed projects discussed included the Biology Complex and the Criticality Experimental Laboratory (Building 9213), and current projects discussed included Alpha-2 and Beta-1. Future projects discussed included Alpha-4, Alpha-5, Beta-4, and Building 9401-1.

Ms. Carden gave the following overviews on specific projects:

Biology Complex – This complex originally had 11 facilities in the complex and was built to perform uranium recovery. The mission changed in 1947 to support the study of the effects of radiation on mice and other animals. She said demolition activities started in 2016, and demolition began in February 2021 and was completed in February 2022.

Criticality Experimental Laboratory (Building 9213) – This facility was built in 1949 to perform experiments and collect data from low-energy, potentially chain-reaction assemblies. She said demolition activities started in July 2020, which was around the same time crews were moved from ETTP. Demolition started in May 2022 and was completed in December 2022.

Alpha-2 – She said this is the largest demolition project to-date at Y-12, and it is currently underway. It was originally built for uranium enrichment, but the mission changed over the years to a variety of different functions. The facility, which was built during the Manhattan-Project era

in the 1940s, required various activities be completed before demolition, including asbestos abatement, radiological screenings, and waste removal. She said there was mercury-contaminated piping in the basement that had to be addressed, and the basement also had to be filled with a low-slump material like concrete before demolition for structural stability to allow for heavy equipment to roll over it during demolition. Additionally, OREM coordinated with the NNSA and CNS to reroute above-ground utilities to minimize effects on NNSA activities on the site. Alpha-2 demolition activities began in September 2024 with the demolition of a carpenter shop on the west side of the facility. Demolition of the large part of the facility began in November 2024 and is about 27 percent complete.

Beta-1 – This facility, which was also built for uranium enrichment during the Manhattan-Project era, is the next large building slated for demolition. Like Alpha-2, the mission at this facility changed over the years. In the 1950s, Y-12 transferred it to the Office of Science for research and development activities. In the 1980s, ORNL built a large coil test facility to test superconducting magnets. She said the facility has now undergone all deactivation in preparation for demolition activities, and crews are currently working on preparing the basement for demolition. She said one challenge to this building has been water infiltration; in less than two years, crews have pumped more than 12 million gallons of water from the basement.

Alpha-4 & 9401-1 – Deactivation activities are underway.

Beta-4 – Early stages of mobilization and planning activities are underway.

Alpha-5 – She said this facility will require a lot of planning and preparation to perform deactivation work due to extensive challenges associated with the building, so it will be done after Beta-4. The goal, she said, is to implement lessons learned from deactivation and demolition activities in Alpha-2 and Beta-1 in the larger, higher-risk facilities.

Mr. Vestal began his portion of the presentation by giving members an overview of cleanup at ORNL, including process steps and key projects completed, currently underway, and planned for future activities, as well as challenges associated with planning and conducting cleanup activities at ORNL.

Mr. Vestal said process steps include documentation approvals that must be coordinated with regulators, building deactivation, which involves disconnecting all utilities in the building, removing combustible material, removing waste, characterizing waste and disposing of that waste.

Next, Mr. Vestal described some challenges with the cleanup, including conducting cleanup at an active DOE site, weather conditions and personal protective equipment (PPE) requirements may limit daily working hours, ensuring worker safety in radiological areas, higher technical difficulty and planning, and outdated drawings and lack of information create unknowns.

Mr. Vestal then described some of the successes achieved. He discussed completed demolitions, including the Tritium Target Facility, demolished in 2021, the Building 3026 West Cell Bank, demolished in 2021, the Bulk Shielding Reactor, demolished in 2022, and the Low Intensity Test Reactor, demolished in 2023. Next, he discussed major prep underway for demolitions, including the Graphite Reactor Support Facilities, Isotope Row facilities, the Oak Ridge Research Reactor, and hot cells.

Board members asked the following questions:

- Mr. Bartholomew asked if water infiltration, as described as occurring at Y-12, is as big of a

problem at ORNL.

- Mr. Vestal said the Oak Ridge Research Reactor has a sump pump in the basement to pump out groundwater, and that pump will be removed before the basement is filled with the concrete material. He said the Homogeneous Reactor Experiment also has water in the basement.
- Ms. McCurdy asked if there are recyclable materials included in facilities slated to be demolished at ORNL.
  - Mr. Vestal said the materials would have to be characterized to see whether they are truly recyclable. He said they would have to meet certain requirements to be released for recycling, and he added that there has been some recycling done from a facility that had no radiological issues.
- Ms. Urquhart-Foster said Ms. Carden mentioned a building being condemned during her presentation, and she asked if Ms. Carden truly meant condemned or if she meant demolished.
  - Ms. Carden said she truly meant condemned. She said after all the deactivation and preparation for demolition activities are completed, engineers go through the facility and officially condemn it, after which time no workers are allowed in the building and fall zones are created in preparation for demolition. At that point, the building is ready for demolition. She said the condemnation is only for a very short time frame; as an example, she said Alpha-2's demolition started less than a week after it was officially condemned.

### **Public Comment**

- Public Comment #1 – Mr. Luther Gibson said this presentation would go well with the previous one on assuring waste disposal capacity, and he asked for more information on the volume capacity.
  - Ms. Carden said of the Alpha-2 facility currently being demolished, almost all is going to the Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF). Mr. Vestal said of Building 3003, which was about to be demolished at ORNL, the waste volume anticipated is less than 500 cubic yards, and it will be disposed of at the EMWMF.
  - Mr. Gibson then asked if that was in the waste handling plans or if it was documented after in the phased construction completion report (PCCR) or in both.
    - Mr. Vestal described the documentation process involved and said it is in the waste handling plan. Mr. Petrie said the final volumes of what went in each landfill is covered in the PCCRs.

Mr. Gibson gave public comments regarding DOE budget justifications, SSAB material distribution timelines and stakeholder communications, 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**

- Ms. Jones directed members' attention to the May meeting minutes distributed previously and asked if there were any corrections. Hearing no corrections, Ms. Jones said the minutes stand approved as written.

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

Ms. Noe said there were no recommendations. She said DOE is waiting for the board to present its budget recommendation, which is currently in process. She then said there was an EM SSAB staff meeting and one of the items discussed was that headquarters is looking at Fall Chairs' meetings being held virtually and Spring Chairs' meetings being held in person. She said the meeting planned for Hanford, Washington, will be moved to the spring, and it's unclear who will host the virtual meeting in the fall. She said there will not be much travel for the next few months.

- Ms. McCurdy asked how many ORSSAB members might be able to attend the Spring Chairs' meeting. Ms. Noe said one or two ORSSAB members normally attend, and there has been no direction regarding how many at this point.

### **Committee Reports**

Executive – Mr. Bartholomew said the executive committee discussed officer elections and the budget recommendation.

EM & Stewardship – Mr. Moore said the budget recommendation is coming along nicely. He said the members have narrowed down the content and now it just needs to be refined for presentation.

### **Additions to the Agenda & Open Discussion**

Ms. Jones told members the next meeting will be the Annual Planning Meeting on August 13 at 6 p.m. She encouraged members to make sure to attend because there will be a lot of information. She also reminded members that board elections are upcoming, and she encouraged members to contact staff if they are interested in running for a position.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Petrie for an update on the Mercury Treatment Facility (MTF). Mr. Petrie said DOE is working with UCOR to re-baseline the project.

### **Action Items**

None

The meeting adjourned at 7 p.m.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the June 11, 2025, meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board.



Amy Jones, Chair



Harriett McCurdy, Secretary

August 13, 2025

Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

AJ/sbm

Public Comment to Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board  
Luther Gibson  
June 11, 2025

I am Luther Gibson, former member and chair of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board, Vice President of the Coalition of Oak Ridge Retired Employees, and 48 years applicable experience to the subject matter discussed here.

These comments are being finalized too late for submission in advance because I was awaiting additional budget justification details to be released by the Department of Energy (DOE). As of this morning, what is available is a skinny budget outline, a one-page summary by top-level appropriation account, and a DOE 2026 congressional justification budget in brief to work off of. The detailed budget justifications that consist of six volumes and a total of 27 separate sections only have 4 four sections available. These are National Nuclear Security Administration Federal Salaries and Expenses, Naval Reactors, Energy Information Administration, and Indian Energy Policy and Programs. Oak Ridge's FY 2026 request would be down 9% from the FY 2025 enacted. The additional information that will be released will not have the opportunity to be discussed it would have had if available earlier.

DOE Order 515.1, Advisory Committee Management Program, approved 01-16-2025, page A-32, MEETING RESPONSIBILITIES FOR DFOs AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS, DFOs: 6 a 2 b, "Distribute agendas and meeting materials to members in advance of meetings, when possible." Reviews in Washington of Oak Ridge information, much already in the public domain, are unnecessary and result in inability to review presentations and meeting materials in advance and to engage as effectively were that not the case. Furthermore, posting of materials associated with a meeting is being delayed by additional review until just before the next meeting. Also, communications to local stakeholders from the local SSAB have become uncertain due to lack of understanding that a more hands-off approach worked just fine in the past.

Correspondence among the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) parties that is available indicates projects being initiated and discussion of issues being raised that the Board should be more engaged in. Hopefully TDEC and EPA will consider that in submitting their input to the annual planning meeting. I'm not going anywhere, and I certainly will with the information I am able to glean.

Thank you as always for your time and attention.