

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

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**Hilton Alexandria Mark Center
5000 Seminary Road
Alexandria VA 22311
September 11, 2018**

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAB – Citizens Advisory Board
DFO – Designated Federal Officer
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer
DOE – U.S. Department of Energy
DNFSB – Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
D&D – Deactivation & Decommissioning
EM – (DOE) Office of Environmental Management
EMAB – Environmental Management Advisory Board
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board
EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act
FY – Fiscal Year
HAB – Hanford Advisory Board
Hanford – (DOE) Hanford Site
HQ – U.S. Department of Energy Headquarters, Washington, D.C.
ICP CAB – Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board
IWTU – Integrated Waste Treatment Unit, Idaho
LANL – Los Alamos National Laboratory
NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act
NNMCAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board
NNSA - National Nuclear Security Administration
NSSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board
ORSSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board
Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory Board
PORTS SSAB – Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board
Portsmouth – (DOE) Portsmouth Site
SRS – (DOE) Savannah River Site
SRS CAB – Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
TRU – Transuranic Waste
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Shelley Cimon, Vice-Chair; James Lynch, DDFO; Kristen Holmes, Federal Coordinator

Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board: Keith Branter, Chair; Trilby McAfee, Vice-Chair; Jordan Davies, Staff

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

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Gerard Martinez y Valencia, Chair; Stan Riveles, incoming Chair

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

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Bill Murphy, Chair; Michael Kemp, Vice-Chair; Eric Roberts, Staff

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

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

Environmental Management Advisory Board Members:

Frazer Lockhart, Tracy Mustin, Josiah Pinkham, Lessie Price, Beverly Ramsey, Timothy Runyon, David Swindle Jr., Robert J. Thompson, Shelly Wilson, Kimberlee Kearfott, Jane Hedges

DOE Participants:

Paul Dabbar, DOE Undersecretary for Science

Anne Marie White, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management

Mark Gilbertson, Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Environmental Management

Shari Davenport, Acting Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Corporate Services

Ken Picha, Acting Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Field Operations

Michelle Sneed, Director, DOE Office of Secretarial Boards and Councils

Darren Bossie, Deputy Director, DOE Office of Secretarial Boards and Councils

Joshua Jones, DOE Office of Management

Robert Boehlecke, DOE Nevada Program Manager

David Rhodes, EM Los Alamos, Office of Quality and Regulatory Compliance

James Malmo, EM Idaho, Assistant Manager for Waste Disposition

Jennifer McCloskey, EMAB Designated Federal Officer

David Borak, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer

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

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

MEETING MINUTES

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB or Board) met on September 11, 2018, at the Hilton Alexandria Mark Center in Alexandria, VA. Participants included EM SSAB officers and members, Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) members, DOE staff, EM SSAB Deputy Designated Federal Officers (DDFOs), Federal Coordinators and contractor support staff. This was the first time the two EM advisory boards met jointly. Members of both boards were participating the EM Cleanup Workshop, which followed this meeting. This meeting was open to the public and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Opening Remarks

Mr. David Borak, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer (DFO) called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. ET. He welcomed meeting attendees to the D.C. area, and invited those interested to visit the 9/11 Memorial at the Pentagon, given that this meeting was held on September, 11.

Mr. Borak and Ms. Jennifer McCloskey, EMAB DFO, noted that the morning sessions included program updates from EM leadership to both the EM SSAB and EMAB members. Following lunch, the EMAB and the EM SSAB would hold separate meetings. Ms. McCloskey added that both meetings will have a public comment period. She also introduced Ms. Michelle Sneed and Mr. Darren Bossie of the Office of Secretarial Boards and Councils.

The EMAB and EM SSAB members introduced themselves. Mr. Eric Roberts, the meeting facilitator, reviewed logistics for the day.

Remarks by DOE Undersecretary for Science, Mr. Paul Dabbar

Mr. David Swindle, EMAB Chair, introduced DOE Undersecretary for Science Mr. Paul Dabbar, who is also a former EMAB member.

Mr. Dabbar opened his remarks by thanking the EMAB and EM SSAB members for coming together in this forum. He emphasized America's great successes in the energy security and innovation realms. He mentioned the National Laboratories' contributions to national defense in recent years. He commended Oak Ridge National Laboratory for commissioning the world's fastest supercomputer and the world's strongest artificial intelligence machine. Mr. Dabbar championed the U.S. as a leader in physics.

Mr. Dabbar reviewed EM projects that have made significant progress, such as cleanup of the final reactor along the Columbia River corridor, the potential closure of the tank farm at Hanford, the demolition of the vitrification facility at West Valley, and the build of the ventilation system at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). In addition, he mentioned the successful continuation of operations at the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) in Idaho and salt waste disposal at the Savannah River Site (SRS). He stressed the importance of looking at EM's successes and lessons learned to help with future projects.

Mr. Dabbar stated that with a well-supported budget comes a great obligation to produce results. He said that it is not only EM's responsibility to the communities, but also to the taxpayers. He discussed encouraging contractors to be innovative with their solutions to risk reduction and cost containment.

Mr. Dabbar said that Portsmouth was recently able to transfer a significant amount of land back to the local community. In addition, he said that when possible, EM would like to return land to local Tribes, which is an important issue to him.

He discussed the reduced emissions at various sites and DOE's market-leading research in batteries, solar cells, and commercial nuclear power. He discussed the tremendous amount of research happening at the labs, and how these local communities have the opportunity to drive EM's mission forward with new technologies near EM's sites.

Mr. Dabbar told the advisory boards that DOE values their input. He encouraged them to keep focused on providing their maximum value as a board.

Mr. Gerard Martinez y Valencia, Chair of the Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board (NNMCAB), asked if the current administration could potentially do away with citizen input such as FACA boards. Mr. Dabbar responded that he does not know of any expectation to eliminate FACA boards and said that he is at this meeting to support and listen to these boards. Mr. Martinez y Valencia thanked Mr. Dabbar for being at the meeting, and said that it would be helpful for the EM SSAB and citizens to be even more involved in the many changes being considered in EM, such as DOE Order 140.1, Interface with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB). Mr. Dabbar said that more citizen input is something that DOE is interested in having.

Mr. Swindle asked Mr. Dabbar to comment on EM's efforts to cooperate and interact with other countries that can benefit from the advancement of EM's research. Mr. Dabbar responded yes, there are a number of bilateral discussions with countries such as Japan and France.

Ms. Susan Leckband, Chair of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB), asked Mr. Dabbar to elaborate on the balance between adequate cleanup and speedy cleanup. Mr. Dabbar responded that as someone who operated a facility, he understands that risk reduction comes first. He said that most of the time being on time and budget is part of the primary goal of risk reduction.

Mr. Doug Howard, Vice-Chair of the Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) asked how often the President is briefed on environmental cleanup. Mr. Dabbar said that at cabinet meetings, DOE issues are discussed and periodically this will include environmental cleanup, approximately once every couple weeks.

Mr. Swindle thanked Mr. Dabbar for his continued service and for meeting with the boards.

EM Budget Update

Ms. Shari Davenport, Acting Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Corporate Services, provided a snapshot of how the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 budget is distributed across the sites, noting that changes will be made based on congressional intent of funding. She said that the level of funding is similar to last year's high level of support. She also said that the budget process is moving very quickly this year.

Ms. Davenport expected the FY 2019 Appropriations Bill to be finalized by the following Friday. In FY 2018, EM received \$7.1 billion in funding, \$300 million of which was directed towards excess facilities, predominantly Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and Idaho National Laboratory. She added that there was also a continued focus on increasing operations at WIPP. Each site saw some level of increase in FY 2018, across the board.

Ms. Davenport said that Ms. Anne White, Assistant Secretary for EM, is focused on challenging the sites and contractors to make every dollar count. While EM is receiving a tremendous amount of support, we have a responsibility to be as efficient as possible with those dollars.

Ms. Davenport mentioned some large operational efforts on the horizon, such as salt waste processing at SRS and low-activity waste at Hanford. She said that Ms. White is looking at the big picture and making sure EM is managing funding requirements efficiently.

Ms. Davenport discussed the House and Senate budget marks on the FY 2019 request. She said that the Senate upheld a commitment to excess facilities. By and large, the FY 2019 bill looks very similar to FY 2018, which will allow the sites to continue the level of operation that is already underway.

Ms. Davenport gave some insight to how the FY 2019 budget is expected to execute. She said that Brookhaven National Laboratory saw Senate support and will be focusing on stack demolition in 2019, due to an increase of \$20 million. For WIPP, the House and Senate supported increasing transuranic waste (TRU) shipment rates and the ventilation system. The Energy Technology Engineering Center would see a small bump to continue efforts. Idaho will focus on IWTU, TRU waste, and maintaining spent nuclear fuel storage. Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) was well supported by the Senate and Moab will also see an increase.

If an increase in funding is not sustainable, it can lead to inefficient efforts, adding that there will be a dialogue at Moab for what can be executed realistically. She said that Nevada will have consistent funding, Oak Ridge has increased support from both the House and the Senate, Paducah will see level funding for C-400 and the Depleted Uranium Hexafluoride Conversion Facility (DUF-6) facility, and Portsmouth will see an increase for deactivation and decommissioning (D&D) activities. She also said that the Office of River Protection will focus on more tank operations, and Richland will steadily continue activities.

Ms. Davenport said that SRS received less funding than requested, which will cause a slowdown in the Salt Disposal Units 8 and 9 and the Liquid Waste Program; however, the proposed FY 2019 funding is still at an acceptable level.

Ms. Davenport emphasized EM's focus on efficient execution and opened the floor for questions.

Discussion

Mr. Gil Allensworth, Chair of the SRS CAB, commented that Savannah River's community is very frustrated with the cuts to the Liquid Waste Program and any potential slowdown at SRS. He asked what DOE is doing to help SRS get the proper funding. He added that it can be hard to hear the excitement for a high level of funding across the board, when SRS is not receiving what they need. He said that there are milestones that SRS needs to achieve to avoid state fines, which further increases the financial burden.

Ms. Davenport responded that the budget that is sent by EM clearly presents the support for SRS and their programs. Negotiations then happen within Congress between the House and the Senate. Mr. Mark Gilbertson, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory & Policy Affairs, said that while EM asked for over \$100 million for SRS, because they believe it is important, they were unsuccessful in getting the House and the Senate to support it. He said EM will need to consider how to better emphasize this importance and get support from the site to communicate this to the Hill.

Ms. Shelly Wilson, who represents the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control on EMAB, commented that she appreciates the high FY 2019 budget request for SRS, and noted that this is the first time in many years that there has been a hardy request for SRS from DOE. She echoed Mr. Allensworth's concerns about the level of funding the site will ultimately receive in FY 2019, mentioning the pension issues at SRS and the strong desire to close the tank farm. Mr. Gilbertson responded that EM is examining the pension issue.

Mr. Howard asked for clarification on the disagreements between the House and the Senate. Ms. Davenport said that she can only speak to what she can see, but they ended up meeting in the middle in the final enacted.

Mr. Allensworth asked if dollars were potentially allocated to a site other than SRS that Congress thinks needs funding more than they do. Mr. Robert Thompson of EMAB explained that it is political, and Savannah River's delegation is not strong enough compared to the other delegations.

Ms. Shelley Cimon, Vice-Chair of the HAB, commented that the budget did not separate infrastructure from actual cleanup costs. She added that this can paint a different picture from reality. Ms. Davenport said that while they want to show transparency, they are also concerned about control points that occur by having separate requests.

Ms. Belinda Price of the Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB), commented that it is regrettable that federal employees may not receive a raise this year, and asked if this affects the budget. Ms. Davenport responded that DOE does not make this decision, and that this has already been taken into account.

Ms. Leckband said that the HAB provides budget priorities to their local EM office, and asked how that information is communicated from the sites to EM Headquarters (HQ), and what happens after that. Ms. Davenport responded that the dialogue happening at site level with EM Field Managers is factored into the initial recommendations within the development of EM's budget request.

EM Field Operations Update

Acting Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Field Operations Mr. Ken Picha began by recognizing the success that EM has seen over the past 29 years, as well as the work ahead. He emphasized EM's focus on risk reduction at the sites in a way that is cost-effective to taxpayers. He listed major successes in the field related to tank waste, construction projects, D&D, and special nuclear materials including spent nuclear fuel. He said that safety requires vigilance; all field managers report to HQ on a periodic basis. He said that EM is focused on protection of the environment, the public, and the workforce.

Mr. Picha reviewed major accomplishments in the field which include the receipt of WIPP's twelve-thousandth shipment, beginning operations at the new on-site disposal facility at SRS, and breaking ground at the mercury treatment facility at Oak Ridge. Additionally, he discussed the cleanup of vertical pipe units at Hanford, and the use of robotics to remotely repair a leak in an evaporator at SRS.

Mr. Picha said that the vitrification facility at West Valley is set to complete cleanup in FY 2018. He showed a photo of the cleanup progress happening at the Separations Process Research Unit in the Atomic Power Laboratory in New York, noting that it is successful so far. He also noted that cleanup of the East Tennessee Technology Corridor and Y-12 at Oak Ridge are both on schedule.

Mr. Picha then discussed progress at SRS. The K Reactors' sludge removal progress is well underway. He said that High-Flux Test Reactor spent nuclear fuel has begun processing, along with cored from H-Canyon. He mentioned the challenge of keeping H-Canyon facilities up to modern safety standards 60 years after it was developed.

Regarding groundwater cleanup, Mr. Picha said that the Hanford 200 West groundwater treatment system has been very successful, and a strategy is being developed to handle the chromium plume at LANL.

Mr. Picha then discussed the challenges facing the complex, such as finding replacement parts for aging, one-of-a-kind facilities. He said that the U.S. frequently uses foreign vendors for components that meet the Nuclear Quality Assurance Standard, which has been a challenge due to the lack of U.S. vendors.

Discussion

Ms. Cimon asked how the latest tariffs might adversely impact the procurement of materials that the U.S. needs from international markets. Mr. Picha said that he would be unable to quantify the impact, but that there will be an impact due to the tariffs on steel and aluminum.

Ms. Leckband asked if DOE is partnering with U.S. vendors to reduce the dependency on foreign markets. Mr. Picha said that while he is not aware of a specific mechanism, but he knows that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is looking into the issue.

Mr. Swindle asked if EM periodically looks at accelerating funds for aging facilities to reduce the life-cycle costs. Mr. Picha responded that the Assistant Secretary wants to focus on opportunities to accelerate this program and determine investments in areas like this. He noted that Mr. Dabbar also has an interest in this topic.

Ms. Leckband asked if the sheer volume of waste in EM is a challenge worth discussing and suggested adding it to his presentation. Mr. Picha said that while he did not have the exact numbers at the moment, he ought to note the complexity and magnitude of the problem.

Dr. Stan Riveles, incoming Chair of the NNM CAB, asked if Mr. Picha could share some observations on the DNFSB in the field. Mr. Picha said that the DNFSB is not active at all of the defense sites, but they meet periodically with the site managers and subgroups. He said that he would categorize the relationship as a good one. Dr. Riveles asked if he anticipates any change from the new provisions of DOE Order 140.1. Mr. Picha said that in discussions thus far, there have not been differences in day-to-day interactions.

Dr. Bill Murphy, Chair of the Paducah CAB, commented that low natural gas prices will put electric utility nuclear reactors in a bind, and asked if DOE keeps track of the utilities cost and if it will cause any of their nuclear reactors to close early. Mr. Picha said that in terms of EM, he does not have an answer, but the Department does have many offices that are aware of and deal with this issue.

Mr. Martinez y Valencia asked what DOE's plan is for commercial industry disposal. Mr. Picha said that the Assistant Secretary comes from a commercial background and is ensuring that EM is leveraging the capabilities of commercial disposal sites. Mr. Gilbertson noted that DOE has a very good idea of the volume of both federal and commercial spent nuclear fuel. He also noted that commercial sites are highly regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

EM Regulatory and Policy Affairs Update

Mr. Gilbertson reviewed key priorities of the EM program, including a drive towards completion and regulatory reform opportunities. He encouraged attendees to engage with their sites regarding the regulation of low-level waste disposal. He discussed the WIPP operations and transportation program as high priorities. He also addressed the challenge that excess facilities present.

Mr. Gilbertson discussed the streamlining of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance program, and the push to reform metrics for NEPA documents. He also mentioned end-state contracting as a priority of the Assistant Secretary. He said that the reinterpretation of high-level radioactive waste is a work-in-progress, and EM looks forward to hearing input today and in the future; the Energy Communities Alliance did a great job laying out the potential opportunity that exists in this realm.

Mr. Gilbertson said that EM is engaging with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on reworking the Superfund process, noting that they are exploring the issues related to federal facilities. EM is also continuing its partnership with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and building on their experience at SRS and Hanford.

Mr. Swindle asked if there is a team being assembled in EM to head the reinterpretation of waste issue. Mr. Gilbertson responded yes.

Ms. Leckband asked if the Test Bed Initiative at Hanford has funding support for expansion. Mr. Gilbertson said that it will depend on the budget process. EM has briefed the Hill on its strategies. Congress has also asked EM to work through alternatives for disposition of Greater-than-Class-C waste materials in the commercial sector.

Mr. Gilbertson addressed WIPP's challenges, such as bringing the new ventilation system online, mining salt to improve access in different areas of the mine, and working through a permitting strategy for the potential radium tank waste to clarify the volume of record. Mr. Gilbertson said that WIPP has successfully dispositioned the above-ground materials that were being stored at Waste Control Specialists for monitoring. He said that they are evaluating alternatives to disposition the remaining containers from LANL. He explained that by diluting the drums, they are able to transport them, and they are determining the most cost-effective way to do so.

Ms. Cimon asked how many drums Mr. Gilbertson was referring to. He responded that there are less than 100 drums of concern. He said that EM is working closely with regulators to disposition these materials.

Mr. Gilbertson highlighted the successes of the waste transportation system, as well as infrastructure. He said that Congress has appropriated additional funds to Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and other facilities' D&D projects.

Discussion

Ms. Wilson asked if EM has considered making small exemptions to high-level radioactive waste rather than reworking the entire definition of waste. Mr. Gilbertson said that the present course is to look at the definition as a whole, but they are open to suggestions.

Mr. Swindle asked what the WIPP volume of record means for waste disposal capacity. Mr. Gilbertson said that the reality is that more capacity will be needed for future materials.

Mr. Swindle asked if the plutonium at SRS could be diluted as an option. Mr. Gilbertson responded that options have been considered and the current schedule may not be a final decision, but they are being respectful of milestones and deadlines.

Mr. Frazer Lockhart of EMAB asked if there have been any dialogues started between other programs looking to D&D using EM workforce. Mr. Gilbertson said that they are exploring with the Office of Science and NNSA what the most cost-effective options are for the taxpayer.

Mr. Timothy Runyon of EMAB asked if a cost benefit analysis had been conducted for the definition change and what facilities would be impacted by the change. Mr. Gilbertson said that getting to the exact numbers is very hard because there are many variables based on where the waste would finally end up, but he noted that there is significant savings potential. He said that where the waste would go is still being considered.

Mr. Martinez y Valencia commented that the disposal increases impact infrastructure. He encouraged Mr. Gilbertson to include citizen input on a larger scale.

Dr. Riveles asked what methodologies EM uses to determine risk and reward. Mr. Gilbertson said that they work in a regulatory framework, which provides ways to determine environmental risks. He said that the sites develop a framework to analyze risks and cost, which is then balanced at the HQ level. Dr. Riveles asked if potential liability is measured in numbers. Mr. Gilbertson said that the liability is calculated and reported annually.

Dr. Murphy commented that Bill Gates and others are planning to build a nuclear reactor that would use depleted uranium, and asked if DOE is working with them to turn a liability into an asset. Mr. Gilbertson said that Mr. Dabbar is interested in exploring options within the laboratories and working with outside entities. He cited examples of reuse of materials, such as SRS recycling disposition materials to benefit the community. He noted that EM is looking for these opportunities all the time.

Remarks by Assistant Secretary for EM, Ms. Anne Marie White

Ms. White thanked the EMAB and EM SSAB members for coming together in a joint session. She said that the Field Managers meeting was going well, with great facilitators and positive energy.

Ms. White expressed her commitment to regulatory reform, which has the potential to create tremendous opportunities for EM. She said that regulatory reform is a major initiative of the administration, and is very important to her. She discussed priorities in this realm, including contract reform and reduction of taxpayer liability.

Ms. White said that she was excited to have a conversation with both boards and opened the floor for questions.

Ms. Leckband stated her concerns about reclassification of waste potentially leading to stove piping decision-making. Ms. White responded that she understands her concern and that she will

ensure that through comprehensive, sound decision making, EM will evaluate the totality of the situation and will look for public input. She said that she looks forward to conversations about how to reduce risk and liability of this issue.

Ms. Belinda Price commented that the Oak Ridge community is concerned with the push towards low-cost contracting mechanisms and how it disadvantages small businesses. Ms. White said that she was a small business owner herself, and she sees unique opportunities for small businesses with end-state contracting. She said that she has met with some small businesses that are members of the Energy Facility Contractors Group regarding these issues and came up with actionable solutions.

Mr. Thompson addressed the high volume of liquid waste at Hanford and asked if there is anything that can be done to help get more funding from Congress next time. Ms. White responded that she is also frustrated, and is committed to educating about the objectives of the site.

Dr. Riveles said that there has been push-back on the changes to DOE Order 140.1 and the New Mexico senators have asked for it to be reconsidered due to lack of public comment and public notice. Ms. White responded that she has not looked very closely at this yet, but there are three hearings that are opportunities for the public to provide input. She said that safety is always a priority. Dr. Riveles commented that he is curious what the issue is with the DNFSB and hopes there will be an opportunity for education.

Mr. Allensworth said that the SRS community is concerned about becoming an interim disposition area without a permanent solution. Ms. White responded that EM is working hard on the tank waste disposition and producing site strategic plans. She added that this will take stakeholder engagement and support before they are able to disposition any of it. Mr. Allensworth said that the SRS CAB has passed a resolution stating that they support this effort.

Ms. Cimon commented that the HAB is concerned about a shift in emphasis from risk to closure, which can affect safety. Ms. White said that environmental risk drives taxpayer liability, which is a major focus. She said that this goes hand-in-hand with cost-effectiveness because both are based on how quickly cleanup occurs.

Mr. Michael Kemp, Vice-Chair of the Paducah CAB, commented that he is discomforted by the lack of cooperation between DOE and EPA. Ms. White said that the DOE-EPA-States Dialogue has been a successful way to discuss their respective opportunities and challenges twice per year.

Mr. Howard asked Ms. White what she thinks are the pros and cons of the contracting side and governmental side of cleanup. Ms. White responded that as a contractor, there is room for innovation and agility, while the government is able to make big policy decisions.

Ms. Beverly Ramsey of EMAB asked if there is a plan to display an EM organization chart on the EM website to help with communication. Ms. White responded yes.

Mr. Runyon asked if there is any focused stakeholder engagement planned to help the public understand the changes surrounding the reinterpretation of waste. Ms. White responded that there is not a specific plan until implementation is considered, but a plan would be developed in the future. She added that stakeholder outreach will play a large role in this plan.

At this time, the EMAB and EM SSAB continued their meetings in separate rooms.

DOE HQ News and Views

Mr. Borak thanked the Board again for coming to D.C. and recognized the members for a fantastic job on their last recommendation. He discussed logistics of the National Cleanup Workshop. He informed the Board about the House Nuclear Cleanup Caucus event happening on Wednesday, September 12. He said that the next EM SSAB Chairs meeting is set to take place in Savannah River in the spring of 2019.

Mr. Borak discussed the Code of Conduct that was sent out to the sites for new CAB members. He said that while the EM SSAB does not have Special Government Employees who are members, it is important to avoid conflicts of interest on the local boards. He reminded the members that anyone that needed to recuse themselves from a vote should contact their Deputy DFO (DDFO) to work out a recusal plan. He encouraged anyone with questions to contact him as well.

Mr. Borak thanked the court reporter and support staff for their help with this meeting. He reviewed logistics of the afternoon session, noting that there will be two recommendations discussed.

Discussion

Ms. Cimon commented that on the HAB, a round robin has helped get members more engaged. Dr. Dennis Wilson asked when in the meeting this takes place. Ms. Cimon responded that they utilize it when there is a topic that they would like everyone to weigh in on. Ms. Leckband added that they develop pointed questions to keep the round robin discussion on track.

Ms. Cimon asked if it is the DDFO's responsibility to ask a member with a conflict of interest to recuse themselves. Mr. Borak responded that if it is noticed by DOE, then yes, but it is not always clear cut if there is a conflict of interest or not. He said that generally the DDFO will be the one to make that call and bring it to General Counsel's attention.

Mr. Allensworth mentioned a time that the SRS CAB had a conflict of interest case in which a member did not know that he had a conflict and it was discovered through conversations on the CAB. He said that in this case, the member resigned and the CAB now raises awareness to this issue regularly at their meetings.

Dr. Riveles asked how the information from the local board meetings gets communicated to DOE. Mr. Borak said that DOE receives recommendations from the boards and they are deemed either accepted, rejected, or partially accepted. He said that the local board recommendations go

to the Field Manager, while the Chairs send theirs directly to the Assistant Secretary. He added that DOE takes these recommendations very seriously. Dr. Riveles asked if there is a regular reporting instrument for the Board. Mr. Borak responded that there is a weekly report to EM leadership. Dr. Wilson asked if there could be another metric, in addition to recommendations, regarding engagements with the public. Mr. Borak responded that this is a good idea to consider.

Ms. Trilby McAfee, Vice-Chair of the Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB), asked if a board does not have consensus, if it is best to include the opposing view in a letter with the recommendation. Mr. Borak responded that each board has their own way of doing things, and for now, DOE leaves it up to the boards on how they choose to do their voting in their by-laws.

Mr. Howard asked what the other boards are doing to recruit new members, and if each board has an active website. Mr. Borak responded that yes, each board has a website. The Chairs discussed methods of recruitment that have worked in the past, including newspaper ads and recommendations from previous members through word-of-mouth.

Chairs Round Robin

Ms. White returned to the room to listen to the Chairs Round Robin. The Chairs shared current issues facing their sites and significant local board accomplishments and activities.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)

Ms. Leckband reviewed the HAB's priorities, including concern about leaking tanks. She said that the HAB has recommended new waste storage. She stated that each year Hanford does not get enough funding to meet the Tri-Party Agreement milestones, even though the amount allocated is enormous. She noted that the highly radioactive plume underneath Hanford's 324 building is being remediated, but there is a concern for worker safety. Ms. Cimon discussed the recommendation that the HAB's Tank Waste Committee is crafting regarding waste incidental to reprocessing.

Ms. Leckband conveyed the HAB's concerns about public education and community involvement. She said that they understand that the HAB does not represent the entirety of the public, and are trying to get young people interested.

Ms. White said that getting young people involved is very important because there is a large age gap in the industry.

Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB)

Mr. Keith Branter, Chair, said that the ICP CAB's main concern is always keeping the Snake River aquifer clean. He said that on April 11, 2018, an exothermic reaction happened inside of a TRU waste drum and was contained and investigated.

Mr. Branter said that Idaho continues to meet milestones of waste shipments to WIPP. He noted two milestones are to have all spent nuclear fuel out of Idaho or road-ready by 2035, and to have all high-level radioactive waste road-ready by 2035. He suggested that it may be time to relook at the Idaho Settlement Agreement since a permanent repository does not exist at this time, and some of the waste, such as calcine, is stable enough to stay put for now. Ms. White said that she agrees that calcine is a very stable form and it is something she will look into.

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB)

Mr. Steve Rosenbaum, Chair, discussed the NSSAB's community analysis work plan that has been circulated to the other sites as a best practice template. He said that in the past five years, the NSSAB had 37 recommendations fully accepted and 15 partially accepted. He also said that the NSSAB is concerned about sustaining public engagement in rural communities.

Mr. Rosenbaum discussed the NSSAB's concerns with transportation and the weak infrastructure of the roads. He also addressed the issues facing the first responders to the site. He said that the hospital north of the site shut down, and was a part of critical infrastructure. He added that this administration seems amenable to infrastructure renewal, and he hopes for support of this issue. Ms. White said that she understands how dire the situation is now that the hospital is gone.

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB)

Mr. Martinez y Valencia said that this year, the site will transition to a new Management & Operating contractor. He discussed the monitoring well at the San Ildefonso Pueblo that monitors the chromium plume. He reported that TRU shipments have resumed from LANL, and he addressed the longer dry seasons this summer that create a threat of wildfires. He said that the truck route is being repaired after having issues similar to Nevada regarding the roads.

Mr. Martinez y Valencia said that there has been student involvement with the NNMCAB and that two members are high school students. He said that they take pride in their youth involvement and can assist other boards that are looking to do the same.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB)

Dr. Wilson discussed the ORSSAB's public outreach opportunities, including the positive feedback that they have received from their Facebook page. He said that they have distributed new member training materials online, which has been helpful. He discussed the ORSSAB's three recommendations this year regarding the budget, a new waste disposal site, and groundwater issues. Dr. Wilson said that the ORSSAB fully supports funding for excess facilities and recognizes that it is critical.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB)

Dr. Bill Murphy, Chair, said that their site will not see much D&D in the next decade. He said that because of this, the CAB knows that they will have a fairly flat budget.

Mr. Kemp said that the C-400 building is the large contaminant source of the site, and investigations of this building caused a delay in the work.

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

Mr. Bob Berry, Chair, said that there were eight acres of land transferred to the Southern Ohio Diversification Initiative, who will develop the land. He gave an overview of the path to becoming the next closure site. He said that the decisions have already been made, and now the work just has to be done by a workforce that is ready to do so.

Mr. Berry noted that the PORTS SSAB, economic development groups, and elected officials all support ramping up cleanup and becoming DOE's next success story. He said that they would like to fully develop the science and safety strategy at the site to continue to test, develop, and implement technology for the cleanup mission. Ms. White said that she would love to see Portsmouth be a closure site.

Mr. Berry led a moment of silence for those lost in 9/11.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB)

Mr. Allensworth said that the Salt Waste Processing Facility is still set to be operating before schedule. He reviewed forecasted infrastructure needs, including repaving of roads, IT network updates, HVAC replacements, and more. He said that infrastructure is estimated to cost \$3 billion over the next 11 years.

Mr. Allensworth noted Augusta, Georgia is one of the top cities in the country for tech, which drains some of the talent from Aiken, Georgia. He said that H-Canyon is the only processing facility of its kind in America, which 34 countries have sent their materials to. He emphasized that without H-Canyon, America would have less nuclear processing capabilities than some third-world countries, and would have an immediate impact on research reactors. He called for EM to be proactive in maintaining H-Canyon to ensure reactor capabilities.

Mr. Allensworth said that to increase workload at H-Canyon, SRS will need a significant budget increase, adding to their existing budget concerns. He said that SRS has proven that they can do the work ahead of schedule and under budget if given the opportunity.

Public Comment Period

At this time, Mr. Roberts invited any members of the public with a comment to speak. There were no comments from the public.

Recommendation Development

Mr. Borak introduced Ms. Kelly Snyder, DDFO of the NSSAB to talk about the Nevada site's community engagement plan. She said that there was a need to find out from the community if they felt that they were receiving enough information about the site, and if they felt engaged. The NSSAB formed a committee to determine the level interest and concern in the community for the

NSSAB and DOE to better meet their need. She noted that hundreds of hours were spent and the committee worked very hard.

Ms. Snyder said that this plan was successful, and it was deemed that the level of community concern was neutral. She said that a major discovery was that each community seemed to prefer a different mode of communication – some from news reports, some from the radio, some online. She said that this will help tailor outreach projects in Nevada and commended the NSSAB for a job well done.

Dr. Riveles asked if Ms. Snyder had any suggestions for widely dispersed populations. Ms. Snyder said that she would not suggest relying on one medium of communication, because each generation and each community seeks a different format. She also noted that community members like to see a face of the project to help them identify with a government agency's work. She said that in Nevada, they are hosting "community conversations" where experts can answer any questions about a specific topic.

Mr. Branter recognized that it is hard to get young people interested. Ms. Snyder suggested talking more about potential career paths to reach high school and college students. She also noted that sometimes having five people that are actively engaged and listening is better than more people that come to meetings and do not listen.

Ms. Leckband introduced a proposed Chairs' recommendation on community outreach, and gave some background stating that she drafted it based on the NSSAB's recommendation. She said that she tried to make it as flexible as possible, recognizing that each board has a different way of doing things.

The Chairs marked up the recommendation for final draft and made several semantic and structural revisions. The Chairs agreed to move forward with this version and present it to their local boards for consideration.

The Chairs then considered a recommendation drafted by the NNM CAB to suspend implementation of DOE Order 140.1, pending consultations with the DNFSB and comments from the public. Ms. Amy Boyette, Director of the SRS Office of External Affairs, was on the team that wrote the original manual for the DNFSB. She explained the nature of the relationship between EM and the DNFSB. The Chairs asked for clarification if this recommendation was within their scope. Mr. Borak explained that it was not within EM's power to suspend implementation of DOE Order 140.1. He recommended changing the wording to focus on EM's responsibilities. The Chairs changed the wording to ask EM for details into how changes to the Order would affect EM sites. Ultimately, the Chairs voted on the recommendation with four supporting and four against, so the recommendation did not pass. Mr. Borak referred the text of the recommendation back to the local boards for review and action at a local board level.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM ET.