

Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board Monthly Meeting



Wednesday, June 11, 2014
6 p.m., DOE Information Center
1 Science.gov Way
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

The mission of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) is to provide informed advice and recommendations concerning site specific issues related to the Department of Energy's (DOE's) Environmental Management (EM) Program at the Oak Ridge Reservation. In order to provide unbiased evaluation and recommendations on the cleanup efforts related to the Oak Ridge site, the Board seeks opportunities for input through collaborative dialogue with the communities surrounding the Oak Ridge Reservation, governmental regulators, and other stakeholders.

CONTENTS

AGENDA

PRESENTATION MATERIALS – Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee Efforts at
ETTP – *to be distributed at meeting*

CALENDARS

1. June
2. July (*draft*)

BOARD MINUTES/RECOMMENDATIONS & MOTIONS

1. May 14, 2014, draft meeting minutes
2. Recommendations on Publicizing Environmental Management Successes
3. Recommendations on Funding to Support Cleanup and Expedite Milestones

REPORTS & MEMOS

1. Recommendation Tracking Chart
2. EM Projects Update
3. Abbreviations/Acronyms for EM Projects Update
4. Travel Opportunities



Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board
Wednesday, June 11, 2014, 6:00 p.m.
DOE Information Center
1 Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

AGENDA

- I. Welcome and Announcements (D. Hemelright) 6:00–6:05
 - A. Next Meeting: Wednesday, July 9. New Member Training Meeting
- II. Comments from the Deputy Designated Federal Officer, and the DOE, EPA, and TDEC Liaisons (S. Cange, D. Adler, C. Jones, J. Owsley)..... 6:05–6:20
- III. Public Comment Period (A. Chourey)..... 6:20–6:30
- IV. Presentation: Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee Efforts at the East Tennessee Technology Park (Steve Cooke)..... 6:30–7:05
 - Question and Answer Period 7:05–7:20
- BREAK..... 7:20–7:30
- V. Call for Additions/Approval of Agenda 7:30
- VI. Motions 7:30–7:35
 - A. May 14, 2014, Meeting Minutes (L. Hagy)
 - B. Chairs Recommendations (D. Hemelright)
 - 1. Recommendations on Publicizing Environmental Management Successes
 - 2. Recommendations on Funding to Support Cleanup and Expedite Milestones
 - C. Second Consecutive Absence: Price, Smith (D. Hemelright)
 - D. Election of Nominating Committee (D. Hemelright)
- VII. Responses to Recommendations & Comments (D. Adler)..... 7:35–7:40
- VIII. Committee Reports..... 7:40–7:50
 - A. Budget & Process (G. Paulus)
 - B. Environmental Management/Stewardship (B. Hatcher/C. Staley)
 - C. Public Outreach (S. McKinney)
 - D. Executive (D. Hemelright)
- IX. Federal Coordinator’s Report (M. Noe) 7:50–7:55
- X. Additions to Agenda 7:55–8:00
- XI. Adjourn 8:00



Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

June 2014

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11 Monthly SSAB meeting 6 p.m.	12	13	14
15	16	17	18 Environmental Management & Stewardship Committee 6 p.m.	19	20	21
22	23	24 Public Outreach Committee 5:30 p.m. teleconference	25	26	27	28
29	30					

All Meetings will be held at the DOE Information Center, Office of Science and Technical Information, 1Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge unless noted otherwise.

ORSSAB Support Office: (865) 241-4583 or 241-4584


DOE Information Center: (865) 241-4780

Board meetings on cable TV and YouTube	
Knoxville: Charter Channel 6, Comcast Channel 12	Sundays at 7 p.m.
Lenoir City: Charter Cable Channel 3	Wednesdays, 4 p.m.
Oak Ridge: Channel 12	Monday, June 23, 7 p.m.
Oak Ridge: Channel 15	Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 8 a.m. & noon
YouTube	http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB



Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

July 2014

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1	2	3	4  Independence Day DOE/Staff Holiday	5
6	7	8	9 6 p.m. New member training	10	11	12
13	14	15	16 Environmental Management & Stewardship Committee 6 p.m.	17	18	19
20	21	22 Public Outreach Committee 5:30 p.m. teleconference	23 Budget & Process Committee 5:30 p.m. Executive Committee 6 p.m.	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

All Meetings will be held at the DOE Information Center, Office of Science and Technical Information, 1Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge unless noted otherwise.

ORSSAB Support Office: (865) 241-4583 or 241-4584 **DOE Information Center:** (865) 241-4780

Board meetings on cable TV and YouTube	
Knoxville: Charter Channel 6, Comcast Channel 12	Sundays at 7 p.m.
Lenoir City: Charter Cable Channel 3	Wednesdays, 4 p.m.
Oak Ridge: Channel 12	Monday, July 21, 7 p.m.
Oak Ridge: Channel 15	Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 8 a.m. & noon
YouTube	http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB

DRAFT

Many Voices Working for the Community



Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

Unapproved May 14, 2014, Meeting Minutes

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) held its monthly meeting on Wednesday, May 14, 2014, at the DOE Information Center, 1 Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge, Tenn., beginning at 6 p.m. A video of the meeting was made and may be viewed by contacting the ORSSAB support offices at (865) 241-4583 or 241-4584. The presentation portion of the video is available on the board's YouTube site at www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB/videos.

Members Present

Jimmy Bell
Noel Berry
Alfreda Cook
Carmen DeLong
Lisa Hagy, Secretary
Bob Hatcher

David Hemelright, Chair
Bruce Hicks, Vice Chair
Jennifer Kasten
Jan Lyons
Fay Martin
Donald Mei

Mary Smalling
Coralie Staley
Scott Stout

Members Absent

Howard Holmes
Scott McKinney
Greg Paulus
Belinda Price¹
Wanda Smith¹

¹Second consecutive absence

Liaisons, Deputy Designated Federal Officer, and Federal Coordinator Present

Dave Adler, Department of Energy-Oak Ridge Office (DOE-ORO), Alternate Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO)
Connie Jones, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
John Owsley, Liaison, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC)
Melyssa Noe, ORSSAB Federal Coordinator, DOE-ORO

Others Present

Aditya Chourey, Student Representative
Karen Deacon, DOE
Nona Girardi, Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board
Spencer Gross, ORSSAB Support Office
Andrew Kern
Pete Osborne, ORSSAB Support Office
Claire Rowcliffe, Student Representative
Roger Thompson, Tennessee Emergency Management Agency
Carlos Valdez, Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board

Laura Wilkerson, DOE

Thirteen members of the public were present.

Liaison Comments

Mr. Adler – Mr. Adler reported that Mark Whitney, the DOE Oak Ridge Manager for Environmental Management (EM) has been promoted to DOE Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM. He will report to the Assistant Secretary for EM in Washington, DC. That position is currently vacant and will be filled by political appointment. Sue Cange, the Deputy Manager for EM in Oak Ridge, will serve as the Acting Manager until a new manager for EM is named.

Demolition has begun on the K-31 Building at East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP). While demolition is underway, work is being done to prepare the K-27 Building for demolition. K-27 still has all of the process equipment in place that was used to enrich uranium. Remaining contamination in the equipment needs to be stabilized before the equipment can be disposed in the on-site disposal facility. Mr. Adler said completing demolition of K-31 will free up additional space at ETTP for industrial redevelopment.

Mr. Adler said a ceremony was held earlier in the day to transfer a significant amount of land at ETTP for industrial redevelopment. Two areas, known as Economic Development Parcels, were transferred from DOE ownership to the Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee for eventual private industrial use. The area is more than 30 acres with infrastructure in place. Mr. Adler said the transfer allows for a corridor from the front of ETTP to the back of ETTP that is unimpeded by DOE security barriers.

Mr. Adler said there are no outstanding recommendations from ORSSAB for DOE to address except those that were approved at this meeting. He said the recommendation on the FY 2016 DOE Oak Ridge EM Budget Request will be sent to DOE Headquarters with the Oak Ridge EM budget request.

Ms. Jones – Ms. Jones said members of the ETTP Project Team met to discuss the three exposure units that make up the footprint of the former K-25 Building and how best to evaluate the area and allow DOE to begin characterization. She said there are a number of processes that need to be worked out before characterization can begin, but the project team is working to resolve the issues.

Mr. Owsley – Mr. Owsley said that as a result of reorganizing the TDEC DOE Oversight Office, Kristof Czartoryski will assume the duties of the TDEC liaison to ORSSAB. Mr. Czartoryski is the TDEC official responsible for the Federal Facility Agreement for the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR). Mr. Owsley will remain as the manager of the TDEC DOE Oversight Office. Mr. Czartoryski's first ORSSAB meeting will be in June.

Mr. Owsley said the 2013 TDEC Environmental Monitoring Report has been published and will be available on the TDEC website at http://www.tn.gov/environment/remediation_energy-oversight-reports.shtml.

Public Comment

None.

Presentation

Ms. Wilkerson's presentation was an update on the Transuranic Waste Processing Center (TWPC). The main points of her presentation are in Attachment 1.

She began by pointing out the location of the TWPC (Attachment 1, page 2), just south of Oak Ridge National Lab (ORNL) on Highway 95.

She explained that transuranic (TRU) waste is waste contaminated with man-made elements with a heavier atomic weight than uranium that have a half life of more than 20 years. She said TRU waste has to be treated differently than other waste on the ORR and requires a geologic repository for disposal. It cannot be disposed in a shallow landfill and must be sent to the deep repository in New Mexico, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).

The TRU waste in Oak Ridge is associated with research activities at ORNL, much of it dating back to the Manhattan Project. The waste consists primarily of protective clothing, tools, lab debris, and soils.

The regulatory driver to dispose of TRU waste is an order from the TDEC Commissioner to implement a Site Treatment Plan that specifies requirements to treat and dispose it (Attachment 1, page 4). DOE's mission is to process, segregate, and repackage the ORNL TRU waste for disposal at WIPP.

The TRU waste inventory in Oak Ridge consists of four different waste streams (Attachment 1, page 4). About 1,600 cubic meters of supernate was disposed in 2004. About 1,500 cubic meters of contact-handled (CH) and about 560 cubic meters of remote-handled (RH) waste is currently being processed. Some has already been shipped to WIPP. When the CH and RH inventories are completed about 2,000 cubic meters of RH sludge will be processed and disposed.

Ms. Wilkerson showed an aerial photograph of the TWPC (Attachment 1, page 5). The TWPC includes 44 facilities on 15 acres. It has operated since 2004 with 4.5 million man-hours without a lost-time incident.

To date 95 percent of the 1,500 cubic meters of CH waste has been processed and 68 percent has been shipped for disposal (Attachment 1, page 6). Of the 560 cubic meters of RH waste 65 percent has been processed and 21 percent shipped for disposal. Ms. Wilkerson explained that RH waste has a higher activity level than CH waste and must be handled remotely.

Ms. Wilkerson explained that the Central Characterization Project (CCP) is an independent body that provides characterization and certification of waste to ensure it meets the waste acceptance criteria for WIPP. In 2011 CCP activities in Oak Ridge were suspended because of budget constraints. In response, DOE in Oak Ridge and the TRU waste contractor took over field characterization to provide continued support for waste processing at TWPC. During CCP's absence DOE and the contractor repackaged, characterized, and staged TRU waste for future CCP certification and shipment. In addition, low-level and mixed low-level waste that could be disposed elsewhere was segregated, repackaged, and disposed. CCP returned as planned in October 2013 (Attachment 1, page 8).

In February 2014 two incidents at WIPP forced the temporary closure of the facility. On February 5 a truck used to transport salt in the mine caught fire. Then on February 14 there was a contamination release (Attachment 1, page 9). A report has been issued on the truck fire incident, but the contamination release is still under investigation. It is not known how long WIPP will be closed while the investigation continues. As a result impacts for the TRU waste program in Oak Ridge are being evaluated.

Ms. Wilkerson said the preliminary plan is to maximize continued progress and utilization of existing resources to process and certify waste (Attachment 1, page 10). Processing of CH waste

and low-dose RH waste casks will continue in order to meet Site Treatment Plan milestones. Waste that is processed can be stored on-site for a time. Ms. Wilkerson said processing of high dose RH is delayed because available storage capacity for it at TWPC has been reached. She said additional RH storage capacity may have to be established depending on the duration of the WIPP suspension.

Near term priorities are to complete the CCP certification approval process and to continue to prioritize and stage TRU waste drums for CCP certification activities. The CH waste inventory will be relocated as needed to allow continued processing of CH waste during the WIPP suspension. The fourth priority is to complete CH and RH TRU debris processing.

Ms. Wilkerson said future work will be to process the RH sludge. Most of it is stored in the Melton Valley Storage Tanks, which are eight 50,000 gallon tanks inside an underground concrete vault (Attachment 1, page 12). Processing the sludge will require building additional facilities to handle the sludge and remaining supernate. The Sludge Facility Buildouts are in the conceptual design stage.

After Ms. Wilkerson's presentation a number of questions were asked. Following are abridged questions and answers.

Ms. DeLong: I've heard rumors that TWPC may be nearing the end of its operational life. Is that true? Ms. Wilkerson: Once we complete processing and disposing of CH and RH waste, and then we modify it to treat and remove sludge we're pretty much done with TWPC and then it would be prepared for decommissioning and demolition. There are potential uses for it by ORNL since they will continue to generate new waste, but that is much less than what TWPC current handles. So that would have to be evaluated, but a final decision has not been made. We are going to have a mission for several years to come until we complete the legacy processing. So there is an opportunity there if the science program wants to use the facility. Ms. DeLong: What is the schedule to finish the work? Ms. Wilkerson: We have a baseline plan to complete the process of CH and RH debris by 2017 and then the follow-on sludge program into the mid-2020s, but because of the WIPP suspension there will likely be impacts to that.

Mr. Hatcher: My question is related to the sludge. Is there intent to look at what other sites are doing with sludge and is the composition similar to that at Hanford? And is there a possibility to ship the sludge to Hanford where they're spending \$12 million on a facility dedicated to that kind of process. Ms. Wilkerson: We have done a lot work with Hanford and Savannah River and getting their experts here to look at what we have. We had an external technical review conducted in 2012 that included experts from Hanford, Savannah River, and headquarters. Ms. Deacon and I went to Hanford last year and spent a couple of days talking with Hanford and the Office of River Protection people who deal with the tanks there. From that we learned about how different our waste is from theirs. So the approach we're taking is the right approach because it is liquid waste and there is not a feasible transportation option so it has to be processed on site. But even if it could be shipped it is so different from theirs it wouldn't be practicable to send it there.

Mr. Bell: Did you mention your definition of TRU waste? Ms. Wilkerson: It's 100 nanocuries per gram. Mr. Bell: A question regarding the tanks in Melton Valley. You have eight tanks that hold about 250 cubic meters per tank. Then you remove the liquid. The contract in the late 1990s included the removal of remote-handled sludge in the same contract. What happened? Why was it not included in this contract and who is now going to do it? You said you're doing designs for buildouts. I assume you're doing designs to get the sludge out of the tanks, which means you're going to add a lot of water to it and you're going to end up with a lot more supernate. What are you going to do with that? Is it going to be drawn off and sent to TWPC as well? Ms. Wilkerson: The sequence in the original contract was to process the supernate, and then the sludges and was to be

disposed as TRU waste. At the time WIPP was not ready to accept TRU waste. So the activity was re-sequenced and the debris work was prioritized following completion of supernate processing. That in combination with funding challenges we have had over the years has caused the processing of the sludges to be delayed. We have a plan for the design activity for the buildouts in the near term. We have a solicitation to procure a design and testing only contract. After that we'll decide how we'll procure for construction of modifications to the facility. Mr. Bell: Does the design for the removal of that waste include consideration of the British system, which was rejected by Hanford? Ms. Wilkerson: Yes, the conceptual design includes use of the same type of pulse jet fluidics system that was used in the past at ORNL to transfer sludges.

Mr. Thompson: If WIPP is down for six months to two years, is there capacity to hold processed waste or any incoming waste? Ms. Wilkerson: There is some waste at Nuclear Fuel Services (in Erwin, Tenn.) that was generated as a result of some work they did in support of past DOE missions. So we have served as a vehicle for that waste to be shipped to WIPP. What we committed to do was to receive the waste and certify it for shipment to WIPP. We did not commit to storing that waste. As a result of the 2011 suspension we had to accept some waste that they had generated or were in the process of generating. Because of the uncertainty at WIPP we felt it was prudent to put a pause to that until we determined what the impact of the WIPP suspension would be on our missions and operations because we have Waste Treatment Plan milestones that are our priority. As we learn more about the situation at WIPP we'll update those plans as needed to support them.

Mr. Kern: You say the RH waste comes in concrete casks. Is that generated on site or does it come from other places in the country? Ms. Wilkerson: Much of it dates to the Manhattan Project. The majority was generated at ORNL. I don't know for a fact if some came from other sites in the 1940s and 50s. But it is waste that had been in storage for many years in earthen covered trenches. It was exhumed and stored at ORNL before being transported to TWPC. Mr. Kern: Those casks can't be shipped for disposal at WIPP? Ms. Wilkerson: No, they do not meet the waste acceptance criteria at WIPP as is.

Committee Reports

Budget & Process – No report. The committee did not meet in April

EM & Stewardship – Mr. Hatcher said the committee met on April 16 and received an update on the removal of technetium contaminated sludge from the Oak Ridge city sewer system. The technetium inadvertently got into sewer lines at ETTP and ended up at a waste water treatment system. DOE took control of the contaminated material and had it shipped off site for disposal. The committee also heard a report on the 2014 Remediation Effectiveness Report for the ORR. The report documents the effectiveness of remedial actions taken to mitigate contamination of radioactive or hazardous waste areas on the reservation. The committee determined no recommendation was needed on the report.

The committee heard a report on enhancing the acquisition, storage, and retention of EM data for future use. The issue manager for the topic said there were a number of questions that require answers and the topic was not ready for discussion of a possible recommendation.

Public Outreach – No report. The committee did not meet in April.

Executive – The committee did not meet in April. However, Mr. Hemelright said a number of board members attended the EM SSAB Chairs' meeting in Pasco, Wash., and he provided a report on the meeting.

He said meeting participants toured the nearby DOE Hanford site. He said Hanford has a very large amount of tank waste, and he understood why Hanford receives a large portion of DOE EM funds to clean up tank waste.

At the meeting the next day, Dave Borak was introduced as the acting Designated Federal Officer. Mr. Hemelright said he expected Mr. Borak to be a capable interim leader for the EM SSAB.

Jack Craig, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM, briefed the group on the various cleanup operations at the various sites in the DOE complex and the how the budget for FY 2015 was shaping up. Part of that discussion was about the temporary closure at WIPP and how it affects some of the sites, including Oak Ridge. Mr. Craig charged the site specific boards to identify community expectations with reduced funding and how increase public participation in SSAB meetings.

Frank Marcinowski, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste Management, provided an update on the situation at WIPP. Shortly after the Chairs' meeting a report was issued and there is speculation the facility could be closed for many months.

Mr. Hemelright said the chairs of the various board discussed cross-cutting issues, and common themes are community involvement, membership, budgets, and groundwater.

The chairs approved two recommendations that will be brought before individual boards for consideration. ORSSAB will review and vote on the recommendations at the June meeting.

Announcements and Other Board Business

ORSSAB will have its next meeting on Wednesday, June 11, 2014, at the DOE Information Center.

The minutes of the April 9, 2014, meeting were approved.

Mr. Chourey and Ms. Rowcliffe were introduced as new student representatives to the board.

The Recommendation on Additional Off-site Groundwater Migration Studies (Attachment 2) was approved.

The Recommendation on Additional Waste Disposal Capacity on the Oak Ridge Reservation (Attachment 3) was approved.

The Recommendation on the FY 2016 DOE Oak Ridge Environmental Management Budget Request (Attachment 4) was approved.

Federal Coordinator Report

Ms. Noe reminded those who traveled to the Chairs' meeting that if they have not been reimbursed for expenses to let her know.

Additions to the Agenda

None.

Motions

5/14/14.1

Ms. Cook moved to approve the minutes of the April 9, 2014, meeting. Ms. Martin seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

5/14/14.2

Mr. Hatcher moved to approve the Recommendation on Additional Off-site Groundwater Migration Studies. Ms. DeLong seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

5/14/14.3

Ms. Martin moved to approve the Recommendation on Additional Waste Disposal Capacity on the Oak Ridge Reservation. Ms. Staley seconded and the motion **passed** with 14 members voting 'yea,' no members voting 'nay,' and one member (Mr. Berry) abstaining.

5/14/14.4

Mr. Hemelright moved to approve the Recommendation on the FY 2016 DOE Oak Ridge Environmental Management Budget Request. Mr. Hatcher seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Action items

Closed

Attachments (4) to these minutes are available on request from the ORSSAB support office.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the May 14, 2014, meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board.

Lisa Hagy, Secretary

Dave Hemelright, Chair
Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board
DH/rsg

DATE

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Hanford
Oak Ridge

Idaho
Paducah

Nevada
Portsmouth

Northern New Mexico
Savannah River

Mr. David Huizenga
Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-1
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Huizenga:

Background

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) Chairs note the examples below that illustrate some of the positive benefits resulting from EM remediation efforts such as:

- Fernald, Ohio, where an operational uranium enrichment plant has been deconstructed and the area reconstituted as parkland;
- Oak Ridge, Tennessee, where the East Tennessee Technology Park now occupies the area previously dominated by the K-25 Gaseous Diffusion Plant;
- Rocky Flats, Colorado, where a nuclear weapons production facility has been replaced by flourishing rangeland and now serves as a wildlife refuge; and
- Hanford in Washington state, where the B Reactor Preservation Project has been completed and is under consideration for national historic preservation.

In every case of EM site remediation, the environmental recovery constitutes a powerful example of how the joint efforts of the Department of Energy (DOE) and community leaders have resulted in a return to the local community and to society of areas or facilities previously exposed to and/or contaminated by nuclear activities.

Recommendation

With full recognition of the presence and value of formal public relations and outreach programs within each DOE facility, and building upon these capabilities, the EM SSAB Chairs recommend that DOE:

- Sponsor an independent examination of the remediation efforts of DOE EM, with the intent of producing video clips and/or lengthier documentaries suitable for

public viewing through a variety of platforms and for academic/scholastic purposes.

- Engage the various EM sites in developing and producing such materials (and referencing those that already exist), so that local resources (e.g. local television organizations and academic science programs) may make use of these materials to address local issues and specific concerns.

Such communication tools would help DOE EM to further capitalize on the presentation of past and emerging EM sites to inform the public about cleanup activities at former nuclear sites to maintain and improve support for environmental cleanup.

Steve Hudson, Chair
Hanford Advisory Board

Herbert Bohrer, Chair
Idaho National Laboratory
Site EM Citizens Advisory
Board

Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair
Nevada SSAB

Carlos Valdez, Chair
Northern New Mexico
Citizens' Advisory Board

David Hemelright, Chair
Oak Ridge SSAB

Ben Peterson, Chair
Paducah Citizens
Advisory Board

William E. Henderson II, Chair
Portsmouth SSAB

Marolyn J. Parson, Chair
Savannah River Site
Citizens Advisory Board

cc: Kristen Ellis, EM-3.2
David Borak, EM-3.2

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

**Hanford
Oak Ridge**

**Idaho
Paducah**

**Nevada
Portsmouth**

**Northern New Mexico
Savannah River**

Mr. David Huizenga
Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-1
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Mr. Huizenga:

Background

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) believes the fiscal year 2015 budget request is insufficient to meet the cleanup obligations facing the EM cleanup sites. We also believe that the Department of Energy (DOE) needs to honor the agreements and established milestones between the federal government, the states, Tribes and affected stakeholders in a more timely fashion.

How Underfunding Increases Cost and Risk

- Funding shortfalls increase the long-term cost of cleanup to the American taxpayers.
- Flat funding increases cleanup costs because it does not consider inflation or escalation of added costs.
- Continuing funding shortfalls result in the downward spiral of additional delays and more costs.
- Continued use of facilities past their design lives increases risk, as has been demonstrated by recent reports of leaking double shell tanks at the Hanford site.
- Loss of institutional knowledge inhibits cleanup efficiency and increases costs.

Cleanup Commitments Must Be Honored

The United States government is obligated to meet existing cleanup commitments and establish new commitments for cleanup in a timely fashion. At the larger sites, much of the low hanging fruit, the most easily completed work, is done. The remaining cleanup at these sites is more complex and will cost more money. This fact cannot be ignored. Some sites, such as Fernald and Rocky Flats, have completed all cleanup activities. Many remaining sites are facing the most difficult, risk laden, and expensive cleanup activities across the DOE EM complex. There are also sites, such as Paducah, whose end state metrics have yet to be established.

We believe these cleanup obligations must be met in real time, not delayed. Every year DOE needs to honor their current commitments by requesting all funding to support cleanup activities and milestones, and request funding for newly established milestones.

The EM SSAB, comprising about 200 people, is composed of eight regional citizens advisory boards from communities in Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee and Washington. We are cumulatively representative of a stakeholder population totaling millions of people who are affected by generator sites, transportation routes and disposal sites.

Recommendation

The EM SSAB requests that:

- DOE meet its cleanup obligations by requesting all annual funding required to support cleanup activities and milestones at each site we represent to complete committed cleanup activities, without delay.
- DOE expedite milestone establishment, and requests funds for those sites that do not have site end state cleanup milestones in place.

The EM SSAB requests that you share this recommendation with the Secretary of Energy.

Steve Hudson, Chair
Hanford Advisory Board

Herbert Bohrer, Chair
Idaho National Laboratory
Site EM Citizens Advisory
Board

Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair
Nevada SSAB

Carlos Valdez, Chair
Northern New Mexico
Citizens' Advisory Board

David Hemelright, Chair
Oak Ridge SSAB

Ben Peterson, Chair
Paducah Citizens
Advisory Board

William E. Henderson II, Chair
Portsmouth SSAB

Marolyn J. Parson, Chair
Savannah River Site
Citizens Advisory Board

cc: Kristen Ellis, EM-3.2
David Borak, EM-3.2

Recommendation Response Tracking Chart for FY 2014

	Date	To	Recommendation	Originating Committee	Response Date	Response Status	Committee Review of Response
1.	5/14/14	Susan Cange, Acting Manager for Oak Ridge EM	Recommendation 222: Recommendations on Additional Off-site Groundwater Migration Studies	EM & Stewardship			
2.	5/14/14	Susan Cange, Acting Manager for Oak Ridge EM	Recommendation 223: Recommendations on Additional Waste Disposal Capacity on the Oak Ridge Reservation	EM & Stewardship			
3.	5/14/14	Susan Cange, Acting Manager for Oak Ridge EM	Recommendation 224: Recommendation on Fiscal Year 2016 DOE Oak Ridge Environmental Management Budget Request	EM & Stewardship and Budget & Process			

EM Project Update

ETTP	April	May
Zone 1 Final Soils ROD	The D3 RI/FS was submitted to the regulators for review.	
Zone 2 ROD		The PCCR for the EU 35 Sumps was approved by the regulators.
K-25/K-27 D&D	Mining of deposits in the segmentation shop is 93 percent complete.	Mining of deposits in the segmentation shop is complete, as is the shipments to Nevada of volutes and boxes of debris.
	Shipments of volutes (98 percent complete) and boxes of debris (96 percent complete) continue.	Grouting and waste disposition continues with a forecast for project completion in summer of 2014.
	The end state status for K-25 has 5 of 23 areas documented for interim completion.	The end state status for K-25 has 14 of 23 areas documented for interim completion.
		The American Nuclear Society Decommissioning and Environmental Services Division selected the K-25 demolition project to receive its Project Excellence Award. This reward recognizes efforts and achievements on a specific project that has contributed to the advancement of any one or all of the fields of D&D, or site reutilization.
ETTP Historic Preservation		A consultation meeting was held on the historic preservation of ETTP. Status of the execution of the Memorandum of Agreement, introduction of the Professional Site Design Team and Museum Professional, discussion of budget, use of authentic equipment, and the end state of the K-25 slab were addressed.
ORNL	April	May
Melton Valley ROD	The Addendum to the MV Remedial Action Report was completed that eliminates the requirement for RCRA reporting since it is being performed under CERCLA.	
Sludge Test Area Buildout AM	The WHP for the Sludge Test Area Buildout was submitted to regulators and approved.	
MSRE (Fuel Salt)	The Waste Handling Plan Addendum was approved by the regulators.	
	NaF Trap removal, weighing, and nondestruction assay were completed. One of the traps will be temporarily stored, pending further evaluation, due to high activity level.	
Buildings 3074, 3136, and 3020 Stack Time-Critical AM		The Removal Action Report was finalized.
U-233 Disposition	Developed a Change Order Proposal for additional scopes of work for the processing campaign design effort.	A briefing and tour of the 3019 Facility was provided to the DOE Deputy Under Secretary for Management and Performance.

EM Project Update

ORNL	April	May
U-233 Disposition	Completed initial development of the Corrective Action Plan associated with the Office of Science, Safeguards and Security survey.	The final report from the Office of Health, Safety, and Security's Office of Independent Oversight, Safeguards, and Security follow-on review held in February was received and is in review.
	A tour of the 3019 Facility was provided to the Deputy Director for Field Operations for the Office of Science.	A review was completed of Isotek System's Software Quality Assurance Program.
	A Partnering Agreement between OREM and Isotek Systems, LLC was signed forming the framework to ensure open and honest communication, collaboration, and conflict resolution.	
Y-12 Site	April	May
Y-12 Phase I ROD Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment	The Outfall 200 D2 Mercury Treatment Facility RDWP and Conceptual Design Report was submitted to the regulators.	TDEC approved the RDWP and the EPA is withholding final approval upon the outcome of the Focused Feasibility Study, which is due to the regulators in September.
	An Independent Design Review (IDR) was conducted for Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility project. The IDR team, which consisted of representatives from Oak Ridge and other sites, did not identify any problems with the design and agreed the appropriate alternative was selected.	Project finalizing Conceptual Design Report and Critical Decision-1 package and preparing for HQ Independent Cost Review schedule to start in July.
Y-12 Long Term S&M	Roof repair activities resumed on Building 9201-4. The repair scope originally identified and initiated at the beginning of the fiscal year is approximately 90 percent complete. Additional scope and funding have been added to the contract based on roof conditions discovered to date.	
	The PCCR for Building 9206 Duct & Fan Removal was submitted to the regulators for review.	
Off-Site Cleanup/Waste Management	April	May
TRU Waste Processing Center	Preparations for SWSA 5 waste processing are ongoing although several contingency plans are under evaluation due to potential impacts associated with the duration of the suspension of shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.	The first three loads of containers to be transferred into storage at ORNL, due to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant shutdown, have been selected and paperwork is underway.
	The revision to the Site Treatment Plan (STP) for Mixed Waste and the Semi-Annual Progress Report was submitted to TDEC for approval.	The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board was onsite to review the Waste Inventory Control System and the new 2R lid-removal testing unit.
		The project completed all annual Performance Demonstration Program NDA certification runs.
EMWMF	The final shipment of the waste lot with higher Tc-99 values was received at the end of April.	EMWMF remained open for waste disposal 98.3 percent of available business hours.

EM Project Update

Off-Site Cleanup/Waste Management	April	May
EMWMF	A Focused Feasibility Study was initiated for the EMWMF and EMDF water.	Work continues on the Focused Feasibility Study with the preliminary identification of treatment options, contaminants and flow volumes.
EMDF	The Environmental Management office received proposals for the Phase I characterization, which includes installation of wells and monitoring. An evaluation methodology has been developed and approved to provide a basis for selecting and awarding the contract.	
Lower East Fork Poplar Creek	An EPA staff member visited site to observe methods to be used during the LEFPC ecological mercury study. The visit covered each of the three sites where samples will be taken and where GPS staking, sample collection, and sample handling methods were observed.	
ORR Groundwater Strategy	Preparation of the Off-site Groundwater Assessment Remedial Site Evaluation Work Plan continued.	Preparation for a June workshop for the ORR Groundwater Modeling Technical Advisory Group (TAG) is ongoing. The TAG will develop an ORR groundwater modeling approach and execute groundwater modeling work. The TAG consists of DOE, EPA, TDEC, and contractor representatives, including outside technical experts.
	The D2 Groundwater Strategy was submitted to the regulators for approval.	

Abbreviations/Acronyms List for Environmental Management Project Update

AM – action memorandum

ARRA – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

BCV – Bear Creek Valley

BG – burial grounds

BV- Bethel Valley

CARAR – Capacity Assurance Remedial Action Report

CBFO – Carlsbad Field Office

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation
and Liability Act

CEUSP – Consolidated Edison Uranium Solidification Project

CD – critical decision

CH – contact handled

CNF – Central Neutralization Facility

CS – construction start

CY – calendar year

D&D – decontamination and decommissioning

DOE – Department of Energy

DSA – documented safety analysis

DQO – data quality objective

EE/CA – engineering evaluation/cost analysis

EM – environmental management

EMDF – Environmental Management Disposal Facility

EMWMF – Environmental Management Waste Management Facility

EPA – Environmental Protection Agency

ETTP – East Tennessee Technology Park

EU – exposure unit

EV – earned value

FFA – Federal Facility Agreement

FPD – federal project director

FY – fiscal year

GIS – geographical information system

GW – groundwater

GWTS –groundwater treatability study

IROD – Interim Record of Decision

LEFPC – Lower East Fork Poplar Creek

LLW – low-level waste

MLLW – mixed low-level waste

MSRE – Molten Salt Reactor Experiment

MV – Melton Valley

NaF – sodium fluoride

NDA – non-destructive assay

NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act

NPL – National Priorities List

NNSS – Nevada National Security Site (new name of Nevada Test Site)

NTS – Nevada Test Site

OREM – Oak Ridge Office of Environmental Management

ORNL – Oak Ridge National Laboratory

ORO – Oak Ridge Office

ORR – Oak Ridge Reservation

ORRS – operational readiness reviews

PaR – trade name of remote manipulator at the Transuranic Waste
Processing Center

PCB - polychlorinated biphenyls

PCCR – Phased Construction Completion Report

PM – project manager

PPE – Personal Protective Equipment

QAPP – Quality Assurance Project Plan

RA – remedial action

RAR – Remedial Action Report

RAWP – Remedial Action Work Plan

RCRA – Resource Conservation Recovery Act

RDR – Remedial Design Report

RDWP – Remedial Design Work Plan

RER – Remediation Effectiveness Report

RH – remote handled

RI/FS – Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study

RIWP – Remedial Investigation Work Plan

RmAR – Removal Action Report

RmAWP – Removal Action Work Plan

ROD – Record of Decision

RUBB – trade name of a temporary, fabric covered enclosure

S&M – surveillance and maintenance

SAP – sampling analysis plan

SEC – Safety and Ecology Corp.

SEP – supplemental environmental project

STP – site treatment plan

SW – surface water

SWSA – solid waste storage area

Tc – technetium

TC – time critical

TDEC – Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation

TRU – transuranic

TSCA – Toxic Substances Control Act

TWPC – Transuranic Waste Processing Center

U – uranium

UEFPC – Upper East Fork Poplar Creek

VOC – volatile organic compound

WAC – waste acceptance criteria

WEMA – West End Mercury Area (at Y-12)

WHP – Waste Handling Plan

WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

WRRP – Water Resources Restoration Program

WWSY – White Wing Scrap Yard

Y-12 – Y-12 National Security Complex

ZPR – Zero Power Reactor

Travel Opportunities

Meeting/Event	Dates	Location	Reg. Cost	Website	Conference Lock Date; # Allocated Attendees	Deadline to Submit Requests
FY 2014						
Fall Chairs Meeting (Attendees: Hemelright, Hicks, Staley)	Oct. 15-17, 2013	Portsmouth, OH	none	http://www.planetreg.com/E79143550250173		Aug. 28, 2014
Intergovernmental Meeting with DOE	Oct. 28-30, 2013	New Orleans	none			Oct. 11, 2014
Perma-Fix Nuclear Waste Management Forum (Requests: Hemelright, Holmes)	Dec. 2-5, 2013	Nashville	\$500	https://events.r20.constantcontact.com/register/eventReg?llr=8n5x6qkab&oeidk=a07e84apcpub37c9f6e&oseq=a01lph9iyhwi		Oct. 23, 2014
Waste Management Symposium Attendees: Price)	March 2-6, 2014 (Registration opens 10/15/13. Early registration ends 12/31/13)	Phoenix	\$995	www.wmsym.org	2	Nov. 20, 2014
National Environmental Justice Conference & Training (Attendees: M. Hatcher)	March 26-28, 2014	Washington, D.C.	none	http://thenejc.org	1	Jan. 29, 2014
Ohio EPA National Brownfields Conference	April 9-10, 2014	Columbus, Ohio				Feb. 19, 2014
Spring Chairs Meeting (Attendees: Cook, Hatcher, Hemelright, Hicks, Staley)	April 22-25, 2014	Richland, WA	none	http://www.eventbrite.com/e/2014-environmental-management-site-specific-advisory-board-chairs-meeting-registration-5248440226	N/A	March 26, 2014
RadWaste Summit (Pending requests: Martin)	Sept. 2-5, 2014	Summerlin, Nevada	525	http://radwastesummit.com/	6/9/14; 2	July 23, 2014
Fall Chairs Meeting (Pending requests: Staley)	Sept. 9-11, 2014 (tentative)	Idaho Falls, ID	none		N/A	July 23, 2014

Travel Opportunities

Meeting/Event	Dates	Location	Reg. Cost	Website	Conference Lock Date; # Allocated Attendees	Deadline to Submit Requests
Western Waste Site Tour (Tentative requests: DeLong, Hagy, B. Hatcher, M. Hatcher, Lyons, McKinney, Mei, Paulus, Price)	Postponed pending resolution of issues related to fire at WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Nevada Nat'l Security Site	none	none		

Shading indicates closed trips