

**ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC
ADVISORY BOARD CHAIRS' MEETING**

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**La Fonda on the Plaza Hotel
100 East San Francisco Street • Santa Fe, NM 87501**

September 15-16, 2010

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ARRA – American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	EPA – Environmental Protection Agency
CD-1 – Critical Decision One	EPI – Energy Parks Initiative
CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act	EIS – Environmental Impact Statement
CFO – Chief Financial Officer	FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act
CR – Continuing Resolution	FFCA – Federal Facility Compliance Act
CPR – Construction Project Review	FTE – Full-Time Equivalent
D&D – Decontamination & Decommissioning	FUSRAP – Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program
DAS – Deputy Assistant Secretary	FY – Fiscal Year
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer	GAO – Government Accountability Office
DFO – Designated Federal Officer	GTCC – Greater-Than-Class C
DNFSB – Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	HAB – Hanford Advisory Board
DOE – Department of Energy	HIP – Hot Isostatic Pressing
DOI – Department of Interior	HLW – High-Level Waste
DU – Depleted Uranium	HQ – Headquarters
DWPF – Defense Waste Processing Facility	IAEA – International Atomic Energy Agency
ECA – Energy Communities Alliance	IFDP – Integrated Facilities Disposition Project
EIS – Environmental Impact Statement	INL – Idaho National Laboratory
EM – Office of Environmental Management	INL CAB – Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board
EM-1 – Assistant Secretary for the Office of Environmental Management	IPL – Integrated Priority List
EM-2 – Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Environmental Management	LANL – Los Alamos National Laboratory
EM-3 – Chief Technical Officer for the Office of Environmental Management	LASO – Los Alamos Site Office
EM-4 – Chief Business Officer for the Office of Environmental Management	LLW – Low-Level Waste
EMAB – Environmental Management Advisory Board	LM – Office of Legacy Management
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board	LTS – Long-Term Stewardship
	M&O – Management and Operating
	MDA – Material Disposal Area
	MLLW – Mixed Low-Level Waste
	MUEF – Multi-Use Educational Facility
	MWSU – Mixed Waste Storage Unit
	NGA – National Governors Association

NE – Office of Nuclear Energy	SC – Office of Science
NNMCAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board	SJTI – Superfund Job Training Initiative
NMED – New Mexico Environment Department	SNF – Spent Nuclear Fuel
NNSA – National Nuclear Security Administration	SNL – Sandia National Laboratories
NRC – Nuclear Regulatory Commission	SNM – Spent Nuclear Material
NSSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board	SSAB – Site-Specific Advisory Board
NSSS – Nevada National Security Site	SRS – Savannah River Site
OMB – Office of Management and Budget	SRS CAB – Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
ORNL – Oak Ridge National Laboratory	SWMU – Solid Waste Management Unit
ORSSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board	SWPF – Salt Waste Processing Facility
Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory Board	TA – Technical Area
PGDP – Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant	TAN – Test Area North
PORTS SSAB – Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board	TSCA – Toxic Substance Control Act
QPR – Quarterly Project Review	TPA – Tri-Party Agreement
RCRA – Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	TRU – Transuranic Waste
RFP – Request for Proposal	UMTRCA – Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act
RH-TRU – Remote Handled Transuranic Waste	USACE – United States Army Corps of Engineers
ROD – Record of Decision	U-233 – Uranium-233
	WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
	WTP – Waste Treatment Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Bob Suyama, Vice Chair; Shelley Cimon, Alternate Member; Pamela McCann, Federal Coordinator

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board: Willie Preacher, Vice Chair; Sean Cannon, Nicki Karst, Tami Sherwood, Harry Griffith, Members; Robert Pence, Federal Coordinator; Lisa Aldrich, Contractor Support Staff

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board: Walter Wegst, Chair; Michael Moore, Member; Cynthia Lockwood, Alternate DDFO; Denise Rupp, Contractor Support Staff

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Ralph Phelps, Chair; Robert Gallegos, Vice Chair; Pamela Henline, Lawrence Garcia, Pamela Gilchrist, Carlos Valdez, Members; Edwin Worth, Lee Bishop, Co-DDFOs; Menice Santistevan, Lorelei Novak, Grace Roybal, Edward Roybal, Contractor Support Staff

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: Robert Olson, Edward Juarez, Members; David Adler, Alternate DDFO; Spencer Gross, Contractor Support Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Judy Clayton, Chair; Ralph Young, Vice Chair; Mark Sullivan, Robert Coleman, Members; Robert Smith, Federal Coordinator; Eric Roberts, Contractor Support Staff

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Richard Snyder, Chair; Val Francis, Vice Chair; Sharon Manson, Shirley Bandy, Members; Greg Simonton, Federal Coordinator; Julie Galloway, Contractor Support Staff

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Donald Bridges, Vice Chair; Gerri Flemming, Federal Coordinator; Erica Williams, Contractor Support Staff

DOE Headquarters:

Inés Triay, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management

Shirley Olinger, Associate Principal Deputy for Corporate Operations

Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Technical and Regulatory Support

Cynthia Anderson, Director, EM Recovery Act Program

John Mocknick, EM Recovery Act Program

James Antizzo, Office of D&D and Facility Engineering

Barry Gaffney, Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis

Melissa Nielson, Director, Office of Public and Intergovernmental Accountability

Catherine Alexander Brennan, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer

Terri Lamb, EMAB Designated Federal Officer

Allison Clark, Office of Public and Intergovernmental Accountability

Other:

Los Alamos Site Office: Kevin Smith, George Rael, Toni Chiri, Donald Ami, Everett Trollinger, David Rhodes, Johnny Harper

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability: Susan Gordon.

Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety: Joni Arends, Basia Miller

Nuclear Watch New Mexico: Scott Kovac

Citizen Action New Mexico: David McCoy

The New Mexican: Roger Snodgrass

JDC Consultants: J.D. Campbell

URS Corporation: Judy McLemore

Zia Engineering & Environmental Consultants: Hank Rosoff

Edgewater Technical Associates: Peter Maggiore

Northwest Dynamics: Lori Isenberg

e-Management, Inc.: Leslie Rodriguez, Elizabeth Schmitt

Meeting Minutes

The Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) met on September 15-16, 2010, at the La Fonda on the Plaza Hotel in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) hosted the meeting. Participants included EM SSAB members and officers, Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and field staff, and EM SSAB Deputy Designated Federal Officers (DDFOs), Federal Coordinators, and contractor support staff. The meeting was facilitated by Ms. Lori Isenberg.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mr. Lee Bishop and Mr. Edwin Worth, Co-DDFOs for the NNMCAB opened the meeting and welcomed the Chairs and presenters to Santa Fe, New Mexico. Additional opening remarks were provided by Mr. Ralph Phelps, Chair of the NNMCAB, and Mr. Kevin Smith, Manager, Los Alamos Site Office (LASO).

Ms. Catherine Alexander Brennan, the EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer (DFO), provided an overview of the meeting objectives and officially called the meeting to order.

Presentation: EM American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Update

Ms. Cynthia Anderson, Director for the EM Recovery Act Program, provided the Chairs with an update on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). A copy of the presentation is available at

http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/sep10/EM%20SSAB%20Chairs%20Fall%202010.ARRA-Update_Anderson.pdf.

Ms. Anderson provided an overview of ARRA financial information, performance metrics, compliance milestone status, human capital issues, and general observations and lessons learned. The EM Recovery Act Program has been underway for more than 16 months. Of the \$6 billion received, EM has already obligated \$5.9 billion to contracts and spent over \$2.7 billion to date.

The program is on track to hit the \$3 billion mark by the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2010. The majority of remaining projects will be completed and the funding spent by September-December 2011. Ms. Anderson emphasized that safety is still a top priority for all ARRA projects. More than 24,000 workers in 12 states have benefited from the EM Recovery Act program. ARRA funding has also allowed EM to exceed its small business prime and subcontracting goals.

EM is currently faced with the challenges of ramping down the Recovery Act Program and transitioning its workforce. Approximately 10,000 workers who were hired under ARRA will need to transition into other employment opportunities. To the greatest extent possible, EM would like to retain this highly skilled workforce. EM field offices are working to develop site-specific transition plans and transition activities such as resume writing, creating job search tools, and retirement counseling. Other proposed activities include job fairs, outplacement services, and coordination with local and state agencies to identify additional employment opportunities. EM will provide stakeholders and the EM SSAB with additional information on workforce transition as it becomes available.

EM is actively engaging the contractor community to support workforce transition activities and has tasked its contractors to help workers who are facing layoffs to find other jobs. In the long-term, EM would like to develop Contract Employee Service Centers at all of the major sites, the goal of which would be to provide the ARRA workforce with access to corporate and commercial industry vacancies. Employees at smaller sites would have virtual access to the service centers, allowing them to upload their resumes for consideration by the various contractors' human resources offices.

EM has striven to provide an unprecedented level of transparency regarding the execution of the Recovery Act Program and ARRA projects. To learn more about the EM Recovery Act Program, participants were encouraged to access the resources listed below:

EM Recovery Act Program Office
 Website: www.em.doe.gov/emrecovery
 E-mail: emrecovery@em.doe.gov
 Phone: 202-586-2083

DOE Recovery Act Clearinghouse
 Website: <http://RecoveryClearinghouse.energy.gov>
 E-mail: RecoveryClearinghouse@hq.doe.gov
 Phone: 1-888-DOE-RCVY

Discussion

Ms. Susan Leckband, Chair of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB), asked whether there would be an opportunity for incomplete projects to continue into 2012 if funding is still available.

Ms. Anderson explained that many sites were able to identify efficiencies due to cost effective practices. Certain projects ended up being cheaper than originally expected, allowing for the creation of buy-back lists. Each site has been asked to put together a buy-back list and can use money from cost efficiencies to complete other work, continue to accelerate cleanup, and meet regulatory milestones.

Mr. Donald Bridges, Vice Chair of the Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) asked Ms. Anderson to describe an ideal transition plan for the completion of the ARRA.

Ms. Anderson suggested that the ideal transition plan is one wherein the contractors who benefited from the ARRA would help workers find other employment opportunities. EM stakeholders can help EM encourage the contract community to undertake this endeavor. EM's contract community should be able to leverage its connections with other companies to help find jobs; as good corporate citizens, contractors have a duty to the public to help minimize layoffs. Dr. Triay and Mr. Matt Rogers, Director for the DOE ARRA office, have communicated these expectations to EM's contractors and encouraged them to develop transition plans that will help prepare workers for new employment opportunities with other companies, agencies, etc.

Mr. Phelps asked if ARRA success stories and best practices are shared amongst sites throughout the complex, providing other field offices with opportunities to benefit from those practices.

Ms. Anderson explained that the ARRA news flashes are used to share that information and are posted on the ARRA website. The content for the news flashes often comes from the monthly program reviews at the sites.

Mr. Phelps asked Ms. Anderson to comment on the ARRA goals for transuranic (TRU) waste certification/shipment and TRU waste acceptance at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). EM is currently behind schedule in shipping the waste.

Ms. Anderson explained that EM does have a plan to get back on track and is working with Hanford and SRS to increase their TRU waste shipments and perform more characterization work in order to account for shipment shortfalls elsewhere in the complex, thereby helping WIPP meet its waste acceptance goals. Additionally, EM has built performance-based incentives into its contracts in order to encourage contractors to prepare more TRU waste for shipment to WIPP.

Mr. Ralph Young, Vice Chair of the Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB), commented that despite the unprecedented successes associated with the EM Recovery Act Program, there did not seem to be a lot of media coverage highlighting these achievements.

Ms. Anderson responded that the EM program is not often recognized in the national media for doing good work. She noted that Mr. Rogers shares EM's successes at meetings with the Vice President, who is in charge of the Recovery Act Program. Legally, the Recovery Act Program cannot place ads or articles in newspapers, but can produce the newsletters and news flashes. It is up to the public and the contractors to confirm that the work is being done well.

Top Board Issues/Concerns

The Chairs shared their boards' major concerns in order to better identify significant cross-complex issues.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)

- The depletion of ARRA funds and its effect on post-stimulus activities.
- Disposing of high-level waste (HLW) originally intended for transport to Yucca Mountain.

- Opening the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB) subcommittee meetings to the public.

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board (INL CAB)

- The post-ARRA workforce transition of contractors and sub-contractors.
- Establishing a path forward for a HLW repository that could accept sodium-bearing waste.
- Meeting the settlement agreement with regard to spent nuclear fuel (SNF) and legacy waste.
- The progress of the Blue Ribbon Commission.

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB)

- Disposing of HLW.
- Expanding WIPP.

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB)

- Meeting compliance deadlines outlined in DOE's Compliance Order on Consent between the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) and Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) once the ARRA funding stream ends.
- Deciding on a cleanup approach for the site's eventual remediation.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB)

- Long-term stewardship (LTS) for sites with ongoing missions.
- Maintaining compliance and meeting milestones once the ARRA funding stream ends.
- Environmental media risk – mercury, contaminant migration, buried uranium.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB)

- The post-ARRA workforce transition of contractors and subcontractors.
- Funding of the baseline.
- Preserving the site's cultural and historic contribution to the nuclear program.

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (PORTS SSAB)

- Determining if waste will be disposed of on or offsite as Decontamination & Decommissioning (D&D) begins.
- Recovering precious metals and constructing an on-site smelter.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB)

- Lack of a federal repository for processing and disposing of large amounts of HLW and plutonium.

Presentation: EM Waste and Materials Disposition Update

Mr. Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Technical and Regulatory Support, provided the Chairs with an update on EM Waste and Materials Disposition. A copy of the presentation is available at

<http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/sep10/EM%20SSAB%20Chairs%20Fall%202010.Waste%20Disposition%20Marcinowski.pdf>.

Mr. Marcinowski presented an overview of internal policy discussions and status updates on waste streams that EM manages. He offered a brief history of EM's current waste management system.

EM was established in 1989 to address the legacy contamination from DOE defense and research missions. The Federal Facility Compliance Act (FFCA) was enacted and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) issued a recommendation calling for safety improvements to low-level waste (LLW) facilities. In response, site treatment plans were formulated in accordance with the FFCA to address treatment and disposition of legacy stores of mixed low-level waste (MLLW), and a complex-wide review of waste management practices was completed in 1996. The Waste Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was published in 1997, and DOE Order 435.1, Radioactive Waste Management, was issued in 1999.

Currently, an update of DOE Order 435.1 is underway to incorporate lessons learned, institutionalize informal guidance documents, address changes in relevant laws, and account for advances in technology. EM recently performed a complex-wide review to assess the document. Though the bulk of the document is complete, additional fine tuning must take place in order to adequately address TRU waste and to clarify issues such as waste incidental to processing. A draft for public comment will likely be released in 2011.

Mr. Marcinowski provided several updates regarding LLW and MLLW disposition, the acceleration of TRU waste disposition, HLW and used fuel management, the Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) EIS, and the Mercury Management EIS. A 120-day public comment period will begin when the GTCC EIS report is completed and released. During that time, public hearings will take place at the sites that are under consideration. Though no firm timeline for public hearings has been established, it is likely that they will begin approximately 60 days after the GTCC EIS is released. DOE will not provide its report to Congress until the public comment period is completed. Mr. Marcinowski also discussed DOE's radioactive waste management priorities. DOE will be revising and working to improve its waste management policy and directives over the next several months.

Mr. Marcinowski reported that he has attended the two Blue Ribbon Commission Disposition Subcommittee meetings that have been held to date and is EM's primary contact on all matters related to the Blue Ribbon Commission. The subcommittee is debating disposal of HLW and SNF. Currently, the Blue Ribbon Commission is in the information-gathering stage and is on target to have a final report in January 2012.

Mr. Marcinowski concluded his presentation by stating that EM has a good working relationship with the states, regulators, and communities around the sites. These relationships and community interactions are an important part of the decision making process and will help EM determine waste disposition paths.

Discussion

Mr. Bridges asked if finding disposal sites was difficult and if there were any waste streams that did not have a specific disposal site.

Mr. Marcinowski responded that identifying new disposal sites is a long process. There is a new disposal cell at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) as well as a new commercial facility in Texas that are going through the regulatory and construction process. There are waste streams that do not currently have a place to go, but the characterization process will help to solve this problem. Depleted uranium (DU) disposal remains a challenge for EM.

Mr. Richard Snyder, Co-Chair of the Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (PORTS SSAB), asked for additional information regarding the depleted uranium waste that DOE expects to receive from the Portsmouth and Paducah conversion facilities.

Mr. Marcinowski explained that there is currently no disposition path for that waste, but DOE has been working with the sites and states to increase the on-site storage capabilities, capacity, and length of time that the depleted uranium oxide may be stored. Ultimately, there are three possible disposal sites: 1) Energy Solutions in Utah; 2) the NNSS; and 3) Waste Control Specialists. Each site has its own process to complete prior to being able to accept DU for disposal and it will likely be a year and a half before any of them completes that process.

Mr. Bridges requested clarification on how the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) rulemaking process would affect the waste disposition schedule, for instance at the Utah Energy Solutions facility.

Mr. Marcinowski responded that because the State of Utah has already initiated its own regulatory process to comply with future NRC requirements, Utah Energy Solutions will not have to wait for the NRC rulemaking in order to start dispositioning waste. The NRC agreed to work with Utah and assist it in developing its process and evaluation of performance assessment. NRC involvement will ensure that Utah's regulatory process conforms to the future rulemaking.

Dr. Walter Wegst, Chair of the Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB), asked if there were capacity concerns regarding the amount of TRU waste that could be stored at WIPP.

Mr. Marcinowski explained that EM believes there will be enough space to dispose of the entire amount of the existing TRU inventory at WIPP, including TRU buried at Hanford and the excess plutonium proposed from SRS. Waste characterization has shown anticipated volumes of TRU to be lower than initially expected. Some waste, for instance, has been characterized as MLLW, which, unlike TRU, does not require disposal at WIPP.

Mr. Bridges asked what part of the process was more difficult and time consuming: waste generation and shipment to WIPP, or receiving the waste at WIPP?

Mr. Marcinowski responded that although WIPP has been operating very close to its handling capacity since the ARRA program began, with approximately 30 shipments of contact-handled and five shipments of remote-handled TRU waste being shipped to WIPP per week, the most difficult

part is waste processing. Processing refers to waste retrieval, repackaging, and inclusion into the Carlsbad system for characterization and certification. Overall, however, DOE is on schedule.

Mr. Phelps asked Mr. Marcinowski to comment on Ms. Anderson's statement in a previous presentation that EM was behind on fulfilling its ARRA metrics for TRU waste.

Mr. Marcinowski explained that complex-wide, the amount of TRU waste being shipped to WIPP is very close to WIPP's handling capacity. When Ms. Anderson said that DOE is behind schedule, she meant that DOE is not meeting its milestones in terms of characterizing TRU waste. However, this performance metric is misleading because the reason EM is not meeting its metrics is due to the fact that much of the waste DOE thought would be TRU has assayed out as LLW. LLW does not have to be shipped to WIPP and can be disposed of elsewhere.

Ms. Anderson acknowledged that the metrics need to be modified in order to reflect this change in status.

Ms. Leckband asked if the Blue Ribbon Commission's draft report would be available for public review and comment when completed.

Mr. Marcinowski responded that he would follow-up with the Blue Ribbon Commission to find out.

Mr. Bridges asked about the public sentiment in locations being evaluated to site a mercury storage facility under the Mercury Management EIS.

Mr. Marcinowski responded that six out of the seven potential locations had very definitive opinions about a facility being sited in their area. The location in Texas, however, was cautiously optimistic about a facility. When DOE conducted the environmental assessment, there was no significant difference in the environmental impact at each location, and other considerations, such as public sentiment, were taken into account. Mr. Marcinowski affirmed that while people in most of the locations did not want a facility to be sited in their area, some did want a facility. In addition, there is currently not an acceptable disposition path for mercury and DOE's only choice is to provide for its long-term storage until the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) makes a determination that there is an acceptable way of disposing of it. The facility will be ready to begin accepting mercury in 2013.

Mr. Phelps inquired as to the status of the nickel recycling efforts.

Mr. Marcinowski responded by stating that a draft bill of sale, similar to a Request for Proposal (RFP), went out concerning the nickel inventories that DOE has at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) and Paducah. DOE has received responses, and they are currently being evaluated by the Source Evaluation Board, as part of the acquisition process.

Ms. Tami Sherwood, a member of the INL CAB, asked for an update on the sodium-bearing waste in the hot isostatic pressing (HIP) process. She also asked if there was a plan for the calcine waste stream.

Mr. Marcinowski stated that the sodium-bearing waste was still an outstanding issue as to how and where it would be dispositioned. He commented that it would be processed through the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit and stored on site while its waste disposition path was determined. As for the calcine, EM decided on the HIP process, and at this time, the site is actively working towards the next step in the project development, which is Critical Decision One (CD-1). A March 2011 deadline with the State has been set for this next step. Mr. Marcinowski also reported that he recently spoke with Mr. James Cooper, Acting Deputy Manager for the Idaho Cleanup Project, about this issue and that things were continuing to move forward.

Ms. Judy Clayton commented that the Paducah and Portsmouth boards are interested in using microwave technology to smelt contaminated materials in order to reduce waste volumes at the sites. Smelting the material would reduce the overall amount of waste that would need to be contained in a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) cell.

Mr. Marcinowski responded that he agreed with Ms. Clayton and the boards that DOE should consider the technology. He has been in touch with Mr. Bill Murphie, Manager of the DOE Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office, regarding the issue.

Ms. Leckband requested that Mr. Marcinowski organize a national workshop after the Blue Ribbon Commission issues its report in order to discuss waste disposition further. In the past, DOE held national workshops on waste disposition with the assistance of the League of Woman Voters that was very successful. Ms. Leckband believes that through workshops, DOE would be able to capture public values concerning waste disposition from not only the EM SSAB, but also from other interested members of the public and organizations. Public involvement would be helpful, as there will still be difficult decisions to make even after the Blue Ribbon Commission report is issued.

Mr. Marcinowski answered that EM would consider organizing a national workshop on the subject. There may be a way to merge what the federal government is doing with what the NRC does in the commercial sector.

Presentation: Footprint Reduction and Energy Parks

Mr. James Antizzo from the Office of D&D and Facility Engineering provided the Chairs with an update on Footprint Reduction and Energy Parks. A copy of the presentation is available at http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/sep10/EM%20SSAB%20Chairs%20Fall%202010.EPI-Briefing_Antizzo.pdf.

Mr. Antizzo began by stating that EM has been cleaning up sites for over 20 years. As the program continues to make progress, land and other assets will become available for future beneficiary uses, such as the development of energy parks. As demonstrated by the diagrams of SRS and Hanford used in Mr. Antizzo's presentation, the footprint reduction that EM can achieve through cleanup is significant. By 2015, EM plans to reduce its footprint by 90%.

Footprint reduction offers tremendous opportunities for local communities and the nation, especially with regard to critical energy, environmental, and economic issues. Mr. Antizzo clarified that DOE is not directing that energy parks be established at sites where land becomes available. Rather, the Department recommends that energy parks be considered as one of the many future use options.

Mr. Antizzo reviewed a number of assets that could be made available through footprint reduction. There is also a wide range of potential energy technologies (i.e. production, distribution, etc.) that may be appropriate for the sites, as well as multiple phases of development like commercial deployment and research and development. However, before pursuing these opportunities, DOE will need to address issues related to the processes, guidance, and potential evaluation criteria that need to be developed.

Local communities, private industry, labor groups, and political representatives have expressed interest in the Energy Park Initiative (EPI) concept; Mr. Antizzo listed a few examples of the entities that have approached EM with project proposals, including Energy Northwest for the Hanford site and a group of companies for a park at Portsmouth, Ohio. Additionally, EM has tried to reach out to the public and other groups through meetings and workshops. Dialogues with the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) have been particularly active.

Mr. Antizzo provided a brief overview of the draft FY 2011 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 5136), which includes language on energy parks. If passed, the legislation will authorize the Secretary of Energy to “facilitate development of energy parks on defense nuclear facility reuse property through the use of collaborative partnerships with State and local governments, the private sector, and community reuse organizations.” There are other, similar pieces of proposed legislation that relate to energy parks as well, demonstrating Congressional support for DOE’s energy park concept.

DOE’s greatest challenge in implementing the EPI concept will be to mobilize all of the players so that they develop best-in-class proposals for projects and clusters of projects that will support national objectives. Development of a sound, national framework within which the sites, local communities, and private sector can work is important to the EPI’s success. A framework will also provide the sites with standardized procedures, while ensuring that the initiative is flexible enough to be tailored to the local community needs and challenges.

Mr. Antizzo reported that EM has continued discussions with senior DOE management regarding the establishment of a Departmental EPI task force. He also summarized other potential tasks that are under consideration and may be pursued in the coming months.

Discussion

Dr. Wegst asked Mr. Antizzo to clarify EM’s definition of footprint reduction. He suggested that EM draw a distinction between footprint reductions that returns land to communities versus that which only decreases the physical size of EM programs within larger DOE sites.

Mr. Antizzo explained that EM’s definition of footprint reduction refers to the completion of cleanup. However, the disposition of the land and assets freed up by that cleanup will depend on

the situation at each site. For example, SRS may keep the entire site intact in order to support future missions. Hanford may be able to turn over more assets because it does not have any future EM missions. Mr. Antizzo noted that DOE could potentially lease land contained within the sites, and added that communities could pursue regional enterprises as well.

Mr. Bridges commented that although future use decisions will be site-specific, guidance from HQ may still be needed.

Mr. Antizzo noted that HQ will likely have to issue some guidance. However, the guidance may vary by site.

Mr. Phelps asked if DOE had taken action on the recommendation to name an energy park lead or project manager that would be charged with championing the initiative.

Mr. Antizzo reported that a decision regarding the establishment of a task force was still pending, but EM hopes that one will be created at the Departmental level in order to make the EPI a DOE-wide initiative.

Ms. Leckband asked when DOE would likely decide on the task force and whether it would include members of the public or stakeholder organizations.

Mr. Antizzo noted that DOE management has been supportive of the EPI concept, but he could not say when a decision would be made. The task force will likely be composed of representatives from the different DOE program offices and sites. However, there could also be advisory committees with individuals from the local communities, Tribal governments, private sector, academia, etc.

Mr. Young asked if there was a list of private industries that have signed up to be part of the EPI, or whether there were entrance criteria.

Mr. Antizzo stated that, so far, EM has held informal dialogues and has talked with groups like the ECA, EMAB, and EM SSAB. Once permission to establish a task force is received, DOE will be able to initiate other forms of communications, such as Federal Register Notices, or a webpage. Ultimately, the goal will be to empower communities and the private sector to work together.

Ms. Nicki Karst, a member of the INL CAB, asked if DOE had given consideration to the potential security issues associated with allowing private enterprises on federal properties.

Mr. Antizzo stated that many of those considerations will be site-specific. HQ may issue an overarching framework with policies and procedures, but many of the decisions regarding which assets will be made available and how will be left up to the sites.

Mr. Bridges asked whether private industry has expressed interest in the EPI.

Mr. Antizzo reported that the industry representatives EM has talked to are very interested in the possibilities for development. DOE's challenge will be to protect the environment and meet

regulatory requirements while still making assets and development opportunities attractive to private industry; much will depend on how the opportunities are structured.

Ms. Pamela Henline, a member of the NNM CAB, asked Mr. Antizzo to comment on the capital needed to implement the EPI and recruit businesses. She also noted that there may be initiatives elsewhere in the government focused on energy independence.

Mr. Antizzo agreed that some seed money will be necessary in order to implement the EPI, and that the proposed legislation requests several million dollars in initial funding. However, DOE will need to depend on the private sector to invest the sums of money needed to fund many of the projects that he discussed. Mr. Antizzo also stated that DOE is reaching out to other agencies with similar programs, such as the Department of Defense and the EPA Repowering America Initiative, in order to leverage the government's existing resources.

Ms. Brennan asked whether the issue of not listing the tribes in the EPI legislation had been raised.

Mr. Antizzo explained that the language in the legislation was developed on Capitol Hill, not by DOE. The tribes are certainly one of the major parties that DOE will want to work with going forward. EM plans to meet with the State and Tribal Government Working Group during its next meeting in November 2010.

Presentation: Land Use Case Study for Technical Area-21

Mr. David Rhodes, Supervisory Federal Project Director for Environmental Restoration Projects and the D&D Team at LASO, provided an update on the Land Use Case Study for Technical Area-21 (TA-21). The case study weighed the options of using residential versus industrial cleanup standards. A copy of the presentation is available at http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/sep10/EM%20SSAB%20Chairs%20Fall%202010.TA-21_LASO_David%20Rhodes.pdf.

Mr. Rhodes provided an overview of the various regulations driving EM's cleanup and land transfer mission at LANL and at TA-21 specifically. While DOE is the regulator for radiological controls, the solid waste regulations are issued by NMED. In accordance with DOE's Compliance Order on Consent with the State of New Mexico, EM must cleanup TA-21 and transfer several tracts of land back to the County of Los Alamos and to the Department of Interior (DOI), in trust for the Pueblo of San Ildefonso. Some tracts of land, however, will remain under DOE authority and will not be transferred because of their contents. Each area that will be remediated is listed in the Order, along with expected completion dates; the last of which is December 2015. If DOE misses these dates, it is subject to a fine from the State. The Order does not specify to which standard each parcel must be cleaned. For those tracts of land that will be remediated to a standard less than residential (i.e. industrial), DOE must receive concurrence from the State. Additionally, the Order specifies that deed restrictions limiting future use will need to be included on any transferred land that is cleaned only to the industrial use standard.

The land transfer process from DOE to the County or DOI (in trust for the Pueblo) includes several steps. After a DOE Corrective Measures Evaluation or Investigation Report is released with

recommendations for soil remediation in a given tract of land, the NMED selects the remedy, and it is subsequently executed by the site cleanup contractor, LANS. LASO, the DOE site office, then submits a Remedy Completion Report to NMED, which is reviewed by NMED and either accepted or rejected. LASO then prepares the tract of land for conveyance and sends a letter to NMED informing it of the new status. NMED further evaluates release of the land and whether or not it might need additional remediation or sampling. After LASO receives a letter from NMED concurring that the land should be released, LASO executes the conveyance.

As for TA-21, DOE is currently finishing its Investigation Reports. Negotiations will take place with the County to determine the standard to which these parcels will be remediated (i.e. residential or industrial). Remediating the land to residential standards can be much more expensive than cleaning it up to industrial standards. The site welcomes feedback from citizens' groups and other stakeholders about this topic and how environmental and economic priorities can be maximized.

Mr. Rhodes' presentation included a map of the land conveyances, past and future, as well as the status of adjacent tracts of land. Because some of the remaining parcels within TA-21 were used as disposal sites, they will be more complex and costly to remediate than adjacent tracts that have already been cleaned. After EM has completed its cleanup, it will implement an LTS monitoring program across the entire site. It will also conduct ongoing and annual examinations and sampling of soil and groundwater at the properties that were once owned by DOE.

Discussion

Mr. Bridges asked why the land transfer to Los Alamos County is taking place.

Mr. Rhodes explained that there is a scarcity of land for town expansion due to the topography of the area and the proximity of some of the DOE facilities to the town itself. Residents of Los Alamos County think some of the DOE facilities are too close. TA-21, for instance, is located just outside of the town's boundaries, next to some of the town's businesses.

Ms. Leckband asked if the released land would be subjected to Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) or CERCLA five-year reviews to ensure that DOE performed its remedies as expected.

Mr. Rhodes responded that he would research the question and report back to Ms. Leckband¹.

Dr. Wegst asked about access management for segments of land that will be transferred to the Pueblo while remaining surrounded by DOE land.

Mr. Rhodes responded that access would be provided through DOE's controlled areas and that some institutional controls on the DOE land would remain.

¹ LANL is regulated under RCRA and will perform post-clean-up / post-closure monitoring as specified in 40CFR264.117 throughout the compliance period. The compliance period is defined as 30 years after closure without specifying a periodicity for sample types. LANL will be developing these post-closure monitoring plans for LTS that will take over from clean-up operations. The LTS plans will include the appropriate sampling frequencies for the specifics of the clean-up areas. CERCLA does not apply to LANL activities.

Mr. Phelps asked what entity determines the cleanup standards for these areas.

Mr. Rhodes explained that this is a complicated process involving conversations with both the State and Los Alamos County. Land surrounding areas that will remain under DOE ownership are more likely to be cleaned to industrial standards, because homes would likely not be built so close to DOE facilities. However, there is an ongoing discussion and negotiation about what the community's desires are. DOE may explore the option of splitting some parcels of land in order to cleanup parts of the parcel to residential standards while allowing the other parts to remain at the industrial standard level.

Ms. Leckband commented that Hanford could not find commercial interest for land it had remediated to only industrial standards.

Mr. Rhodes acknowledged her point, but stated that Los Alamos is different from Hanford in two ways. First, the County already has plans for the land that will be transferred back to it. Second, the topography of the land surrounding Los Alamos creates land scarcity, and there is pressure to utilize almost all available land.

Mr. Bridges commented that industrial standards are acceptable unless the County indicates a strong desire otherwise.

Ms. Leckband stated that if DOE has the opportunity, it should clean up the land to residential standards because the land might be desired for residences in the future.

Mr. Phelps pointed out that the County will continue to engage in long-term economic development and land-use planning in order to explore all options for cleanup and make an informed recommendation to DOE.

Mr. Rhodes responded that the County had expressed interest in creating an industrial park in the area, and that thus far, it has been very amenable to DOE's proposed use and cleanup standards.

Ms. Brennan suggested that the Chairs may want to schedule a discussion on risk-based priorities and where they fit into EM's overall priorities.

Mr. Donald Ami, an Intergovernmental Program Specialist at LASO, commented that much of TA-21 is recognized as a traditional use area of the San Ildefonso Pueblo. The Pueblo filed a claim under the Indian Claims Commission Act several years ago, and the settlement of this case resulted in some land, including a very small piece of DOE land, being turned over to the Pueblo. Most of the land came from parcels that were formerly part of the National Forest.

Presentation: EM Budget Update

Mr. Barry Gaffney, Acting Director for the Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis, provided the Chairs with an update on the EM planning and budget process. A copy of the presentation is available at

http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/sep10/EM%20SSAB%20Chairs%20Fall%202010.Budget%20Update%20Barry_Gaffney.pdf.

Mr. Gaffney provided an overview of EM's planning and budget priorities, funding history, and the status of the FY 2011 and FY 2012 budgets. Ms. Joann Luczak, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Office of Program Planning and Budget, is scheduled to follow-up with the EM SSAB concerning the development of milestones and the stakeholder involvement process. Mr. Gaffney discussed the FY 2011 budget request, its goals, and new project structure, including plans to improve project management and restructure the EM portfolio. He also discussed the FY 2012 cleanup approach and gave a strategic planning overview that included the current strategic planning status and key assumptions made by EM.

In formulating program priorities, EM attempts to achieve the greatest risk reduction for the radioactive content. For this reason, after safety, which is first and foremost, EM places highest priority on its tank waste mission (see presentation for other cleanup priorities). These priorities are also reflected on the state funding distribution map for the FY 2011 budget request. The states of Washington and South Carolina lead the sites in funds requested at more than \$1 billion each.

From 2001-2010, EM has spent over \$70 billion towards its cleanup mission, which has allowed it to close its Rocky Flats site, Ohio sites, and almost finish the design phase of the WTP at Hanford. In addition, EM has received approximately \$6 billion in funding from ARRA, which has allowed it to clean up facilities and hazardous materials years ahead of schedule. With the \$6 billion ARRA investment, EM estimates it has achieved approximately \$7 billion worth of cost savings and cost avoidances, a 116% return on investment.

As for the FY 2011 budget, EM-HQ is directing the field to anticipate a potential three-month to year-long Continuing Resolution (CR) for its budget appropriation. The field should also be cautious about committing too much funding in any project until the Appropriation is finalized. This is because the House of Representatives was dissatisfied with DOE's conveyance of the message about the cancellation of the Yucca Mountain project. As a result, the House has included a legislative restriction on DOE in its appropriations bill that would not permit transfer of more than \$2 million in 2011 without its approval.

Mr. Gaffney also reported that both the House and Senate decreased the amount of funding DOE had requested be directed to work at Portsmouth. This reduction is likely to be included in the final appropriations language, because a new funding source would be required to support the Portsmouth work and still needs authorization. The Administration had requested that the increase in funding for D&D come from reinstating the uranium enrichment D&D fund for a period of 15 years. The fund would be supported by renewing a fee on nuclear utilities for a debt the industry feels it has paid. The appropriating committees in Congress indicated that should the administration wish to pursue reinstating the fund, it should work with the authorization committees, in whose domain this issue belongs.

As for the FY 2012 strategic planning overview, EM is striving to reduce its footprint in order to decrease the long-term cost of its projects and to meet the scheduled completion dates for cleanup. Overall, EM has estimated total costs of between \$272-324 billion for its mission-

related activities. EM is focusing on optimizing tank waste processing by leveraging science and technology to drive down these long-term costs.

Discussion

Ms. Henline asked if LANL would receive a portion of the \$25 million requested in FY 2011 for groundwater remediation technology investments.

Mr. George Rael, Manager of Environmental Operations at Los Alamos, responded by stating that a call for papers would take place across the complex for this type of work. He noted that a group at LANL is currently examining more advanced modeling that would enhance groundwater remediation processes. This group will likely participate in the call for papers and be able to receive or at least compete for part of the \$25 million that was requested.

Mr. Young inquired as to whether EM would be applying lessons learned through the ARRA work processes to improve upon project management and restructuring of the EM portfolio.

Mr. Gaffney responded that many of the ARRA ideas and processes that were developed for that work are being brought into the budget and planning processes for FY 2010 and will guide how EM executes its entire program in FY 2011.

Dr. Wegst asked how the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication facility at SRS relates to EM's strategic planning for FY 2012.

Mr. Gaffney explained that because the facility is a National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) project, it is not included in EM's scope.

Ms. Clayton asked if hotel costs incurred by EM have been increasing over the past 10 years, taking away from EM's budget to perform cleanup work.

Mr. Gaffney said that EM was actively working to reduce the "hotel" or maintenance and security costs associated with its pending work. One way of doing this is through Footprint Reduction, especially at Hanford and SRS, which can eliminate some of the services that facilities at those sites currently require.

Ms. Henline mentioned that the flat level of baseline funding for the EM program has prevented it from meeting some of its regulatory obligations and has forced it to pay fines instead of using the funding for further cleanup work. She asked what EM planned to do about this problem.

Mr. Gaffney responded that it is a difficult situation, and the most DOE can do is to help Congress and the President understand its position and the dilemma it faces.

Mr. Bridges inquired about what might happen in the out-years if the budget is reduced to help pay down the federal deficit.

Mr. Gaffney explained that the administration has requested that federal agencies decrease their FY 2011 requests by 5%, but how that reduction would be applied to individual programs has yet to be determined. If the economy improves, the pressure to decrease the spending budget of the federal agencies may ease. It is likely, however, that budgets will be tight for the next few years.

DOE-HQ News and Views

Ms. Brennan announced that Ms. Melissa Nielson, Director of the Office of Public and Intergovernmental Accountability, was not present because she was attending the EMAB meeting. She explained that EMAB is a single board made up of technical experts that reports to the Assistant Secretary for EM on corporate issues.

There were a number of follow-up items from the April 28-29, 2010, Chairs' Meeting in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, regarding the budget. Ms. Brennan reported that the EM Office of Budget will issue planning guidance to the sites in the February-March 2011 timeframe to ensure proper time is allowed for the EM SSAB local boards to engage with their respective sites on critical activities, such as strategic planning, budgeting, compliance requirements, and prioritization of site activities. This effort will culminate in the development of site priority lists, which include the planning of out-year profiles for a rolling five-year time frame. EM is required by the Chief Financial Officer to submit an integrated priority list (IPL) to initiate the budget process each FY; the IPL reflects a five-year strategic plan and there is no EM effort underway to develop a formal five-year strategic plan separate from the IPL. DOE is currently updating its programmatic strategic plan, but it is not known when that will be released. Ms. Luczak and Ms. Connie Flohr, Director of the Office of Budget, will be holding a separate conference call with the Chairs October 5, 2010, to discuss this guidance.

Ms. Brennan stated that she wanted to address several miscellaneous items that have come up over the past six months. Members, who are up for reappointment, as well as those being nominated for appointment, will now be asked to fill out a universal application. The site staffs are responsible for managing recusals and need to have the latest information from members regarding employment and connections to DOE. The DDFOs are required to ensure that there is no inappropriate domination by special interests. It has been suggested that the discussion of recusal and potential conflicts of interest be broached at each local board's annual retreat.

Going forward, the fall EM SSAB Chairs' Meeting will be held in October rather than September, due to conflicts with end of the FY planning and the annual budget reporting process. A planning committee was established for the spring EM SSAB Chairs' Meeting, which will be held April 12-14 in Las Vegas.

The Chairs agreed to hold their next bi-monthly conference call on December 2, 2010.

EM SSAB Product Discussion

Ms. Leckband noted that each of the Chairs received a copy of the proposed recommendation that EMAB open its subcommittee meetings when possible. The recommendation, which is similar to one recently approved by the HAB, encouraged DOE to comply with the Presidential

direction for open and transparent government processes. Except when meetings must be closed as permitted by law (e.g. for national security, personal privacy, or criminal investigation), all such meetings should be open to the public. When a meeting is closed, rationale for its closure should be clearly explained.

After a short discussion, the Chairs tabled the proposed recommendation until after Dr. Triay spoke with the Chairs the next morning.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Scott Kovak, a member of Nuclear Watch New Mexico, commented that DOE is making an effort to streamline the oversight of its contractors. He recommended that the approval of commercial disposal sites incorporate a public approval component. Currently, the Waste Control Specialists site in Texas is a commercial disposal site being considered for use as a LLW site for EM waste. Mr. Kovak recommended that DOE stop using unlined trenches for the disposal of LLW across the complex. He asked that EM consider not funding new weapons construction projects until after remediation is complete at the various sites across the complex.

Ms. Susan Gordon, Director of the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, commented that the issue of land transfers at LANL is of great concern to the organization. She recalled that the Mound site in Ohio was closed with cooperation from a community reuse organization that wanted the land cleaned up to industrial standards. Originally, restrictions were included in the deed to the land that prohibited digging, gardens, and the construction of childcare facilities. Several years after the site was handed over to the city, a community member of the reuse organization spotted plans for a childcare center to be built on site. Ms. Gordon noted that capturing the history of a contaminated site and the dangers that remain with an industrial-level cleanup is important. She suggested that the sites need to be cleaned up to residential-level standards so that in the future no one is at risk for exposure to contaminants.

Mr. David McCoy, Executive Director of Citizen Action New Mexico, commented that the organization monitors waste disposal and weapons issues at Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), LANL and Kirtland Air Force Base. The use of stainless steel well screens, bentonite clay and other organic drilling fluids was found at each of these sites. Mr. McCoy was previously involved with writing the notice of intent to sue the State of Idaho and DOE for continued operation of the calcine facility and the WERF LLW incinerators on the basis of not having hazardous waste permits. Mr. McCoy was also involved in the writing of technical documents regarding the advanced test reactor facility. He cautioned the INL CAB to keep an eye on the reactor. Mr. McCoy noted that at SNL there is a similar reactor, called the annular core research reactor. He raised concerns about the building's safety during an earthquake. Regarding groundwater monitoring wells, Mr. McCoy commented that DOE, SNL, EPA and the NMED knew for at least 15 years that all of the wells, with the exception of one, were in the wrong location. He asked how DOE could claim there was no evidence of contamination when there was not an adequate monitoring network in place to detect it. Mr. McCoy stated that at the LANL hazardous waste permit hearings, Dr. Michael Barcelona testified to the inadequacies of the groundwater monitoring system for contamination located beneath TA-54.

Ms. Joni Arends, Executive Director of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, commented that she was concerned about the scheduling of the EMAB and EM SSAB public meetings simultaneously. She indicated that the EM SSAB Chairs should be present at the EMAB meeting and vice versa. Ms. Arends encouraged the Chairs to object to the simultaneous scheduling of the EM SSAB and EMAB meetings.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Leckband reported that she was unable to make a public comment at the EMAB meeting because they were running behind schedule. She indicated that she still planned to address her concerns with Dr. Triay the following morning.

Ms. Brennan encouraged the Chairs to attend the remainder of the EMAB meeting.

The meeting was recessed at 4:07 p.m. MDT and reconvened at 8:00 a.m. MDT on September 16, 2010.

Thursday, September 16, 2010

Opening Remarks

Mr. Bishop welcomed participants to the second day of the meeting.

Presentation: EM Program Update

Dr. Inés Triay, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, provided the Chairs with an update on the Office of Environmental Management. A copy of the presentation is available at http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/sep10/EM%20SSAB%20Chairs%20Fall%202010.EM1%20Triay_09-16-10.pdf

Dr. Triay briefly reviewed EM's mission statement and Secretary Chu's key guiding management principles for DOE. Dr. Triay highlighted the need to treat EM's people as the program's greatest asset and the need to maintain a safe, secure, and compliant posture throughout the complex. EM's greater programmatic priorities are based on risk, which is determined by the amount of radioactivity per unit volume; activities that present the greatest risk are given top priority. She indicated that other factors are taken into account when identifying program priorities, as well. EM recognizes the need to develop a more holistic approach to prioritization that accounts for and balances other factors such as regulatory compliance and business case scenarios, in order to optimize the use of the program's resources.

EM's Journey to Excellence Roadmap will lay out the goals and strategies for achieving the program's full potential. The Roadmap will serve as a blue print for how EM does business and should transcend changes in political leadership by providing a solid, enduring foundation from which future Assistant Secretaries can launch their initiatives. The EM SSAB was encouraged to

provide feedback and assistance in the development and implementation of the Journey to Excellence Roadmap.

EM's Journey to Excellence is structured around four program goals:

1. Complete tank waste treatment facilities in a timely manner
2. Reduce the lifecycle costs and accelerate the cleanup of the Cold War legacy
3. Complete disposition of 90% legacy TRU waste by 2015
4. Reduce the EM footprint: 40% by 2011, leading to 90% by 2015

EM's programmatic success depends on the achievement of three critical management goals:

1. Improve safety performance
2. Improve project and contract management
3. Demonstrate excellence in management and leadership

Dr. Triay concluded her presentation by identifying focus areas for the EM SSAB to pursue in FY 2011: Budget Priorities, Waste Disposition Strategies, Footprint Reduction and Future Land Use, Public Involvement and EM's Journey to Excellence Roadmap.

Discussion

Mr. Bridges asked what information the Journey to Excellence Roadmap contained.

Dr. Triay explained that the Journey to Excellence Roadmap is a 30-page document that contains guiding principles to establish a framework for decision-making, as well as program and management goals.

Ms. Shelly Cimon, an alternate member of the HAB, commented that the transition from Management and Operating contracts to incentivized contracts has created a fundamental paradigm change in the way Hanford does business. She asked for Dr. Triay's thoughts on the transition and its impact.

Dr. Triay responded that at Hanford there are two contractors, one to construct the waste treatment plant and one to manage the tank farms. The management construct at Hanford moving forward will consist of a federal project director and two deputy federal project directors--one for construction and one for commissioning. Dr. Triay explained that to achieve excellence in management and leadership, EM will either go back to using site-wide contractors or embrace its role as an integrator for multiple contractors.

Ms. Leckband commented that the HAB provided EM with advice concerning openness of EMAB subcommittee meetings, but that the Chairs decided not to send it forward until they heard what Dr. Triay had to say on the matter. She noted that each of the local boards' subcommittee meetings is open to the public, a practice that should be adopted by the subcommittees of the EMAB, as is possible. Ms. Leckband pointed out that there are many subject matter experts at the sites who could prove valuable to the EMAB's subcommittees.

Dr. Triay responded that Ms. Nielson and Ms. Terri Lamb, EMAB's DFO, will be working to address the issue of opening the subcommittee meetings. She agreed that it is important to receive advice from experts at the sites who have excellent ideas on how to proceed with the cleanup at the sites.

Ms. Leckband noted that the previous day she suggested to Mr. Marcinowski that there be a national meeting on waste disposition as soon as the Blue Ribbon Commission report is released. The meeting would cover two of the EM SSAB's four focus areas: Waste Disposition and Public Involvement.

Dr. Triay stated that she and Mr. Marcinowski would engage the Blue Ribbon Commission's DFO, Mr. Timothy Frazier, to advocate for a national meeting on waste disposition.

Mr. Phelps asked how the EM SSAB was doing with regard to the four focus areas, and if there was anywhere in particular they needed to sharpen their efforts.

Dr. Triay responded that the EM SSAB has done an outstanding job addressing the identified focus areas in the past, but she would also like the board to focus on the Journey to Excellence Roadmap. The local EM SSAB boards are an integral part of the community and can provide a unique perspective on the Journey to Excellence Roadmap. She encouraged the Chairs to engage their colleagues at the site level and to help develop a culture of excellence in EM at all levels of the organization, including contractors. EM works with 10 major contractors throughout the complex and can appeal for realignment of their corporate culture to achieve EM goals within the context of the Roadmap.

Mr. Young commented that the Administration is under a lot of pressure regarding the ARRA program. He pointed out that EM has managed the ARRA money exceptionally well, but has yet to be praised publicly from an Administrative level.

Dr. Triay stated that Mr. Rogers has been an advocate for the EM Recovery Act Program and has elevated its successes to all levels, not only in DOE, but within the Administration as well.

Ms. Cimon expressed concern about the legacy TRU waste at Hanford. Seven burial grounds at the site have no records at all, and, a few weeks ago, a backhoe operator hit a chunk of SNF. Other parts of the trenches are actually on top of old effluent ponds. She pointed out that adequate characterization of waste remains an issue at the site.

Dr. Triay responded that Mr. Matt McCormick, Manager of the Richland Operations Office, has been working with Mr. Marcinowski on this particular topic. She reported that EM is working in earnest to figure out exactly how to characterize the waste at the appropriate level to assess the risk of retrieving it as opposed to leaving it under a safe configuration.

Ms. Cimon stated that she learned there is going to be a larger allocation of dollars for technology development. She asked if EM was going to issue calls for proposals for specific needs.

Dr. Triay stated that the Secretary and the Under Secretary feel strongly about investing in technology development and deployment. The National Academy of Sciences reviewed EM's roadmap and proposed a path forward with respect to tank waste and groundwater, the two areas with the biggest technological gaps. EM will be working with the Under Secretary during September in order to be poised for the increases in the technology development investments that will begin in 2012. The FY 2011 budget includes roughly \$60 million for tank waste and about \$30 million for everything else.

Ms. Cimon asked if the increase in funding will support the deep vadose zone initiative that Mr. McCormick has introduced at Hanford.

Dr. Triay responded that EM is looking at the technology development and deployment program as one program, including that for cleanup within the deep vadose zone at the Hanford site and elsewhere.

Round Robin: Top Three Site-Specific Issues, Accomplishments, and Board Activities

The Chairs were provided an opportunity to share the current top three issues facing their sites as well as significant local board accomplishments and activities. A copy of the presentation is available at

http://www.em.doe.gov/PDFS/ssab/sep10/EM%20SSAB%20Chairs%20Fall%202010.Top_Issues.pdf

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) – Edward Juarez and Robert Olson

Issues:

1. Budget and associated milestone issues.
 - Future budgets will be inadequate to support the site's cleanup commitments and goals in a timely manner.
 - Deteriorating facilities need to be removed to enhance remediation at ORNL and the Y-12 National Security Complex.
 - Funding has declined in recent years while scope has increased, which is affecting milestones. Regulatory disputes have arisen over milestone commitments.
2. Environmental media risk.
 - Large amounts of mercury used in the separations process at Y-12 remain unaccounted for and have traveled into the lower East Fork Poplar Creek.
 - Containments may have migrated off site into Melton Valley.
 - The ORNL central stack has the potential to produce hazardous emissions.
 - Bear Creek Valley contains 40 million pounds of buried uranium.
3. LTS at ongoing mission sites.
 - Contaminated areas of the site will require LTS with the active involvement of DOE and the oversight stewards.
 - DOE has no long-term strategic plan or guidance for stewardship at ongoing mission sites.
 - There is no future landlord participation in LTS planning.

Accomplishments: The ORSSAB planned and hosted the April 28-29, 2010, Chairs' Meeting in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The board redesigned the ORSSAB exhibit at the American Museum of Science and Energy in Oak Ridge.

Major Board Activities: The board planned and held its annual retreat.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) – Donald Bridges

Issues:

1. Resolve major legacy of nuclear weapons production at the SRS by treating and disposing of liquid waste and closing tanks.
 - Safely treat and disposition 37 million gallons of radioactive liquid waste and close 49 additional underground storage tanks.
 - Execution of the Lifecycle Liquid Waste Disposition System Plan is underway to accelerate tank closures and utilize key technology deployments.
 - Development of a system plan to close 22 tanks in 8 years (FY 2018). Rev.14 (FY 2022) and upgrade the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) capacity from 325 to 400 canisters per year in 2012.
 - Salt Waste Processing Facility is scheduled to be operational by May 2013.

2. Consolidation and disposition of plutonium.
 - Discussion of plutonium storage and disposition plans at the SRS date back to the mid-1990s. The board first made a recommendation concerning this issue in 1997.
 - In December 2003, the DNFSB urged DOE to expedite the development of a complete, well-considered plan for the disposition of all excess plutonium to preclude unnecessary extended storage of plutonium at SRS.
 - DOE needs to finalize plans for the disposition to preclude unnecessary extended storage of plutonium.
 - A surplus plutonium disposition supplemental EIS public scoping meeting was held August 17, 2010.

3. Lack of a federal repository for nuclear waste disposition and storage.
 - Waste content of the DWPF canisters has been formulated based on the waste acceptance criteria for Yucca Mountain.
 - Communities surrounding SRS believe that the site will be a de-facto long-term waste storage site if a federal repository for nuclear waste does not become operational.
 - The State of South Carolina has been promised by DOE that the state will not be used for long-term storage of plutonium or other HLW.
 - Continuing to store waste at multiple sites around the country is a safety and security concern.
 - Credibility and costs remain issues. To study another federal waste repository to the same degree as Yucca Mountain would take decades to complete. Continuing to store waste at multiple sites around the country could be a safety/security concern. Citizens have not been provided the technical or scientific basis for cancellation of Yucca Mountain.

Accomplishments: The SRS CAB recommended that DOE support the SRS Superfund Job Training Initiative (SJTI) created by EPA. The objective of the SRS SJTI is to support under-served, under-employed, and unemployed individuals by providing training for marketable trade, professional and interpersonal life skills, and entry-level environmental remediation or SRS-related job opportunities. Eleven fast track technical trainees began work at SRS as RADCon inspectors in June 2010. An additional 28 candidates began in July 2010.

Major Board Activities: The SRS CAB improved and increased participation in video conferences for subcommittee meetings. The board participated in a number of public meetings throughout the community with representatives from the Government Accountability Office, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Savannah River National Laboratory, Savannah River Remediation, DOE, and EPA.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) – Susan Leckband

Issues:

1. Groundwater characterization and potential remediation of the vadose zone.
 - Draft Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS identified groundwater impacts.
2. RCRA site-wide permit.
3. Post ARRA cleanup budget.
 - Potential baseline funding reduction in 2012 and beyond.
 - Workforce transition of contractors and sub-contractors.
 - Loss of cleanup momentum.

Accomplishments: The HAB's Chair and Vice Chair met with Mr. Daniel Poneman, Deputy Secretary of Energy, as well as Dr. Triay, the EMAB Tank Waste Subcommittee, and DOE field office managers. Additionally, the Blue Ribbon Commission visited the site and heard testimony from the HAB Chair, among others.

Major Board Activities: The HAB's Public Involvement subcommittee has an ongoing dialogue with Public Information Officers from the Tri-Party Agencies on the Public Involvement Strategic Plan, Community Relations Plan in the Tri-Party Agreement, and public meetings and workshops.

Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board (INL CAB) –Willie Preacher

Issues:

1. Budget and post-ARRA funding.
 - Continuance of full base program funding in light of ARRA completion.
 - Extension of ARRA funding until 2015 based on the amount of remaining cleanup and compliance with the Idaho Settlement Agreement.
2. HLW repository and stakeholder involvement.
 - Final disposition of calcine and sodium-bearing waste as outlined in the Idaho Settlement Agreement.
 - Final disposition of 400 metric tons of SNF stored at INL.
 - The site would like to explore other treatment processes comparable to vitrification.

3. Funding long-term liabilities/unfunded liabilities.
 - Long-term surveillance and monitoring of the site.
 - Ensure funding for liability transfers.

Accomplishments: The board passed three recommendations in FY 2010.

Major Board Activities: The INL CAB Chair and Vice Chair provided comments to the Blue Ribbon Commission regarding on site waste. The board also conducted a new member orientation.

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) – Walter Wegst

Issues:

1. Continued characterization of groundwater contamination at Pahute Mesa and public water supplies for Beatty and the Amargosa and Oasis Valleys.
2. Mixed Waste Disposal Unit/Mixed Waste Storage Unit (MWSU).
 - The existing MLLW site is scheduled to close by the end of 2010.
 - MWSU application has been submitted to State of Nevada
3. Membership/Retention.
 - The test site's activities have no direct impact on Las Vegas residents.
 - Rural communities closer to the site are sparsely populated and length of recruitment process can be discouraging.
 - There is more public interest in NNSA activities than EM activities.

Accomplishments: The board is using a six-foot tall display panel and information booklets to promote outreach.

Major Board Activities: The NSSAB is considering restructuring the Board with reduction of committees to address attendance issues, improve educational opportunities, and decrease costs.

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) – Ralph Phelps

Issues:

1. EM should provide full baseline funding (base program) for FY 2012 and beyond to meet the cleanup schedule of DOE's Compliance Order on Consent with the State of New Mexico. The deadline for completion of these milestones is 2015.
2. Continue development of an integrated site-wide Surface Water and Groundwater Monitoring Program that incorporates best management practices for new wells.
3. Complete cleanup of Material Disposal Area (MDA) B and the continued cleanup of building TA-21, TA-54 and MDA-G with the aid of ARRA funding.
 - Remove TRU waste from MDA-G and continue remediation.

Accomplishments: The NNM CAB has actively participated in safeguarding the water supply in Los Alamos and communities reliant on the Rio Grande Basin.

Major Board Activities: The board continues outreach to the local communities and the eight Northern Indian Pueblos, one of which shares a boundary with LANL. The NNM CAB's membership continues to grow and diversify.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB) – Judy Clayton and Ralph Young

Issues:

1. Budget and post-ARRA funding.
 - Loss of trained and talented workers gained through the ARRA program.
 - Negative effects on base operations and enforceable milestones.
 - Balance to maintain worker health and safety.
2. Preserve the cultural and historical significance of the site.
 - Explain how Paducah fit into the overall Manhattan Project.
3. Increase the community engagement process with major decisions pending in 2011.
 - Construction and location of a CERCLA cell on or off site.

Accomplishments: With the approval of a membership package currently under review at DOE-HQ, the Paducah CAB will be at capacity with 18 members.

Major Board Activities: The Paducah CAB co-sponsored an “Eco-Fair” with DOE, May 11-12, 2010, that drew over 500 area sixth-graders from four middle schools to the West Kentucky Wildlife Management Area. The students enjoyed environment-related demonstrations presented by Murray State University, Paducah Power System, Kentucky Fish and Wildlife, Paducah Remediation Services, the U.S. Coast Guard, and Greater Paducah Sustainability.

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (PORTS SSAB) – Richard Snyder and Val Francis

Issues:

1. Ensure that the new D&D cleanup contractor adheres to its commitments.
 - Create jobs and retain ARRA workers when possible.
 - Provide opportunities to small businesses.
 - Ensure accelerated cleanup of the site.
2. A large volume of metals will be generated as a result of the D&D of the process buildings.
 - The PORTS SSAB is interested in DOE's stance on recycling to include asset metals reclamation and how waste minimization can be integrated into a path forward on waste disposition.
3. Understanding and defining EM's role in the Energy Parks Initiative.

Accomplishments: An educational series has been conducted by the Future Land Use subcommittee on planning and conceptualization that will help the subcommittee better understand the landscape, use mapping and use planning when deciding the future use of the site.

Major Board Activities: The PORTS SSAB visited the Mound Facility and interacted with political leaders. The visit helped educate the board on goals that needs to be reached during cleanup.

Significant Issues from Presentations and Discussions

Mr. Willie Preacher, Vice Chair of the INL CAB, asked if the HAB has any tribal members.

Ms. Leckband responded that the HAB included members of the Confederated Tribe of the Umatilla, the Yakama Nation, and the Nez Perce.

Ms. Clayton commented that the loss of resources, specifically steel, used to build the K-25 facility was very disconcerting to her. She asked if similar activities were occurring at other sites.

Mr. Robert Olson, a member of the ORSSAB, clarified that the problem at K-25 and K-33 is that there a tiny amount of contamination is present, and it costs more to decontaminate the materials than to buy them new. He pointed out that the segregation of metals is expensive. At ORNL some materials go in a CERCLA cell, and others go in an ordinary landfill.

Ms. Clayton responded that if there is a need for these metals in the nuclear industry, they could be used instead of using our virgin materials. Microwave technology has the capability of handling radioactivity that can target the metals individually.

Mr. Val Francis, Vice Chair of the PORTS SSAB, explained that sites like Portsmouth and Paducah need to use of every bit of land. He emphasized the sites' need for DOE support on recycling rather than burying contaminated materials.

Ms. Leckband commented that she did not know Hanford's policy on recycling, but said she would take the question back to the field office.

Ms. Cimon pointed out that DOE has a moratorium on recycling, but that materials can be used inter-industry and within the complex.

Ms. Nielson suggested that recycling be added as a topic of discussion on the agenda for the next Chairs' meeting.

Mr. Phelps noted that at the TA-21 site at Los Alamos, several buildings were not contaminated, and the steel and materials from those structures were recyclable.

Dr. Triay thanked the Chairs for their presentations and assured them every effort would be made to address their concerns.

Ms. Leckband suggested that new individuals volunteer to serve on the planning committee for the next Chairs' meeting. She proposed that a workshop on groundwater be built into the next meeting agenda, because it is a common issue across the complex.

Ms. Cimon announced that the NRC and DOE will be co-hosting a workshop on future rulemakings at the Waste Management Conference in 2011. She encouraged the local boards to send representatives to the conference. Additionally, Ms. Cimon recommended that in the future the EMAB and EM SSAB meetings be scheduled within the same week, but not the same day.

Mr. Bob Suyama, Vice Chair of the HAB, informed the Chairs that he would be speaking at the DOE-Office of Legacy Management's 2010 Long-Term Surveillance and Maintenance Conference, November 16-18, 2010, in Grand Junction, Colorado. The conference will feature presentations on a number of topics, including property reuse and renewable energy, continuing mission sites, partnerships with Tribal governments, and a stakeholder perspectives panel with EM SSAB representation. He requested input from each of the sites on the LTS issues they are facing. A copy of the agenda is available at http://www.lm.doe.gov/ltsm_conference/index.htm

Public Comment Period

Dr. J.D. Campbell, a former member and Chair of the NNM CAB, encouraged the Chairs to work with EM to resolve groundwater issues across the complex. He urged the NNM CAB board members to support the integration of the vadose zone with the groundwater migration and modeling effort.

Dr. Campbell stated that groundwater is a very significant issue.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Brennan concluded the meeting by thanking the Chairs and the staff of the EM SSAB for their hard work and the NNM CAB and site staff for hosting the event. She also recognized members of the meeting planning committee.

Ms. Brennan adjourned the proceedings at 11:30 a.m. MDT.