

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

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**United States Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave SW, Washington DC 20585
Room 5E-069
May 16, 2018**

PROCEEDINGS

Board members present:

Mr. Frazer Lockhart, Stoller Newport News Nuclear
Ms. Tracy Mustin, Consultant
Mr. Josiah Pinkham, Nez Perce Tribe
Ms. Lessie Price, Aiken City Council
Dr. Beverly Ramsey, Consultant*
Mr. Timothy Runyon, Consultant*
Mr. David Swindle Jr., Management Services/AECOM
Mr. Robert J. Thompson, Energy Communities Alliance
Ms. Shelly Wilson, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control,
Environmental Council of the States, National Governors Association Federal Facilities Task
Force

*Present via phone for part of the meeting (one section of meeting was missed by phone participants due to technical difficulties)

Board members not present:

Dr. Kimberlee Kearfott, University of Michigan
Dr. Carolyn Huntoon, Consultant
Ms. Jane Hedges, Consultant
Mr. James Rispoli, Project Time & Cost, LLC

EMAB Designated Federal Officer:

Ms. Jennifer McCloskey, DOE-EM

Others present for all or part of the meeting:

Ms. Anne White, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management
Mr. Paul Dabbar, Undersecretary for Science
Mr. Mark Gilbertson, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of
Regulatory & Policy Affairs
Ms. Shari Davenport, Acting Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Corporate
Services
Mr. Ken Picha, Senior Liaison Advisor for Field Operations
Mr. Norbert Doyle, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management
Mr. Rob Seifert, Director, Office of Regulatory Compliance
Ms. Elizabeth Connell, Office of Regulatory Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement
Ms. Elizabeth Davison, Office of Regulatory Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement
Ms. Kristin Taylor, Office of Regulatory Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement
Mr. Steve Trischman, Director, Office of Budget and Planning
Ms. Michelle Sneed, Director, Office of Secretarial Boards and Councils
Mr. Darren Bossie, Deputy Director, Office of Secretarial Boards and Councils
Mr. Jared Bierbach, e-Management
Ms. Alyssa Harris, e-Management
Mr. Mark Frei, Bechtel National
Mr. Eric Gleysteen, Edgewater Federal Solutions

ACRONYMS

D&D – Deactivation & Decommissioning
DOE – U.S. Department of Energy
ECA – Energy Communities Alliance
EFCOG – Energy Facility Contractors Group
EM – U.S. Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management
EMAB – Environmental Management Advisory Board
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FY – Fiscal Year
HLW – High Level Waste
IDIQ – Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity
NE – U.S. Department of Energy Office of Nuclear Energy
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
NNSA – National Nuclear Security Administration
SC – U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science
SPRU – Separations Process Research Unit
SRS – Savannah River Site
TRU Waste – Transuranic Waste
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WTP – Waste Treatment Plant

OPENING REMARKS

The Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB or Board) semi-annual public meeting was convened at 9:00 a.m. EDT on Wednesday, May 16, 2018, in Washington, DC by EMAB Designated Federal Officer Ms. Jennifer McCloskey. Ms. McCloskey noted the EMAB recently added a new member, Mr. James Rispoli, who could not make it to this meeting. She reviewed logistics and reminded the Board of their goal: to provide the Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management with advice and expertise in any area where she may need guidance.

Each member of the EMAB then introduced themselves. EMAB Chair David Swindle, Jr. welcomed Ms. White and reviewed the agenda. He reminded EMAB members to recuse themselves from any discussion topic that presented a conflict of interest. He also reminded attendees that any registered lobbyists must identify themselves when speaking during the public comment session.

Mr. Swindle encouraged those interested in learning more about the EMAB and its past work to visit <http://energy.gov/em/services/communication-engagement/environmental-management-advisory-board-emab>. The meeting was open to the public and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Ms. Anne White, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management welcomed the Board members and thanked them for bringing their collective experience to the meeting. She recognized the benefits that the EMAB brings to the EM program.

Ms. White shared her background in the nuclear industry. She said she views Headquarters' role as a facilitator to eliminate roadblocks. She said she hopes to drive decisions in the field to solve problems. She added EM's leadership is enthusiastic about their goals. She stated she hopes to create stability and a path forward for the program.

Mr. Paul Dabbar, Department of Energy (DOE) Undersecretary of Science, thanked the Board for their contributions to EM over the years. He began his remarks by highlighting DOE's major focus areas, which include national security and commercial energy policy. He noted the U.S. is leading the way regarding renewable energy and emissions reduction. He said it is important to diversify the country's energy sources to promote local economies and energy security.

Mr. Dabbar also highlighted Secretary Rick Perry's commitment to both contract and regulatory reform. He said multiple regulatory review teams exist to analyze laboratory operations. He said the Secretary is very highly focused on EM contracts and their challenges.

Mr. Dabbar discussed EM's latest successes in the complex, including the C Tank Farm and Waste Treatment Plant progress at Hanford. He noted the EMAB's work has successfully impacted the progress of these programs.

Mr. Dabbar also emphasized the importance of EM sites to their local economies and workforce enhancement. EM leadership is encouraging the sites to produce long-term master plans for their sites.

Mr. Dabbar affirmed there are many positive successes at each site, and said Ms. White has been diving into the specifics with great leadership. He ended his remarks by acknowledging his appreciation for EMAB.

Mr. Swindle thanked Mr. Dabbar for recognizing the past work of the Board and opened the floor for questions. Mr. Bob Thompson commented that continuity in leadership is very important to the success of the program. Mr. Dabbar agreed, noting many Board members have a rich history and institutional knowledge.

Ms. Tracy Mustin asked about opportunities to grow the federal workforce for the future of EM. Ms. White responded this issue is being taken very seriously, and a plan is under development. Mr. Dabbar noted voluntary retirement incentives have assisted in the promotion of young people in the field.

Ms. White and Mr. Swindle thanked Mr. Dabbar for addressing the Board.

EM BUDGET UPDATE

Ms. Shari Davenport addressed the Board and began discussing a shift in allocations which favors EM. She said the appropriations for the approved Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 budget omnibus have been a great success.

Ms. Davenport described the FY 2019 budget process and its status. Currently, the appropriations committees have been briefed on the details of EM's budget request, and the Senate will be marking it up next week. She added EM sees strong support from the House of Representatives.

Ms. Davenport spoke to some of the main focuses of the FY 2019 budget, which include support of Savannah River's tank waste system, the set-up of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) ventilation system, Oak Ridge's mercury treatment facility, and Hanford's Waste Treatment Plant (WTP).

Ms. Davenport reviewed the major FY 2019 budget priorities of each site, as well as the accomplishments from FY 2017 and FY 2018 outlined in her slides. She noted at Oak Ridge, the increased funding for excess facilities will assist in the strategic review of their Deactivation & Decommissioning (D&D) efforts.

Mr. Swindle asked if EM is prepared for future decreases in funding. Ms. Davenport responded EM is benefitting from a sustained level of consistent funding, and increased emphasis on addressing excess facilities. She added this will allow some carryover for some time. Mr. Gilbertson commented Ms. White's focus is on completions, and the extra funding is being used

to minimize future liabilities possibly increasing future costs. Ms. Mustin commented it is important to consider there may be an increase of facilities EM gains ownership of, along with costly crisis infrastructure at WIPP that may increase EM's budget needs. Mr. Gilbertson also acknowledged the pension issue at Savannah River is being analyzed.

Mr. Gilbertson noted EM's budget experts are working to address challenges related to non-defense and defense excess facilities accounts.

Mr. Swindle mentioned a previous EMAB discussion regarding excess facilities coming under EM ownership from other organizations, such as NNSA, and asked whether those organizations would provide additional funding. Ms. Davenport said she is unsure if money comes from other organizations, but the current funding level for excess facilities is more than the traditional level.

Ms. Shelly Wilson asked if a plan is in place for the growing pension issue. She asked if the pension will have a separate part of the budget, or if it will be combined with the entire Savannah River Site (SRS) budget. Office of Budget and Planning Director Mr. Steve Trischman responded they are trying to avoid separating it because it creates another control point of the budget.

Mr. Trischman commented there is a strong focus on having enough in the budget to maintain operations at the sites and continue hiring and training of staff.

Ms. Davenport said the FY 2020 budget is currently being built and will be sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in September. She highlighted the GAO's new high risk area for 2017: Environmental Liability. She explained it is difficult to provide accurate budget requirement estimations for decades into the future. She said analyzing EM's life cycle costs is important when communicating the program's environmental liability.

Ms. Wilson asked if Congress seems frustrated with the amount of money needed for cleanup and sees a need for a drastic change. Ms. Davenport said there can be frustration, and it is important for EM to communicate transparently and strategically.

Mr. Swindle thanked Ms. Davenport for updating the Board.

FIELD OPERATIONS UPDATE

Mr. Ken Picha from the Office of Field Operations began his update presentation with an overview of how his office is organized. He noted all field managers report to his office, with the exception of the Office of River Protection, which reports to the Assistant Secretary. Site liaisons report to the field managers from Headquarters. He noted this provides focus and representation for the field.

Mr. Picha recognized the progress EM has made by reducing the number of active cleanup sites from over 100 to 16. He added this unfortunately does not equate to 80 percent of the work being complete, because the remaining sites pose the most difficult challenges.

Mr. Picha said that he expects the Separations Process Research Unit (SPRU) cleanup to be almost completed by the end of 2018. Ms. Mustin asked for the anticipated completion date for Moab cleanup. Mr. Picha responded it depends on funding, however, it is currently set at mid-2030s.

Mr. Picha noted recent accomplishments, including WIPP's 12,000th shipment arrival and Oak Ridge's new project to address mercury at the Y-12 National Security Complex. He also mentioned SRS's completion of a 30 million gallon on-site salt disposal unit. He said hosting the EMAB meeting at Savannah River helped to move this project towards completion. He recognized Hanford's recent cleanup of vertical pipe units from burial grounds and ground remediation.

Mr. Picha listed some anticipated accomplishments in 2018, including the demolition of the C-400 building at Paducah, the vitrification facility at West Valley, and the 326 building at Portsmouth. He said the Office of Naval Reactors has asked EM to manage a portion of their D&D activities while providing EM with all the necessary funding. Mr. Gilbertson added a decision has not yet been made.

Mr. Picha said SRS is in the process of installing a tank-side cesium removable capability. He noted it would provide more capability to pretreat salt waste, which is the majority of the overall tank loads at SRS. Mr. Gilbertson emphasized this technology has been tested and proven successful. Mr. Picha said this is being evaluated for a similar application at Hanford.

Mr. Picha stated the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit at Idaho is set to resume soon. He also said Idaho is developing processes for calcine retrieval.

Mr. Picha said the Salt Waste Processing Facility at SRS has faced some commissioning challenges due to a valve that is no longer manufactured. He noted equipment can become obsolete when working on such long-term projects. He said this is a lesson learned, and EM is becoming more proactive in this regard.

Mr. Picha discussed a diagram of K Basin West at Hanford, which has completed readiness reviews and will proceed as soon as possible. He noted the contractor took advantage of existing infrastructure in this case, allowing operations to begin three months ahead of the milestone date.

Mr. Picha mentioned at WTP, the low activity waste facility is nearing physical construction completion. He added a procedure for ensuring any issues can and will be mitigated, has been completed three months ahead of schedule.

Mr. Picha noted Savannah River has begun processing the High Flux Isotope Reactor cores from Oak Ridge to provide a pathway for the High Flux Isotope Reactor to continue operations. He added EM supports the Office of Nuclear Energy by continuing to accept highly enriched uranium fuel at Savannah River.

Mr. Gilbertson mentioned that SRS is conducting research to provide a way to dispose of Germany's fuels containing U.S. origin uranium. Mr. Picha added a major challenge at SRS is the facilities are over 50 years old.

Mr. Picha said SRS has been developing a capability to downblend plutonium to qualify it for disposition at WIPP. Mr. Gilbertson noted there is a National Academy of Sciences study being conducted on this currently.

Mr. Picha said WIPP is trying to ramp up shipment intake from eight weekly shipments to ten by the end of FY 2018. He discussed the groundwater treatment system at Hanford 200 West and the chromium plume at Los Alamos. He mentioned the progress on D&D at the Plutonium Finishing Plant. He added there are only a few more months of demolition activities at SPRU.

Mr. Gilbertson discussed the challenge of proceeding with D&D activities in close proximity to other ongoing site operations. He said the waste at SPRU is characterized as remote-handled transuranic (TRU) waste.

Mr. Picha recognized the great amount of work done at the small sites with few resources. He discussed the Plutonium Uranium Extraction Facility tunnel incident and the aging facilities challenge.

Mr. Picha mentioned the Energy Facility Contractors Group (EFCOG) is currently developing a commissioning guide to assist with project planning.

Mr. Swindle thanked Mr. Picha for giving a status on all of these sites. Mr. Picha said the Office of Field Operations prioritizes safety, security, and quality assurance. He said monthly site reviews, where site managers present a status update of their sites to Headquarters management, have been able to provide better indicators of potential risks.

REGULATORY REFORM DISCUSSION

Mr. Mark Gilbertson opened his remarks by discussing the Executive Order driving the regulatory reform effort. He noted there has been follow-up from Secretary Rick Perry to obtain input from advisory boards on this matter. On December 7, 2017, Secretary Perry sent a memorandum to all Heads of Departmental Elements to direct their respective Federal Advisory Committee Act committees to identify regulatory reform initiatives. Secretary Perry was particularly interested in suggestions concerning how DOE regulations, guidance or policies can be improved, streamlined or eliminated. Mr. Gilbertson said EM is looking at how to improve efficiency in these areas.

Mr. Gilbertson highlighted some regulatory reform focus areas, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reform. He said this entails ensuring NEPA activities support the decision-making process in an efficient manner. He said EM is trying to streamline activities by giving more responsibility to the field.

Mr. Gilbertson said the current administration is looking into the reclassification of High-Level Waste (HLW) to focus on the constituents of the waste rather than the waste's origin. He noted this may affect how EM will address calcine waste at Idaho, as well as some tank waste at Hanford. He said a decision has not yet been made, but both Mr. Dabbar and Ms. White are interested in investigating.

Mr. Gilbertson said EM is looking to continue to strengthen its relationship with regulators and understand what reform activities are occurring at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). He recognized as the largest cleanup program in the world, EM seeks more support from EPA to efficiently eliminate risks. He said EM is also trying to improve relationships with states, tribes, and other stakeholders.

Mr. Norbert Doyle, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management, discussed the Buy Indian Act and opportunities for DOE to award contracts to tribal-owned companies. He explained DOE's subcontracting goals to include various socioeconomic categories which currently exist, and there is an opportunity to include Indian-owned businesses as a specified requirement.

Mr. Doyle also discussed the potential streamlining the acquisition process. He noted the contract evaluation process is very involved, extending the time needed to provide a contract in place from start to finish. He said the use of template Request for Proposals and the revision of the review process for documentation will save a significant amount of time. He said experts will be hired through the EM Consolidated Business Center to lead this process and train Source Evaluation Board teams to assist proposals through using best practices.

Mr. Doyle highlighted a focus on reforming Management & Operating contracts for major site facilities. He noted EFCOG has given a valuable industry perspective on this reform effort. He said DOE is also working with contracting leadership in the field to obtain their perspectives on potential reform elements.

Mr. Doyle said tribal industry outreach continues at the Reservation Economic Summit, the Waste Management Symposium, and other small business events.

Mr. Swindle mentioned the reform of acquisition processes at the Department of Defense. He said there are some lessons learned that are worth analyzing for DOE's purposes. Mr. Gilbertson asked the Board to think about a strategy for contracts from a macro perspective, taking lessons learned into account.

Ms. Wilson discussed the need for more flexibility of regulatory requirements. Her first recommendation was to dispose of waste based on the risk it poses, rather than its origin, opening up more treatment and disposal options. She emphasized the recharacterization of some HLW would allow it to be stored at WIPP, providing a significant cost savings. She recognized the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) has raised this issue and began the momentum of this discussion. She said she anticipates letters from both the Environmental Council of the States and the National Governors Association Federal Facilities Task Force stating their interest in working with DOE on this issue.

Ms. Wilson discussed the prohibition of tank waste at WIPP and the revisitation of TRU waste determination at West Valley.

Mr. Gilbertson said this is being discussed within EM. He said a permit modification has been developed for the removal of the prohibition of tank waste at WIPP. He also said remote-handled TRU waste volume is calculated differently than contact-handled TRU waste, which is being addressed.

Mr. Tim Runyon said while these aren't new ideas, timing is everything, and this seems to be a great time. He noted by adjusting the TRU waste volume of record, the available disposal capacity at WIPP increases by one third. He suggested building an external consortium of groups that will support these changes.

Mr. Swindle noted this issue also affects NNSA, the Office of Science (SC), and others. Ms. Wilson recognized the power of harnessing partners and momentum. She discussed performance-based cleanup standards and realistic future-use scenarios to align a common end goal for cleanup.

Ms. Wilson discussed the EPA Superfund Task Force recommendations regarding third-party financing and indemnification options. She noted there are many EPA recommendations that can be useful tools for DOE. She suggested there may be enough expertise in the labs to replace a third-party team of experts that review cleanup decisions. She discussed potentially partnering with EPA.

Ms. Wilson said since DOE uniquely affects tribal nations, it seems appropriate for tribal contracts to receive special consideration. She recognized there may be both advantages and cautions. Ms. Wilson suggested EM explore the SC model of contract reform for the structure of award fee boards and contract opportunities for tribes. She also suggested EM consider working with more fixed price or Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts allowing more flexibility.

Mr. Fraser Lockhart said the latest Los Alamos cleanup contract has IDIQ activities, and there are early indications it will be effective. Mr. Doyle said there are much more IDIQ activities compared to two years ago. He noted technically, most of the contracting work can be broken down into fixed-price contracts, but it will depend on if the site has enough people to oversee the process.

Mr. Josiah Pinkham appreciated the intention to give tribal-owned businesses special consideration. He recognized the challenge of stimulating the tribal economies.

Mr. Swindle recognized the time the Board has invested to refine these points. He thanked the participants for making the discussion efficient and informative.

DISCUSSION OF BOARD TOPICS

Mr. Swindle welcomed everyone back from lunch and recognized Mr. Roger Jarrell, EM Senior Advisor who had just joined the meeting. Mr. Swindle reviewed the morning's session for Ms. White who had rejoined the meeting for the afternoon session. He went over the presentations given to the board and some of his takeaways.

Ms. White said how happy she was to join the board for their meeting only six weeks into her tenure as Assistant Secretary. She spoke about how she looks forward to utilizing the Board effectively and maximizing its value to EM.

Ms. White emphasized the importance of safety in EM's cleanup mission. She relayed her own history as a contractor and how she directly benefited from a culture of safety at the sites where she worked.

Mr. Swindle said how important training is to this topic area and relayed some of the discussion with Mr. Gilbertson regarding the issue of effectively utilizing training.

Mr. Swindle then addressed the topic of regulatory reform and how Ms. White can utilize the Board to assist her in this area. He spoke about HLW redefinition and asked Ms. White how the Board can assist.

Ms. White said she had been working with ECA and other groups for the past few years on this topic and joined Mr. Gilbertson in saying the Board could help with communication and messaging to the larger stakeholder community in the future. Mr. Swindle asked Ms. White if EM had provided an integrated project team on the subject. Ms. White responded that they had. Mr. Swindle told Ms. White the Board would like to offer to weigh in, at her request, at the appropriate time.

Ms. Wilson addressed regulatory reform as it relates to EPA and its regulations applying to DOE-EM work. Specifically, she mentioned the Superfund Taskforce Recommendations the EPA Administrator has been spearheading. She said these recommendations seem to be very topical to DOE and would assist with the inconsistencies DOE and EPA currently face with one another.

Ms. Wilson spoke about the DOE-EPA-States Cleanup Dialogue that currently exists and how this could factor into future work.

Ms. Wilson said there is an EPA assistance program offering training for community visioning and engagement. She said this could be a good program for EM to work with in order to establish end goal alignment with the various communities around the complex. She said many EPA recommendations seem to be designed to help engage third parties, external parties, and communities with the cleanup and potentially contribute monies towards this end.

Ms. Wilson mentioned the additional funds EM is receiving to address excess facilities and she wondered if there is some way for EPA to help DOE in engaging others to put in cleanup dollars to help projects already in the end stage process.

Ms. Wilson wondered if there were any resources or staff at the National Laboratories that could help address the Federal Facility Agreement dispute resolution and/or help with third party optimization evaluation. Ms. Wilson again brought up the topic of partnering as it relates to DOE and mentioned again the DOE-EPA Dialogue hosted by the Environmental Council of the States. She talked about EPA Region 4 specifically and its strong history in partnering with the Department of Defense on base closures.

Ms. White said she agreed with the importance of partnering and these sorts of agreements between agencies and parties. She spoke about DOE's history in partnering with its own contractors. She said she would like some input from the Board on a pilot project like this.

Ms. Wilson then moved on to discuss contracting and mentioned the way in which SC had refocused their award fee contracting boards to be chaired by headquarters. Ms. Wilson said a similar structure could provide some consistency to EM's situation.

Ms. Wilson pivoted to the sub-topic of tribal contracting and mentioned the importance of spending more time targeting tribally owned companies for contracting opportunities with EM, especially due to the unique way EM cleanup affects their communities. She said she understood EM is already doing a great deal within the world of tribal affairs to target tribally owned businesses for contracting opportunities. But wondered if there was an application of the Buy Indian Act that could be applied to DOE-EM related contracts.

Mr. Lockhart noted there are already several mechanisms existing to bring more tribally owned companies in to DOE-EM work. He cited the government-to-government relationship, fixed price contracts and subcontracting opportunities as several examples of these.

Ms. Mustin noted it would be helpful for EMAB to gain an understanding of what other external groups are advising EM to do with regard contract reform. In particular, she mentioned the upcoming EFCOG meeting and the intergovernmental groups and added so EMAB can build on those efforts.

Ms. White said she agreed with this approach and said she has initiated a comprehensive review of EM's contracting situation from top to bottom. Ms. White said she wanted to have an understanding of the state of the contract before things start going south. She said that once this process fleshes out further she intends to request assistance from EMAB on this topic.

Ms. White then addressed some of the topics she wanted the board to address. She would like the Board to focus on how EM can promote innovation, specifically examples of how industry generates and facilitates innovations that apply to EM. She directed the Board begin to examine examples from industry where they've done workshops or competitions that have driven innovation, and noted efforts by the Secretary of Energy to kick-start innovation through competitions at DOE. She also welcomed recommendations on how best to work with the Board on getting ideas for innovation.

Mr. Swindle asked Ms. McCloskey to provide the Board with information on the Secretary's initiative on innovation. Ms. McCloskey said she would provide that information to the board.

Mr. Swindle spoke about how many good ideas and initiatives are out there and because of turnover in EM leadership there has been some difficulty in getting many of these implemented on the ground where they need to be working.

Mr. Swindle asked Ms. White if she would allow to Board to look at implementation of these innovative ideas and provide input on how EM can address workforce transformation through these plans. He said he'd also like to help EM find better ways to translate these ideas into action. Ms. White agreed this would be a great use of the Board's time.

Mr. Thompson spoke about how DOE's aversion to risk impacts innovation. EM may need to take more risks and prepare to fail in order to push good ideas forward. Mr. Lockhart, building on Mr. Thompson's point mentioned the Federal Acquisition Regulation contracts and how innovation is not built into the baseline for those. He mentioned this makes it harder to incorporate innovative approaches and ideas into contracts.

Mr. Thompson suggested EFCOG could provide input on the problems associated with these contracts. Ms. Mustin said that everyone needed to have "skin in the game".

Ms. Lessie Price said in her experience at SRS, it seems some of the same ideas get shopped around. She urged Ms. White to pursue finding new ideas on innovation and encouraged creative thinking about EM issues. Ms. White said she understood and thought the idea of using competitions would be productive.

Mr. Pinkham said how grateful he was for DOE's efforts to work with tribes. He noted the various DOE-EM officials who have visited his tribe and specifically mentioned the great working relationship he has with Mr. Doug Shoop, the Richland Operations manager.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Mark Frei of Bechtel National, in Reston, VA, spoke about his background as both an EM federal official and contractor, and congratulated Ms. White on her confirmation as EM Assistant Secretary. Mr. Frei urged Ms. White to be courageous, not so risk-averse and to work directly with her contractors. He spoke about the need for the Assistant Secretary to be a genuine partner to the field and he then thanked her for her time.

Mr. Eric Gleysteen made a comment on behalf of his employer, Edgewater Federal Solutions. As his company is an IT firm he wanted to raise the issue of cybersecurity with the Board. He spoke of the importance of the issues of cybersecurity and how EM needs to be proactive in its discussion of this very important topic. He encouraged the Board and EM officials to reach out to members of the public and those who are familiar with the topic mainly in the cybersecurity industry to seek out solutions and innovative approaches to these very important issues and problems.

Mr. Swindle thanked both members of the public for their time and comments.

BOARD BUSINESS

Mr. Thompson motioned to approve the Fall 2017 EMAB meeting minutes. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously by the board.

Mr. Swindle and Ms. McCloskey told the Board the next EMAB meeting would be on September 11, 2018, in Alexandria, VA at the Mark Center Hilton Hotel. The meeting will be co-located with the National Cleanup Workshop, which is sponsored by ECA and DOE.

Mr. Swindle recapped the day's sessions and suggested the Board begin work on the topics identified by Ms. White on the next EMAB monthly call. Ms. McCloskey agreed to provide the Board the Secretary's innovation goals for their review.

Mr. Swindle cited a document written by Elon Musk in which he shares some wisdom regarding innovation and new ways to approach dealing with these internal processes. Mr. Swindle said he would make sure to share this document with the Board.

Mr. Thompson brought up some of the examples of the SC advisory boards and asked Ms. McCloskey for clarification on what board members can and can't do regarding advocacy, specifically as it relates to selling ideas. Specifically how the Board can promote its mission on the Hill.

Mr. Lockhart said he saw things a little bit differently and EMAB provided an opportunity to serve as a conduit for ideas and to allow different subject matter experts and relevant individuals to provide input through the board.

Mr. Swindle reminded the members that the Federal Advisory Committee Act prohibits lobbying and formal advocacy.

Mr. Swindle reviewed logistics for the upcoming EMAB monthly calls and meeting in September. He also reminded the members to submit names of potential EMAB candidates for consideration.

Mr. Swindle thanked the Board members, DOE officials, and members of the public for their participation in the day's session, and adjourned the meeting at 3:05 PM.