

# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board Monthly Meeting



**Wednesday, October 8, 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 – Oak Ridge National Laboratory Update – *to be distributed at meeting*

## CALENDARS

1. October
2. November (*draft*)

## BOARD MINUTES/RECOMMENDATIONS & MOTIONS

1. September 10, 2014, draft meeting minutes
2. EM SSAB Recommendation: Initiate Process of Permit Modification for Additional Surface Storage at WIPP

## REPORTS & MEMOS

1. Trip Report – Fay Martin, RadWaste Summit
2. Trip Report – Dave Hemelright, Fall EM SSAB Chairs' Meeting
3. Trip Report – Coralie Staley, Fall EM SSAB Chairs' Meeting
4. Trip Report – Spencer Gross, Fall EM SSAB Chair's Meeting
5. Recommendation Tracking Chart
6. EM Projects Update for August/September
7. Abbreviations/Acronyms for EM Projects Update
8. Travel Opportunities



**Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board**  
**Wednesday, October 8, 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, November 12  
Presentation Topic: East Tennessee Technology Park Zone 1 Soils Proposed Plan
- II. Comments from the Deputy Designated Federal Officer, and the DOE, EPA, and TDEC Liaisons (S. Cange, D. Adler, C. Jones, K. Czartoryski)..... 6:05–6:20
- III. Public Comment Period (A. Chourey)..... 6:20–6:30
- IV. Presentation: Oak Ridge National Laboratory Update (Bill McMillan) ..... 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. September 10, 2014, Meeting Minutes (L. Hagy)
  - B. Chairs Recommendation to Initiate a Process of Permit Modification for Additional Surface Storage at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (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 (A. Cook)
  - 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

# October 2014

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			1 Budget & Process Committee 5:30 p.m.  Executive Committee 6 p.m.	2	3	4
5	6	7	8 Monthly SSAB Meeting 6 p.m.	9	10	11
12	13 Columbus Day Holiday DOE/Staff holiday	14	15 Environmental Management & Stewardship Committee 6 p.m.	16	17	18
19	20	21 Public Outreach Committee 5:30 p.m. teleconference	22 Executive Committee 6 p.m.	23	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	
<b>Knoxville:</b> Charter Channel 6, Comcast Channel 12	Wednesdays at 9 p.m.
<b>Lenoir City:</b> Charter Cable Channel 3	Wednesdays, 4 p.m.
<b>Oak Ridge:</b> Channel 12	Monday, October 27, 7 p.m.
<b>Oak Ridge:</b> Channel 15	Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 8 a.m. & noon
<b>YouTube</b>	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB">http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB</a>



# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

## November 2014

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11 Veteran's Day DOE/Staff holiday	12 Monthly SSAB Meeting 6 p.m.	13	14	15
16	17	18	19 Environmental Management & Stewardship Committee 6 p.m.	20	21	22
23	24	25 Public Outreach Committee 5:30 p.m. teleconference	26	27 Thanksgiving DOE/Staff holiday	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.

**Budget & Process and Executive Committee meetings to be determined.**

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

Board meetings on cable TV and YouTube	
<b>Knoxville:</b> Charter Channel 6, Comcast Channel 12	Wednesdays at 9 p.m.
<b>Lenoir City:</b> Charter Cable Channel 3	Wednesdays, 4 p.m.
<b>Oak Ridge:</b> Channel 12	Monday, November 24, 7 p.m.
<b>Oak Ridge:</b> Channel 15	Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 8 a.m. & noon
<b>YouTube</b>	<a href="http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB">http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB</a>

## DRAFT

*Many Voices Working for the Community*



# Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

---

## Unapproved September 10, 2014, Meeting Minutes

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) held its monthly meeting on Wednesday, September 10, 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](http://www.youtube.com/user/ORSSAB/videos).

### Members Present

Jimmy Bell	Jennifer Kasten	Mary Smalling
Noel Berry	Jan Lyons	Wanda Smith
Alfreda Cook	Fay Martin	Coralie Staley
Lisa Hagy	Donald Mei	Scott Stout
Bob Hatcher	Greg Paulus	Wanfang Zhou
David Hemelright, Chair	Belinda Price	

### Members Absent

Howard Holmes

### 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)  
Kristof Czartoryski, Liaison, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC)  
Connie Jones, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 4 (via telephone)  
Melyssa Noe, ORSSAB Federal Coordinator, DOE-ORO

### Others Present

Sally Brown, Restoration Services, Inc. (RSI)  
Spencer Gross, ORSSAB Support Office  
Pat Halsey, DOE  
Pete Osborne, ORSSAB Support Office  
Claire Rowcliffe, Student Representative  
Lynn Sims, RSI  
Chris Thompson, TDEC

Five members of the public were present.

### Liaison Comments

Mr. Adler – Mr. Adler reported on the status resuming shipments of uranium-233 from Oak Ridge National Laboratory to the Nevada National Security Site for disposal. Shipments have been on hold for several months because of concerns the state of Nevada has had regarding the safe transportation and disposal of the material. Negotiations have been underway for sometime between

DOE Headquarters and the state of Nevada to come to an agreement to resume shipments. Mr. Adler said the Oak Ridge Federal Project Director for the U-233 Project Bill McMillan described the negotiations as 'cordial and productive,' and he thinks progress has been made in resolving many of the concerns. Mr. McMillan hopes the situation will be rectified soon and shipments can resume. He will be at the October meeting to talk more about the project.

Work by the Groundwater Working Group is making good progress. Meetings have been held focusing on the development of large-scale groundwater models that could be used to predict the effects of off-site pumping of groundwater. Mr. Adler said the goal is to be able to determine if and when off-site groundwater usage should be restricted. The modeling could be used also in the design of cleanup projects for on-site contamination problems.

Mr. Adler said the EM & Stewardship Committee will receive a briefing on the Groundwater Working Group on September 17 at 6 p.m. at the DOE Information Center.

Mr. Adler said an off-site groundwater sampling program is being planned among DOE, TDEC, and EPA. Sampling is scheduled to begin in January. Local officials and affected property owners will be notified of the sampling plans.

At East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP), work continues preparing the K-27 Building for demolition. The K-31 Building is ready for demolition. All of the asbestos-containing siding has been removed and prepared for shipment to the on-site landfill near Y-12 National Security Complex. Mr. Adler said there will be some characterization of the K-31 pad and demolition is expected to begin the first week of October. Demolition should be completed in a late winter to late summer timeframe depending on budget allocations for FY 2015. Mr. Adler said when K-31 demolition is complete there will be about 200 acres of land available for redevelopment at ETTP that has roads, power, and rail service that is necessary for industrial development.

Mr. Adler reported that DOE has responded to all ORSSAB recommendations.

Ms. Jones – Ms. Jones reiterated Mr. Adler's report on the progress of work at ETTP. She mentioned that DOE, EPA, and TDEC met recently on the proposed construction of a mercury treatment plant at Y-12. Mr. Adler expanded her comments by saying the leadership of EPA Region 4, TDEC in Nashville, and DOE had met to discuss a number of cleanup projects. He said some issues need to be resolved concerning the construction of the mercury treatment plant including its engineering configuration, treatment capacity, and how clean the water should be when it leaves Y-12. He said those kinds of issues need to be resolved prior to the construction start milestone in 2017.

Mr. Czartoryski – Mr. Czartoryski introduced Chris Thompson as TDEC's new deputy director for the Division of Remediation. She now has the responsibility previously held by John Owsley, who now serves as a senior advisor in the DOE Oversight Office.

He said Mr. Adler and Ms. Jones provided a good briefing of discussions among the three agencies.

### **Public Comment**

None.

### **Presentation**

Ms. Halsey and Ms. Brown provided presentations on the Oak Ridge EM Stewardship Program and the tools to track stewardship activities.

Ms. Halsey said her presentation would cover topics that are supportive of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) and the tools that support long-term stewardship. The FFA is an agreement among DOE, EPA, and TDEC that guides the cleanup of the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR). The main points of Ms. Halsey's presentation are in Attachment 1.

In the early years of ORSSAB, the board formed the End Use Working Group Stewardship Committee to develop an outline for stewardship activities on the ORR. The committee wrote a definition of stewardship: *acceptance of the responsibility and the implementation of activities necessary to maintain long-term protection of human health and the environment from hazards posed by residual radioactive and chemically hazardous materials.* Anytime radioactive or hazardous materials are remediated and protected in place controls must be implemented to ensure the safety of the public and the environment. Land use controls are mechanisms to assure protectiveness (Attachment 1, page 3).

Stewardship requirements begin with a record of decision (ROD) for cleanup of an area. The ROD states what the eventual land use objectives and controls will be when cleanup is complete. A chart on page 4 of Attachment 1 explains engineering and land use controls. Ms. Halsey explained that land use controls can be implemented with the signing of a ROD. When the land use controls are implemented then stewardship tracking controls begin. Examples of land use controls are deed restrictions, excavation permits, postings, and fences.

Stewardship tracking information is compiled yearly in the Remediation Effectiveness Report (RER). The RER describes how well stewardship requirements are working and how land use controls are followed.

When engineering controls are completed (Attachment 1, page 4) a completion document is produced. The completion document includes all of the long-term stewardship requirements and how those requirements are reported. The RER, the Five-year Review, and the EM geographical information system (GIS) are all available to the public. The Five-year Review determines if protective measures are still working and appropriate for current conditions.

Ms. Halsey explained the primary documents in the FFA that are used for stewardship (Attachment 1, pages 5-6).

Ms. Halsey then described the tools used to report on long-term stewardship activities (Attachment 1, page 7). They include the GIS, the Oak Ridge Environmental Information System (OREIS), the Land Use Manager, and the Five-year Review. She said the GIS was developed for the public to view areas of the ORR where work is done. It provides links to fact sheets and any related documents. OREIS is a database of sampling that has been done on the ORR before and after signing of RODs.

In 2013 and 2014 two environmental baseline surveys were completed that identified areas of the ORR that have never had any evidence of federal operations. As a result of those surveys the Oak Ridge Site Description in Appendix B of the FFA was modified and the Appendix C of the FFA (Oak Ridge remediation sites) were decreased. Ms. Halsey explained that the ORR is what is owned by DOE. The Oak Ridge Site are any areas, on and off the Reservation, that have been determined to be contaminated by federal operations.

Ms. Halsey then demonstrated online the GIS and its various features.

After the GIS demonstration, Ms. Halsey talked about using OREIS, which is also publically available and required by the FFA.



A number of enhancements have been made to OREIS related to RODs and subsequent activities. For instance, a watershed exposure unit (EU) can be accessed to see what data have been collected for the unit. OREIS contains all data used to generate the RER. Enhancements to OREIS were made to ensure that data storage requirements and reporting were being met.

Ms. Halsey showed the main entry page for OREIS (Attachment 1, page 12). She pointed out the newly added spatial query tool (SQT). When the SQT is clicked it brings up the map shown on page 13. The blue dots are sampling locations. Any blue dot can be clicked and data related to that sampling location is available.

Ms. Halsey said shape files are being added to the SQT. She showed an example of a shape file for Melton Valley (Attachment 1, page 14). The shape files are the tan capped areas in Melton Valley. Shape files will be done for any area where contamination is left in place. Other samples of shape files are in Attachment 1, pages 15 and 17.

Ms. Brown's portion of the presentation was explaining the Land Use Manager (LUM), a web-based tool for tracking stewardship requirements of the Oak Ridge Site, specifically institutional and engineering controls. The main points of her presentation are in Attachment 2.

Ms. Brown works with the Waster Resources Restoration Program (WRRP), which is responsible for ensuring long-term stewardship remedies remain protective. It monitors and tracks land use and engineering controls and those controls are reported through the RER and Five-year Review.

WRRP also works with surveillance and maintenance programs, which implements controls, conducts site inspections, performs maintenance, and documents all that information in the LUM. WRRP relies on radiation control programs using DOE orders that protect radiologically contaminated areas (Attachment 2, page 2).

LUM is used to implement, track, maintain, and verify stewardship controls. There are more than 45 sites that have either engineering or land use controls that require tracking.

Features and system benefits of LUM are noted on page 5 of Attachment 2. Ms. Brown said the primary feature is efficient tracking and accountable records of regulatory requirements and compliance, which ensures nothing is missed. LUM provides automatic email reminders of inspections and maintenance requests. LUM is a paperless system that is taken into the field using durable laptop computers.

LUM provides a data repository for site information including types of controls, contaminant data, decision documents and other information related information. Ms. Brown said another benefit is that it has standardized data content and reports from across the ORR.

There are plans to make some of the information in LUM available to the public in OREIS. There will be a link on the OREIS home page to LUM maps (Attachment 2, page 6). These are interactive maps where a user can click on a part of the map and it will bring up information about the site (Attachment 2, page 7).

Ms. Brown showed screen shots of the LUM and how an inspector would use it in the field (Attachment 2, pages 8-16).

From the home page on page 9, an inspector would click on Quick Links, Inspections at the bottom of the screen. That would go to the next screen (page 10). In this example the screen shows what is

due to be done at Y-12 on Chestnut Ridge. At the bottom of the screen it shows all the inspections that are to be done, including the due date. In the example, the task chosen is Chestnut Ridge Security Pits. When that is clicked the next screen (page 11) is the inspection form. The inspector goes through each inspection item. The inspector can determine if each inspection item is compliant, deficient, or not inspected. If deficient is chosen it creates a site maintenance request, which shows in the example at the bottom of the screen. When the request is generated it is sent to the facility manager advising that a site maintenance request has been generated and the manager needs to initiate a remedy.

When finished, the inspector clicks the submit button. Another email is sent to the facility manager saying the inspection has been completed and the facility can approve the inspection. Page 12 shows the screen the facility manager would see every item that needs to be finalized. In the example, the facility manager clicks on the Chestnut Ridge Security Pits, which brings up the next screen, page 13, that shows everything is compliant, except the one deficiency for which a site maintenance request has already been generated. The manager would click on report status to finalize. The manager can follow up on the site maintenance request by picking the new request for the site. If there are a number of requests, they can be exported to an Excel file. By clicking on the pdf file, it generates a work order that is sent to a contractor to fix the problem.

The facility managers can access a map of the site and see what needs to be remedied.

Ms. Brown finished her presentation showing a photo of the notebooks of paper records that had to be kept prior to using the LUM (Attachment 2, page 17). She said it was a time consuming and cumbersome process that is now all done electronically.

After the presentations, a number of questions were asked. Following are abridged questions and answers.

Mr. Hatcher – Are there data in this system that would be useful in the groundwater modeling program that Mr. Adler reported on earlier? Ms. Sims – Yes, for the groundwater modeling we are retrieving the data from ORIES.

Mr. Hemelright – Regarding the LUM, are there any controls to ensure an inspector actually goes out and does the work? Ms. Sims – The request is sent to the supervisor and the supervisor validates it. That person is a responsible individual who goes into the field and checks it. Many of the site inspections for wells are teams and they go out and check together.

Mr. Paulus – Ms. Halsey, you said several times that OREIS is available to the public. Do you have counter to know how many times it's accessed? Ms. Halsey – Yes, on the screen when you first enter the system it shows a counter. We first started the count in 2006. Since that time we've had 57,834 people access it. Mr. Paulus – If I do a Google search will this information come up? Ms. Halsey – I have Googled for environmental information in Oak Ridge and a link to OREIS does come up.

Ms. Smith – Tell me more about the deeds. Ms. Halsey – The deeds show where we have to put use restrictions on that area. For instance in Melton Valley where we had to put caps on the waste buried there that tells future generations through publically available deed that digging is not allowed.

Mr. Czartoryski – I would like to add that OREIS also contains independent environmental monitoring data that was obtained by TDEC. I have a question about deed restrictions. What level of effort do we have to verify that deed restrictions are actually noted and recorded in county

offices? Ms. Brown – Annually for the RER, I go and check at the county registrar of deeds. For Anderson County, those records are online, so I check them online. For Roane County I go to the courthouse and check the Melton Valley deeds to make sure they are still available. I report in the RER that the deeds are checked annually and verify they are still in place and accessible.

Ms. Smith – Do people live in Melton Valley? Ms. Halsey – No, that part of Melton Valley is on ORR and no one lives on the ORR.

### **Committee Reports**

Budget & Process – no report.

EM & Stewardship – Mr. Hatcher reported that the committee discussed an idea that came from the board's annual meeting about having the committee members visit sites where EM work is being done and meet with project managers who can discuss the work and how it is being done. Mr. Adler is developing a work plan that will include topics where tours can be set up.

At the September 17 committee meeting Dan Goode, the liaison to the board on the groundwater modeling effort, will report on the program.

Public Outreach – Ms. Lyons reported the committee did not meet in August. At its September 23 meeting it will develop its work plan for FY 2015.

Executive – Mr. Hemelright said the committee reviewed the major topics of discussion at the board's annual meeting. The committee specifically discussed ways to make board meetings more interactive, productive, and beneficial. One idea is to make changes in how recommendations are approved because current bylaws require two-thirds of the membership be present to vote on recommendations. Another idea is to reinstate refreshments at board to provide for more socialization and allow members who travel long distances to be able to have something to eat. He said there are some restrictions on this, but perhaps ways can be found to make it possible.

The decision was made to have the annual meeting at a location away from the DOE Information Center in 2015.

Ideas were discussed to increase member attendance at meetings. One idea was to make them less formal and shorter to encourage public participation. The ideas of having fewer meetings and changing venues within the area around Oak Ridge were discussed. The committee discussed the possibility of taking board meetings on field trips to where EM work is being done.

It was questioned if the annual meeting has to be held in August. At that time of year some members are not available. The bylaws currently call for an August annual meeting, so the bylaws would have to be amended if a change is desired.

A question was asked if funds could be made available to produce a video on the work of Oak Ridge Oral History Program. Mr. Hemelright said Mr. Adler is checking on that.

### **Announcements and Other Board Business**

ORSSAB's next meeting will be Wednesday, October 8, 2014, at the DOE Information Center.

The minutes of the June 11, 2014, meeting were approved.

The EM SSAB Chairs' Recommendation on Publicizing EM Successes was approved (Attachment 3).

The EM SSAB Chairs' Recommendation on Funding was approved (Attachment 4).

The ORSSAB Recommendation on DOE Oak Ridge GIS Fact Sheets was approved (Attachment 5).

Mr. Hemelright, Ms. Lyons, and Ms. Hagy were elected chair, vice-chair, and secretary respectively for FY 2015.

### **Federal Coordinator Report**

Ms. Noe reported that four people have resigned from the board (Carmen DeLong, Bruce Hicks, Sandra Lindsey, and Scott McKinney) and work is underway to recruit replacements for them. She asked if board members knew of anyone interested in becoming a member to let her or staff know.

### **Additions to the Agenda**

None.

### **Motions**

#### **9/10/14.1**

Mr. Paulus moved to approve the minutes of the June 11, 2014, meeting. Ms. Cook seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

#### **9/10/14.2**

Ms. Price moved to approve the EM SSAB Chairs' Recommendation on Publicizing EM. Ms. Smith seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

#### **9/10/14.3**

Ms. Smalling moved to approve the EM SSAB Chairs' Recommendation on Funding. Ms. Cook seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

#### **9/10/14.4**

Mr. Hatcher moved to approve the ORSSAB Recommendation on DOE Oak Ridge GIS Fact Sheets. Mr. Stout seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

#### **9/10/14/5**

Ms. Price moved to approve the slate of candidates for officers for FY 2015 (Mr. Hemelright, chair; Ms. Lyons, vice-chair; and Ms. Hagy, secretary). Ms. Smith seconded and the motion passed **unanimously**.

The motions to consider two consecutive absences for Mr. Paulus and Ms. Smith were removed from the agenda as they were in attendance. The motion for two consecutive absences for Mr. Holmes was removed as Mr. Hemelright said Mr. Holmes had been ill and unable to attend meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

**Action items**

1. Staff will email all members requesting additional volunteers to serve on the Nominating Committee. **Complete.**
2. The idea of non-board members staffing exhibits will be discussed at an Executive Committee meeting.

Attachments (5) to these minutes are available on request from the ORSSAB support office.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the September 10, 2014, meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board.

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

DATE

EM SSAB Chairs Meeting  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
Draft Chairs Recommendation  
September 17-18, 2014

Initiate Process of Permit Modification for Additional Surface Storage at WIPP

**Background**

The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) has been operating since 1999 as the only underground repository for transuranic (TRU) waste disposal. Having the WIPP facility available for TRU waste disposal has been shown to be extremely important to the Department of Energy (DOE) as well as sites across the United States needing to safely and reliably dispose of TRU waste. WIPP operations on a continuing basis are critical to the success of the DOE Office of Environmental Management's (EM) waste disposal mission.

**Observations and Comments**

With the recent shutdown of WIPP, DOE efforts to complete programs for the shipment of TRU waste from sites needing this method of waste disposal have been jeopardized. The shutdown of WIPP has rendered these sites unable to complete commitments due to respective state consent orders or regulatory requirements. Planning for future shipments to WIPP is also now on hold with no effective time table of when shipments may be able to resume.

Building of additional TRU waste storage facilities at the various generator sites with limited lifetime expectancies is neither efficient nor cost effective. It would be wise to not duplicate the permitting process at multiple sites and concentrate on one site that can truly facilitate permanent long-term disposal of TRU waste.

Reestablishing the current means and methods of TRU waste transport from sites would maintain the present available transport system readiness, keep personnel training levels and maintain effective use of present facilities. An additional consideration to transporting waste as soon as feasible is that transportation costs will likely rise significantly in the ensuing years.

**Recommendation**

Due to the serious problems that the shutdown of the WIPP has caused the various DOE facilities that must ship TRU waste, the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board recommends that DOE-EM Headquarters should immediately prepare to expand the above-ground TRU waste interim storage installation at WIPP so that EM sites can proceed with TRU waste shipments even before the underground WIPP disposal operation is approved for reopening.

## Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

### TRIP REPORT

---

- I. **Name of Traveler:** Fay M. Martin
- II. **Date(s) of Travel:** September 2-5, 2014
- III. **Location of Meeting:** JW Marriott Las Vegas Resort & Spa, Las Vegas, Nevada
- IV. **Name of Meeting:** The Eighth Annual RadWaste Summit
- V. **Purpose of Travel:** To represent ORSSAB and learn about waste management issues relevant to DOE-ORO EM
- VI. **Discussion of Meeting:**

The Opening Plenary session was entitled “The Path Forward for WIPP and Transuranic Waste Across the DOE Complex.”

Ryan Flynn, Secretary, New Mexico Environment Department said that they were eager to get the WPP facility up and running. He summarized the two problems, namely the Vehicle Fire on February 5, 2014 and the Radiological Release on February 14, 2014. During this release, 21 employees at WIPP tested positive for radiological contamination. Flynn then spoke about what DOE had done. For positives, he cited the Multi-laboratory Technical Assessment teams and LANL teams, the WIPP Town Hall Meetings and Communication with Regulators. He mentioned some negatives such as the initial communication with regulators and the public that damaged DOE’s credibility at the start. He said the pace of the investigation is still moving too slowly and that DOE headquarters is having difficulty keeping everyone focused. For the Path Forward, Flynn said that the root cause of the release must be identified by an Independent team. He said that headquarters could not manage the recovery operation from Washington DC; they needed someone on site to make decisions.

Frank Marcinowski, the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Waste Management, US DOE-EM, the next speaker, mentioned the past successes of WIPP. He spoke of the Accident Investigation Board, The Technical Assistance Team (including ORNL), Regulatory and Stakeholder coordination and TRU waste. He said that his department supported the recovery of such an important operation, for as he remarked, “The eyes of the world are on us.”

Jim Blankenhorn, WIPP Recovery Manager, Nuclear Waste Partnership, gave a history of WIPP. He mentioned that it was opened on March 26, 1999 and had received 11,894 shipments. He showed a graphic picture of the smoke coming out of the intake shaft during the WIPP Haul Truck Fire Event on February 5, 2014. Among the findings he reported that the maintenance

program was ineffective, the fire protection program was less than adequate and the Emergency Management/preparedness and response programs were ineffective. He said that they had developed a Nuclear Safety Document to support recovery activities. He pointed out the need to revitalize the Safety Management Program, and to have a new ventilation system. He assured the attendees that they would come out of this situation much stronger than before.

The next session was entitled “Decommissioning Commercial Reactors: Projects, Planning and the Public.”

David Victor, Chairman, Community Engagement Panel for San Onofre Decommissioning Project, described the spent fuel storage and disposal strategies, decommissioning strategy and Emergency Preparedness. He emphasized that serious people were willing to volunteer huge amounts of time for this endeavor, which he described as a tremendous civic engagement.

One interesting session was entitled “High-Level Waste and Spent Fuel Policy: Are changes on the Way?” Eric Knox, Chairman, Nuclear Infrastructure Council; Operations Manager, URS was the speaker. His answer to the question was “Maybe”. He said that we had to address the management structure. He discussed transportation issues and the National Policy on recycling and mentioned that France was building a deep geological repository.

In the session on “Update on NRC Low-level Waste Regulatory Initiatives”, Andrew Persinko, Deputy Director, Decommissioning and Uranium Recovery Licensing Directorate, U.S. NRC, spoke of the “The Phantom 4” radionuclides namely H-3, C-14, Tc-99 and I-129 and said that they required separate manifest totals.

In the session entitled “A State Perspective on the Regulatory Path Forward”, one speaker Brad Broussard, Texas Commission on Environmental Quality mentioned the regulatory compliance period of 1000 years and the requirement of a 10,000 year intruder assessment analysis. Another speaker, Rusty Lundberg, Director, Utah Division of Radiation Control, discussed the state priorities and said that the state should operate a regulatory framework that is transparent and predictable.

Another interesting session was entitled, “Radiological Byproducts from Oil and Gas Operations: As Volumes Grow, States Look for Solutions”. Speaker Dale Patrick, Manager, Radioactive Materials and Indoor Air Quality Programs, North Dakota Department of Health, discussed how much oil was in North Dakota . He quoted a figure of 7.4 billion barrels of oil. He discussed the fracturing process, and also the examination of wildlife for contamination. Jared Thompson, Program Leader Radioactive, Materials Program, Arkansas Department of Health: Chairperson, Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc (CRCPD) Task Force to Review the TENORM Aspects of the Oil and Gas Industry, gave details of a forum that he described as invaluable for the exchange of information. He showed a detailed map of the shale formations in the USA.

On Thursday, September 4, 2014, the first session was on “A Nevada Perspective on Waste Management Decisionmaking and State Relations. Leo Drozdoff, Director, Nevada Conservation and Natural Resources Department asked the important question “How do we ensure that



'lessons learned' stay as 'lessons learned'?" He stressed that Federal and State communication was necessary for success.

One highlight of the Summit was the session entitled "Prioritizing Disposal and Waste Management at DOE Sites". The speaker was the personable Christine Gelles, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary, Waste Management U.S. DOE-EM. She mentioned the EM FY 2015 Budget request of \$5,622 billion total and asked the question, "What should we focus on in spending this money?" She gave several priorities, namely:

- Access to treatment and/or disposal capacity
- Availability of storage capacity
- Availability of "technology" and needed skill sets
- Cost and Schedule
- Policy
- Regulatory considerations
- Stakeholder considerations
- NEPA

She emphasized that because of constrained resources, it was necessary for us to prioritize.

I found the session on "The Future of Disposal at the Nevada National Security Site" really interesting because I had visited the site in 2012.

Scott Wade, Assistant Manager, Environmental Management, Nevada Site Office, U.S. DOE, spoke about the Area 5 Waste Management site and said that NNSS was approved to dispose of radioactive classified and non-radioactive classified waste. Rob Boehlecke, Nevada Operations Office, U.S. DOE, gave more descriptions of Area 5, saying that there were 740 acres total of which 184 acres were in use, He mentioned the historic nuclear test sites nearby and described the arid environment and deep groundwater (~ 800 feet).

The next session was of interest because it described the work of the Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board. The title of the session was "Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board Perspective on LLW Transportation and Disposal at the NNSS"

The first speaker was Kathy Bienenstein, Chair, Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board. She said that they had 15-20 members as well as some tribal members and liaisons who were non-voting. She explained how they operated: by developing work plans, by providing recommendations to DOE, and then DOE would respond. Their focus was on groundwater, soil, outreach, waste/management, transportation, budget and membership.

Donna Hruska, Vice-chair, Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board, spoke on ways to improve how Nevada evaluated waste generator facilities, as well as ways to enhance/refine the radioactive waste acceptance process.

On Friday September 5, 2014, there was a Workshop in Conjunction with EFCOG Waste Management Working Group: During WIMP Shutdown, What Options and Alternatives Exist for Transuranic Waste Inventory Across the DOE Complex? This session was combined with "Overview of DOE Waste Policies and Strategy: Opportunities Presented by 435.1, Transuranic



## Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

### TRIP REPORT

---

- I. Name of Traveler:** David Hemelright
- II. Date(s) of Travel:** 9/15/14 – 9/19/14
- III. Location of Meeting:** Idaho Falls, ID
- IV. Name of Meeting:** EM SSAB Semi Annual Chair's Meeting
- V. Purpose of Travel:** To attend the meeting as the chair of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board, and offer any insight as required/requested. Interact with other SSAB Chairs and Washington, DC Environmental Management (EM) folks.
- VI. Discussion of Meeting:** See VII below, combined report
- VII. Significance to ORSSAB:** Synopsis of trip is as follows: 1st day was a tour of the Idaho National Lab (INL) an 890 square mile site developed in the early '50s as part of the atomic energy program. The physical size of INL is comparable to Lake Erie, and it is the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest nuclear site, Nevada being the largest in size. It was at Idaho (EBR-1) that the very first electric power was generated by atomic energy. At EBR-1 there are the two atomic powered jet aircraft engines that were developed for a prototype aircraft but never produced because the ICBM program was more efficient and less costly. The size of the jet engines is astonishing; well over 3 stories in height. It is hard to even envision them in a modern 747 aircraft.

We also toured the clean-up sites (under roof), but because of a slight "rad release" we were not able to go inside. A tour of the control center followed. After the waste management facility, we toured the tank waste clean-up facility which was in its final "shakedown" phase getting ready to go into production to process the tank waste at INL. From a layman's point of view, it is too bad that Hanford does not have this type of waste treatment stream.

Day one of the Chair's meeting commenced with the standard "welcome" talks from the local officials and Dave Borak, the designated federal Officer for the EM SSAB. After Herb Boher, INL chair, welcomed us, Eric Roberts, the meeting facilitator, gave an overview of the meeting and goals. Mark Whitney spoke to the assembled chairs as his role as acting EM Assistant Secretary until a permanent Assistant Secretary can be officially appointed,

Mark's talk was about the challenges facing the SSABs across the clean-up complex. The primary challenge will be funding. It appears as if EM will be flat funded with \$5.6 billion dollars for the next foreseeable years. The Budget Control Act dictates the same or better funding over the years, but not allowing a reduction in funding. In essence, "the situation is grim, and the highest risks must be addressed

first.” Mark went on to speak about the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), and how its shutdown affects all EM clean-up sites and regulatory milestones. As of mid September 2 reports have been issued on the WIPP fire and rad release, the third report “what happened” is due about December 2014. It is anticipated that WIPP will resume normal operations in 18 months, plus or minus. Lessons learned in the WIPP incidents are “culture of safety” must be maintained, and a backlog of deferred maintenance is detrimental to operations. (As a maintenance professional, I could have told you so. Look at the money spent on getting K-25 ready to make it safe enough to demolish!)

The capital projects that are underway include Hanford tank waste treatment plant. Issues there are being worked through. The Idaho integrated waste treatment unit is in final test mode prior to going operational, and the Savannah River salt waste processing facility is expected to be complete in 2016 and become operational in 2017/2018. A mercury treatment facility and an additional waste disposal site, both at Oak Ridge are on the horizon, too.

“We need to recognize our success,” Mark said. (Recall this was a recently approved recommendation from all the Chairs to EM.) This is the 25<sup>th</sup> year of the EM program, and the “contamination footprint” has been reduced by more than 90 percent. Ninety-six sites have been cleaned.

The priorities Mark spoke of are TRU (transuranic) and low-level waste disposal, budgetary priorities and how they tie into a better understanding of the local communities, and the community concerns. Last priority is obtaining and maintaining local citizen engagement in the DOE EM programs and success.

After Mark spoke, Connie Flohr, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Budget spoke to the assembled Chairs. Her talk was enlightening enough that even I could follow. Connie is a new face to the EM SSAB community, but not to the inner workings of federal funding and budgeting. Connie has been in direct communication with personnel at the Office of Budget and Management, controllers of the purse strings, and allocator of funds. So far, it has been a good relationship. Connie spoke of assuming flat line funding of \$5.6 billion, also. Savannah River asked from what funding does the fine imposed by regulators come? The answer is from the program funds allocated, reducing the amount of clean-up to pay the fines. There are, however, supplemental environmental agreements in place with some regulators that allow for “in kind” or additional clean-up work in lieu of cash payments for fines.

Following all that, the board chairs participated in a round table discussion of how they participate in the annual budgeting process, or not. I was surprised at how many SSABs are not on the same level of budgetary sophistication as ORSSAB. Not all of the boards are briefed or kept as informed as we are. Recall, each year the ORSSAB provides a recommendation to DOE EM on the current budget request.

After the budget roundtable, the assembled Chairs went into their roundtable on topics, activities and accomplishments. A PDF of the SSAB’s topics can be made available from our staff. ORSSAB set the tone for the future with our talk of transitioning from project oriented to stewardship orientated. Thank you EM/Stewardship Committee, and thank you ORSSAB for providing such insight to be presented.

Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste Management, spoke about the progress at WIPP. He basically reiterated what is known - there was a fire and a rad release. However, he did go into depth on what steps are being taken, explaining why the long time frame in re-opening, to correctly analyze and rectify the contamination on panel 7. Upon completion of Frank’s presentation, the ORSSAB Chair asked if the large, secure, away from population space above ground in WIPP could be utilized as temporary storage for waste while WIPP is being readied for more waste? That way the other sites could continue their waste removal, the local regulators would be happy (not to mention the local citizens), and

the waste would be stored securely at WIPP ready to go underground when WIPP become operational. Franks response was, "We are considering it." That is a good sign. See what happens in Thursday's session.

Day 2 (Thursday) of the meeting was David Borak day, He presented news and views from DOE EM headquarters and we celebrated 20 years of successful SSAB history. Recently, "reviewers" looked at all the local SSABs and determined that their roles were vital to the success of the DOE EM clean-up program. The local boards significantly contributed to the DOE EM clean-up success in establishing local priorities and goals. Like all the speakers before him, David reiterated about the challenging budgets and all the work ahead of DOE EM. He spoke of the DOE Secretary's drive for diversity on the boards on all ranges, ethnic, gender and geographical. New methods of communication were discussed. ORSSAB touted our former student representation on the Public Outreach Committee that got us on Facebook, etcetera.

The product development session of the meeting discussed potential cessation of SSABs as the clean-up mission winds down, and the need for stewardship increases. Only one recommendation was brought forth by the vice chair of the Northern New Mexico Citizen's Advisory Board, and that was to recommend to DOE EM that WIPP should be expanded above ground to securely accept TRU waste shipments from generator sites to keep the TRU waste stream moving on target, and keep sites from falling behind on the milestones set by local regulators. Imagine that. All the other SSABs agreed and the recommendation will be forthcoming.

**III. Names & Telephone Numbers of Significant Contacts:**

A complete listing of all attendees can be obtained from staff, if desired.

**IX. Action Items:**

The recommendation for additional storage at WIPP will be coming before the ORSSAB for approval. Recommend immediate approval and return to DOE EM HQ.

**X. Travelers Signature & Date:**

Respectfully Submitted,

*Dave Hemelright*

David Hemelright

via e-mail 9/30/2104



## Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

### TRIP REPORT

---

- I. Name of Traveler:** Coralie Staley
- II. Date(s) of Travel:** September 15-19
- III. Location of Meeting:** Idaho Falls, Idaho
- IV. Name of Meeting:** 2014 SSAB Fall Chairs' Meeting
- V. Purpose of Travel:**

To attend the Fall SSAB Chairs' Meeting

**VI. Discussion of Meeting:**

On Wednesday, September 16, I participated in the tour of the Idaho National Lab site to learn more about the facilities at that location. The Fall Chairs' Meeting took place on September 17-18. The meeting began with a welcome from the mayor of Idaho Falls. Opening remarks were presented by officials of the Idaho Falls site. EM updates were presented by Mark Whitney, Acting EM Assistant Secretary, Connie Flohr, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Budget. There were several questions concerning the budget and funding decisions, from the chairs of the Boards. Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste Management gave an update focused on the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Questions from chairs included many concerning storage of waste at individual sites until WIPP is again open for disposal. Each of the chairs presented the activities, topics and accomplishments of their local Board.

**VII. Significance to ORSSAB:**

The Chairs' meetings present opportunities for learning from other boards about the progress, issues, experiences, and activities at the various locations. There are many opportunities to work cooperatively with members of other SSABs to address issues common to all of the boards. There are opportunities to get updates on the accomplishments and goals of each board, also.

**VIII. Names & Telephone Numbers of Significant Contacts:**

N/A

**IX. Action Items:**

N/A

**X. Traveler's Signature & Date:**

Signature: (via e-mail) Coralie A. Staley

Date: September 22, 2014



## Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

### TRIP REPORT

---

- I. Name of Traveler:** Spencer Gross, ORSSAB staff
- II. Date(s) of Travel:** September 16-18
- III. Location of Meeting:** Idaho Falls, Idaho
- IV. Name of Meeting:** Fall 2014 EM SSAB Chairs meeting
- V. Purpose of Travel:**

To provide administrative support to ORSSAB members attending the meeting.

**VI. Discussion of Meeting:**

The trip began with a tour of the Idaho National Lab by attendees of the meeting on September 16. The tour included visits to the Radioactive Waste Management Complex, the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project, and the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit. The group had lunch at the Experimental Breeder Reactor 1, the first reactor to generate electric power. It was shut down in 1964 and is now a National Historic Landmark.

Mark Whitney, the DOE Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM), began the Chairs' meeting on September 17 with an update on EM activities.

He said there a number of challenges facing EM. One of those is the EM budget. Budget allocations of about \$5.6 billion are expected for the next several years. While that amount is less than allocations a few years ago, he said it is still a significant amount of money and a lot can be accomplished with it.

Closure of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) is another challenge. Whitney said WIPP is vital for the disposal of transuranic (TRU) waste across the complex, and money and resources are needed to support the recovery. The goal is to reopen WIPP in about 18 months, but safety will not be compromised, he said. A lesson learned from WIPP was deferred maintenance, and sites will be asked to report on deferred maintenance.

There are a number of construction challenges across the complex, including the Waste Treatment Plant at Hanford, the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit in Idaho, and the Salt Waste Processing Center at the Savannah River Site.

With all of the challenges, Whitney said it was easy to forget progress that has been made. He mentioned the completion of the K-25 Building demolition in Oak Ridge as an example. He also said progress is being made on the demolition of the K-27 and K-31 Buildings. Major modifications of H-Canyon at Savannah River were completed ahead of schedule. Portsmouth and Paducah are working to process uranium hexafluoride to a more stable form. At Hanford an underground storage facility to support operations was completed.

Whitney reminded the group that this is the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of the EM program. Many sites have been closed, and DOE's EM footprint has been reduced by about 90 percent. He said decision making has been improved by the work of the SSAB and stakeholders to find cost effective solutions to problems.

But he said the most challenging work remains, and the priorities are focused on waste disposition, especially at WIPP. On-site disposal is an important component of EM's job.

He said in a constrained budget environment it's important to make sure DOE's priorities align with community priorities. DOE wants to increase community involvement.

The next presenter was Connie Flohr, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Program Planning and Budget. She said the President's EM budget request to Congress was for \$5.622 billion. At the time of the meeting, the House had passed a 'mark' of \$5.632 billion and the Senate had passed a mark of \$5.942 billion. The two houses will have to agree on a final allocation. Flohr said the President's budget request for Oak Ridge EM was \$385 million.

Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste Management, recapped the incidents at WIPP that forced its closure. Corrective action plans have been drafted for both events. A report is still due on the cause of the second event, a burst storage drum that released some radiation. He said more than 800 experiments have been conducted above ground to try to recreate the event. Video mapping of the affected area will be done to try to learn more about what happened.

Even though shipments of TRU waste to WIPP have been stopped, Marcinowski said DOE wants sites to continue to process TRU waste for shipment. EM has begun a TRU Waste Management Assessment to evaluate generator sites for treatment and characterization of TRU to ensure there are no vulnerabilities. DOE will have to work on appropriate sequencing to work off the backlogs of TRU at Oak Ridge and Idaho.

The last presentation of the day was by Thomas Johnson, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary of Acquisition and Product Management, who gave a talk about contracting and how DOE EM does business.

The second day of the meeting, September 18, began with a report by Dave Borak, the Designated Federal Officer for the EM SSAB. He said the presidential nominee for



Assistant Secretary for EM, Monica Regalbutto, was awaiting Senate confirmation. Her nomination has been voted out of committee, but the full Senate must approve her nomination. She was at the meeting and made a few comments.

Borak then did a presentation on the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the EM SSAB.

The meeting concluded with the agreement on a draft recommendation to DOE to consider establishing interim storage areas at WIPP for ready-to-be-disposed TRU waste. The idea is to get TRU waste away from generating sites and to WIPP ready for disposal for when the facility reopens.

The next chairs meeting will be held at the Savannah River Site in the spring of 2015.

**VII. Significance to ORSSAB:**

Understanding other boards' issues and maintaining working relationships with the other SSABs is useful in helping ORSSAB do its job. Working on joint recommendations provides added value for the meeting participants and DOE.

**VIII. Names & Telephone Numbers of Significant Contacts:**

**IX. Action Items:**

**X. Traveler's Signature & Date:**

Signature: 

Date: 9-25-14

## 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	8/5/14	<b>Partial:</b> DOE did not address recommendation point of reviewing existing monitoring well network. DOE will address that omission.	
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	7/28/14	<b>Complete:</b> DOE addressed all points of the recommendation.	Committee accepted response.
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	6/17/14	<b>Complete:</b> DOE Oak Ridge EM submitted the recommendation to DOE HQ along with its budget request for FY 2016.	
4.	9/10/14	Susan Cange, Acting Manager for Oak Ridge EM	Recommendation 225: Recommendation on DOE GIS Fact Sheets	EM & Stewardship			

## EM Project Update

ETTP		August	September
Zone 2 ROD			Characterization of EU Z2-6 (Building K-31 footprint) and of EUs Z2-20, 21, and 22 (Building K-25 footprint) was initiated.
			The RDR-RAWP was revised to reflect comments from EPA.
K-25/K-27 D&D	Draining and inspecting process gas equipment greater than 3-inches in diameter is 90 percent complete and non-destructive assay of K-27 Building components is 95 percent complete.		Non-destructive assay of K-27 Building components is 98 percent complete (planned completion in October) and intrusive sampling is 93 percent complete (planned completion in November).
	The foaming of the process gas piping and equipment is 5 percent complete.		The foaming of the process gas piping and equipment is 8 percent complete.
K-31 Demolition	Exterior transite panel removal is approximately 97 percent complete.		Exterior transite panel removal is proceeding. It will be completed and building demolition will commence in early October.
	The WHP for disposal of demolition debris was approved by the regulators.		Additional concrete and steel samples have been taken to support disposal at EMWMF.
	Friable asbestos removal is complete and the waste profile for transite is complete and disposal has begun.		
ORNL		August	September
U-233 Disposition	Technical evaluation of the contract change proposal for additional safeguards and security modeling was completed and submitted.		An assessment of the contractor's Operating Experience/Lessons Learned Program was completed. The program was found to be adequate with no findings and several noteworthy practices and observations.
	Negotiations were completed on the proposal for additional safeguards and security modeling.		Completed annual inspections of the two Legal Weight Truck (LWT) casks, which are expected back to the 3019 facility in early October.
			The Natural Phenomena Hazards evaluation of Building 2026 was completed and is in the review process.
			Personnel from the State of Nevada Governor's office met with senior DOE officials to continue discussions associated with the disposal of waste at the Nevada National Security Site.
Y-12 Site		August	September
Y-12 Mercury Abatement Phase I ROD	Obtained two sets of stormwater samples for pre-design studies and provided Pre-Design Study update to UEFPC Project Team. Completed the first semi-annual Peer Review on the Outfall 200 Project.		Submitted the ROD Amendment FFS/PP for Outfall 200 to the regulators for review.
			Submitted the Time-Critical Action Memo for the Haul Road Ravine to the regulators.
Y-12 S&M			

## EM Project Update

Off-Site Cleanup/Waste Management	August	September
TRU Waste Processing Center	EPA conducted an audit of the new NDA unit and the contact-handled (CH) visual examination process resulted in no issues.	Completed a draft report from the recent DOE/HQ assessment, <i>Chemical Integrity for Transuranic Waste Disposition at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant</i> . Some notable practices were identified and one potential concern is being evaluated.
EMWMF	Continue to focus on maintenance activities, installation of the enhanced operational cover, and preparing to receive the K-31 waste. Work continues on the EMWMF/EMDF Focused Feasibility Study.	Work continues on the EMWMF/EMDF Focused Feasibility Study. The FY 2014 PCCR (D2 version) was completed.
EMDF	Road construction and site preparation continue. Roads are being constructed to facilitate installation of five monitoring well clusters. These wells will be used to measure water levels and to evaluate the hydrogeological suitability of the site.	
Reindustrialization	A Covenant Deferral Request (CDR) supporting transfer of the former K-33 area was transmitted to the regulators. This property consists of approximately 136 acres located in the northwest portion of the ETTP Heritage Center, including former site of the K-33 building.	The Covenant Deferral Request (CDR) for the former K-33 area was issued for a 30-day public review period. The property is planned for transfer in the second quarter of FY 2015, pending regulator and DOE HQ approvals.
WRRP	Held meeting with EPA and TDEC to discuss responses to comments on the FY 2014 RER.	The 2014 RER (D2 version) was submitted to the regulators for approval.
ORR Groundwater Strategy	The Groundwater RSE Work Plan was approved by the regulators.	Technical Advisory Group meetings were held in September to discuss progress, recommendations, and path forward for groundwater model development.
	Work continued on development of a test case groundwater model. Model progress and recommendations will be discussed at September meetings of the Technical Advisory Group.	

## 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

FFS – Focused Feasibility Study

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

PP – Proposed Plan

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
<b>FY 2015</b>						
<b>Spring Chairs Meeting</b> (Pending requests: ___)	TBD	Savannah River site	none		N/A	
<b>Intergovernmental Meeting with DOE</b> (Pending requests: ___)	TBD	TBD	none			
<b>Waste Management Symposium</b> (Attendees: Smalling, Price. Pending requests: Staley)	March 15-19, 2015 (Early registration ends 12/31/14)	Phoenix	\$995	<a href="http://www.wmsym.org">www.wmsym.org</a>	11/1/14 (# attendees 2)	10/22/14
<b>National Environmental Justice Conference &amp; Training</b> (Pending requests: ___)	TBD	Washington, D.C.	none	<a href="http://thenejc.org">http://thenejc.org</a>		
<b>Ohio EPA National Brownfields Conference</b> (Pending requests: ___)	TBD	Columbus, Ohio				
<b>RadWaste Summit</b> (Pending requests: ___)	TBD	Summerlin, Nevada	525	<a href="http://radwastesummit.com/">http://radwastesummit.com/</a>		
<b>Fall Chairs Meeting</b> (Pending requests: ___)	TBD	Santa Fe, NM	none		N/A	
<b>Western Waste Site Tour</b> (Tentative requests: DeLong, Hagy, Hatcher, Lyons, Mei, Paulus, Price, Smalling)	Postponed pending resolution of issues at WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Nevada Nat'l Security Site	none	none		
<b>Perma-Fix Nuclear Waste Management Forum</b> (Pending requests: ___)	Transitioned to a bi-annual event. Next meeting is slated for December 2015	Nashville	\$500			

Shading indicates closed trips