

**Summary of the 2014 Annual Meeting
Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board
Saturday, August 16, 2014, 8 a.m. to noon
DOE Information Center, 1 Science.gov Way
Oak Ridge, Tenn.**

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) met for its annual planning meeting beginning at 8 a.m., on Saturday, August 16, 2014, at the Department of Energy (DOE) Information Center, 1 Science.gov Way, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The objectives of the meeting were to:

- Develop an increased understanding of and commitment to the goals of the board
- Evaluate the effectiveness and achievements of the board in FY 2014
- Begin development of the FY 2015 work plan

The meeting was facilitated by Jenny Freeman, Strata G. The agenda is Attachment 1.

Members present

Noel Berry	Dave Hemelright,	Greg Paulus
Alfreda Cook	Chair	Scott Stout
Lisa Hagy, Secretary	Jan Lyons	Wanfang Zhou
Bob Hatcher	Fay Martin	
	Donald Mei	

Members absent

Jimmy Bell	Howard Holmes	Mary Smalling
Carmen DeLong	Jennifer Kasten	Wanda Smith
Bruce Hicks, Vice Chair	Belinda Price	Corkie Staley

Others present

Dave Adler, DOE-Oak Ridge Office (DOE-ORO), Alternate Deputy Designated
Federal Officer (DDFO)
Susan Cange, DOE, DDFO
Aditya Chourey, ORSSAB student representative
Kristof Czartoryski, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC), ORSSAB Liaison
Jenny Freeman, Strata G
Spencer Gross, ORSSAB Support Office
Connie Jones, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), ORSSAB Liaison
Melyssa Noe, DOE-ORO, ORSSAB Federal Coordinator
Pete Osborne, ORSSAB Support Office
Claire Rowcliffe, ORSSAB student representative

Mr. Hemelright opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking them for making the effort to attend. He reviewed the objectives for the meeting and guidelines for how the meeting was to be conducted.

Ms. Cange introduced Mr. Zhou as a new member to the board who was attending his first meeting.

DDFO Comments

Ms. Cange, the board's DDFO, is also the DOE-ORO Acting Manager for Environmental Management (EM). She gave an overview of the program and talked about the short-term and long-term plans. The main points of her presentation are in Attachment 2.

The mission of the program is to complete the cleanup of the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR). The program is focused on protecting the region's health and environment, making clean land available for public use, and ensuring the ongoing missions at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) and Y-12 National Security Complex.

EM work is organized by portfolios at East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP), ORNL, and Y-12. Work is conducted by several contractors; the largest are UCOR, WAI, and Isotek. UCOR has the largest contract of about \$2.5 billion to clean up ETTP, and it is responsible for surveillance and maintenance at all three sites. Its contract runs to 2016 and there is a one-time option to extend the contract an additional four years.

WAI's contract is to operate the Transuranic (TRU) Waste Processing Center. Isotek is responsible for disposing of uranium-233 at ORNL.

Ms. Cange explained the key considerations at each site (Attachment 2, page 5). The primary risk at Y-12 is mercury. While the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry has said there are no adverse impacts of mercury in East Fork Poplar Creek, the amount of mercury leaving Y-12 via the creek is above state guidelines and DOE must try to reduce concentrations.

At ORNL the primary risk is radiological. There are more than 26 million curies of radioactive material stored at the lab very near billions of dollars' worth of infrastructure investments.

Life-cycle cost is the primary risk at ETTP. Almost \$60 million is spent annually on maintaining a safe status and essential services. Ms. Cange said that cost is a large drain on EM's budget. She said the sooner ETTP can be cleaned up the more money that can be directed to Y-12 and ORNL.

Ms. Cange listed EM's near term goals:

- Complete the demolition of Buildings K-27 and K-31 at ETTP.
- Construct and operate a mercury water treatment system at Y-12. Ms. Cange said construction of the plant is in preparation for cleanup of mercury-contaminated buildings at Y-12 that will likely release mercury during cleanup or demolition.
- Dispose half of the uranium-233 inventory at ORNL and prepare for processing the remaining inventory. Ms. Cange said there is a path to dispose about half of the inventory and when that is finished what remains will be downblended.
- Continue processing TRU debris.
- Prepare for TRU sludge processing.
- Continue planning for a new disposal cell. Ms. Cange said the current disposal facility is projected to be filled by about 2020. A second facility is needed to complete cleanup of Y-12 and ORNL.

EM's long-term goals are:

- Complete TRU debris processing (~2018)
- Complete construction of the mercury treatment facility at Y-12 (~2020)
- Complete cleanup of ETTP (~2022)
- Begin demolition of mercury-contaminated buildings at Y-12 (~2023)
- Complete uranium-233 disposition (~2024)
- Begin operation of a new disposal facility (~2024)

- Complete transuranic sludge processing (~2026)
- Begin demolition of central campus buildings at ORNL (~2027)

Ms. Cange showed a proposed cleanup schedule (Attachment 2, page 8). She said the dark blue areas indicate cleanup work, yellow is remediation of groundwater and soil, and green is waste processing activities. She said the cleanup program is projected to last through early to mid-2040s depending on budget allocations.

EM has a number of challenges affecting its cleanup goals, (Attachment 2, page 9) including:

- Diverse, complex projects
- Competing priorities
- Declining budgets
- Regulator and stakeholder expectations and commitments
- Ongoing DOE missions

Ms. Cange said while other sites in the DOE complex may have just one or two projects, Oak Ridge has several different complex projects that are competing for priority and funding. Sometimes there are more projects than available funding so difficult decisions must be made. She said while Oak Ridge has a healthy cleanup budget it is not enough to address projects within given timeframes.

Ms. Cange said cleanup commitments are made through the ORR Federal Facility Agreement among DOE, EPA, and TDEC, and the Site Treatment Plan between DOE and TDEC. These agreements have commitments that DOE must achieve.

She noted that cleanup work at Y-12 and ORNL must be coordinated to make sure ongoing missions are not hindered.

Ms. Cange said EM continues to position for the future by:

- Balancing competing risks at Y-12, ORNL, and ETTP.
- Optimizing progress and efficiencies while maintaining a good safety record. She said the incidents at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico that forced its temporary closure illustrate how problems can have a devastating impact on operations.
- Looking for innovative ways to perform work. Ms. Cange said with insufficient funding it's important to be innovative and creative.
- Identifying near-term goals while continuing longer-term strategic focus.

Ms. Cange then reviewed the role of ORSSAB:

- Maintain awareness of key program focus areas.
- Provide recommendations on high-level programmatic decisions and project implementation. She said there was a time when many decisions on cleanup had not been made, but many of those decisions have been made and are now in the implementation phase. But she said there are some opportunities for ORSSAB input on key decisions such as the proposed disposal facility.
- Solicit input from broader regional stakeholder community. Ms. Cange noted the Public Outreach Committee had been active in that area.
- Participate in national dialogues concerning the EM program. She reminded the group that ORSSAB is one of several similar boards across the country. Leadership of all the boards will gather in September in Idaho for a meeting to discuss cleanup issues.

At this point, Mr. Hatcher asked if the TRU sludge operations could be shifted to the Hanford site where similar operations are underway. Ms. Cange said that had been considered, along with the Savannah River Site, but there are difficult and expensive issues in finding proper shipping containers to transfer the material.

Mr. Hatcher also asked, as land is transitioned from DOE ownership to industrial development, if there has been any consideration of offering the land to descendants of those who were displaced in the 1940s to develop the area for Manhattan Project purposes. Ms. Cange said she didn't have enough information to answer that question, but she believed that the original owners were compensated for the loss of their properties and gave up all claims to the lands. She noted that not all land is being designated for industrial development. Some has been set aside for conservation or historic preservation. Mr. Adler noted that some of the original property is now used by the community in areas such as Robertsville and Oliver Springs.

Ms. Cange concluded her portion of the meeting by asking board members to think about ways to make the monthly meetings more productive. She challenged them to think about ways to make the meetings more interactive, be more beneficial, and generate more interest in the community.

She said she was not requesting changes, but thought it was a good time to reconsider the structure of meetings, frequency of meetings, and how the board operates.

Board Operations

This part of the meeting was a general discussion about the monthly meetings, meeting attendance, frequency of meetings, number of members needed to vote on recommendations, and so on.

Mr. Hemelright noted that only 11 members were present for the meeting out of a total of 20. He said there has not been a quorum of members present at the last two meetings to vote on recommendations originated by the eight SSABs to be sent to the DOE Assistant Secretary for EM. Unless there is a quorum at the September meeting, ORSSAB will not be able to sign the recommendations prior to the Fall EM SSAB Chairs' meeting September 16-18.

Ms. Freeman asked if there were any ideas about getting more board members actively engaged. Mr. Hemelright said member engagement comes and goes. He said part of the problem with approving recommendations is the board's bylaws are somewhat restrictive requiring three-quarters of membership present and two-thirds of those must approve the recommendation. The Budget & Process Committee is reviewing the current bylaws and is also awaiting guidance from DOE Headquarters on bylaws revisions for all the SSABs.

Mr. Hemelright said the Public Outreach Committee has made great strides in its work, and the EM & Stewardship Committee has had good discussions. He said he welcomes ideas from members to make meetings more interactive, and he asked for suggestions on number of meetings and length of meetings.

When he first became interested in becoming a member it was nice to have food available. He said many people do not have time to eat prior to the meetings, and having food available makes it a good way to socialize.

Mr. Hemelright said this was the first time the annual meeting was held at the site of the monthly meetings. Previous annual meetings have been held off-site with a social event the night before. He said the social events are good ways to communicate with and get to know members.

Ms. Martin said she also liked the social gatherings the night before annual meetings.

Ms. Cook said one of the requirements for being a member is to attend meetings and not miss two in a row.

Ms. Cook said since many of the EM projects are now in implementation, she asked what difference ORSSAB can make – 'are we making a difference,' 'do we have a purpose?'

Ms. Lyons said the board is in a different mode and the board's demographics are different than when it was first established. She said people today are not interested in long, formal meetings, but much has been accomplished in committees in informal settings. She said people don't have to be as committed to

committee membership. She said perhaps the board meetings don't have to be as often and not always have a presentation, just a business meeting occasionally.

Mr. Hemelright noted getting new members is a time-consuming process. Ms. Noe said it is difficult to find interested people who are not connected with DOE in some way. When someone is identified the approval process takes so long that applicants often are either no longer interested or have moved on to something else by the time the appointment is finalized.

Mr. Paulus said he had missed five meetings but had been out of the country with family, which comes first. He said members must feel like they are challenged and are contributing. He said the restriction on DOE connections was not good and that approach should be changed.

Mr. Paulus liked the idea of reducing the number of meetings noting that if a member is on a committee that makes it even more difficult. He felt the meetings should be restructured and ways found to keep members stimulated.

Mr. Hemelright said some of the other boards do not meet in the same place each time. He suggested changing the meeting venue occasionally so people from other communities can attend. He did note a letter from a current member to Ms. Cange strongly supporting keeping meetings monthly.

Ms. Cook said she believed the monthly board meetings kept members together as a unit. One of the committees often meets by teleconference. She wondered if the other committees could do that. As for attendance, she said if people feel like they are making a difference they will participate in some fashion.

Ms. Lyons said it may be difficult for the EM & Stewardship Committee to meet by teleconference because of presentations that are given. She thought perhaps webinars could be set up for both board and committee meetings.

Regarding community interest, Ms. Lyons said in talking with area librarians about placement of the 'Advocate' newsletter, some of the librarians said it was important, while others said no one in their communities care. She said it's up to ORSSAB to reach out to those communities. She liked the idea of having meetings in different venues in the nine-county area around the ORR, but she said it would take a while to get people to attend.

Ms. Noe ran down the FY 2014 meeting schedule. The board did not meet in October 2013 because of government sequestration. The board has not met in December the last few years. Inclement weather caused cancellation of the February meeting. The board did not meet in July in lieu of new member orientation.

Ms. Cange reported on how other SSABs meet:

- Hanford Advisory Board meets four times a year for two days.
- Idaho National Lab Citizens' Advisory Board meets four times a year for a day.
- Nevada SSAB meets six times a year in the evenings.
- Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board meets six times a year from 1-5 p.m.
- Portsmouth SSAB meets six times a year at 6 p.m.
- Savannah River Citizens' Advisory Board meets six times a year for a day.
- Paducah Citizens' Advisory Board meets six times a year.

Ms. Cange said the boards can continue to have monthly activities, but they do not have to be full board meetings. Ms. Freeman said DOE's Oak Ridge budget rollout meeting this year was restructured and had good attendance. It was an interactive meeting with breakout groups.

Ms. Hagy commented on seeing projects in progress. She said it's important to actually see sites and what is being done to understand the issues better. With pictures in presentations she said it's more difficult to understand size and complexity and seeing something up close allows a person to be more involved. Mr.

Czartoryski said not all planning of work has been completed and taking members into the field to explain projects being considered could be useful.

Ms. Cook said having the opportunity to travel to other sites is important to see what their problems are, how they are being addressed, and how they operate.

Mr. Hatcher commented on different venues for meetings. He said perhaps board meetings should remain at the Information Center, but the EM & Stewardship Committee could go to areas like Kingston where committee presentations may relate to that community. He thought it would be easier to take committee meetings on the road than full board meetings. Ms. Noe said that was a good idea that could generate interest in being on the board.

Ms. Jones noted that in the first years of the board when there were many decisions to be made, a number of board meetings were held at Roane State Community College. She said venue is important for participation by the public.

Mr. Paulus asked Ms. Cange if she had a concept for any board transition. She replied that she had been thinking about it for a while and her observation is the board is not functioning optimally.

She said perhaps the monthly meetings have become a chore for some members. She wanted board members to be enthusiastic and to participate and for the board to provide more input on recommendations.

She said she has thought about how to structure things so they are more interactive and not necessarily be meetings. She thought there could be more interaction with project team leaders and go on tours of some of the facilities and project sites.

Ms. Cange has thought about ways the board could interact with the community a couple of times a year. She thought the board could take a more active role in planning and conducting EM's budget rollout. She thought different types of interactions would lead to a better performing board.

In any case, she said DOE will support the board because it provides a service to DOE.

Mr. Paulus asked how changes would be accomplished. Mr. Adler said these ideas would be discussed at the Executive Committee level and any new approaches would be put in the board's work plan.

Ms. Cange said the Executive Committee could develop a recommendation to restructure how the board operates and present the recommendation to the board to consider.

Ms. Cook said whatever the Executive Committee decides should be clearly reported at the board level.

Mr. Adler said to ensure full involvement of members, some of these ideas should be discussed at the EM & Stewardship Committee meeting when it develops its work plan for 2015.

Ms. Cange said the board might want to broadly advertise what the committees discuss and any board restructuring.

Board Mission and Accomplishments

Mr. Hemelright reviewed board accomplishments for FY 2014 (Attachment 3).

He said the EM SSAB Chairs' meeting will be September 16-18 in Idaho Falls. At each chairs' meeting boards are asked to present their top issue, accomplishment, or activity. Mr. Hemelright asked if there were any suggestions on what to take to the meeting.

Mr. Hatcher suggested item number 3 on the list of accomplishments: Follow the transition in long-term emphasis from cleanup to stewardship.

Mr. Hatcher said all sites involved in cleanup will eventually have need for stewardship.

Mr. Paulus agreed, but he also suggested the recommendation on groundwater was important, although it may not be relevant to all sites. Mr. Hatcher said everyone has a groundwater problem of some sort. Mr. Paulus thought numbers 1 and 3 could be tied together.

Ms. Hagy agreed with sending up number 3.

Work Plan Topics and Discussion

Each year ORSSAB sends letters to DOE, EPA, and TDEC requesting topics for the board to consider in next fiscal year. The agencies responded and those suggestions were compiled in Attachment 4.

Mr. Adler said these topics relate mostly to the EM & Stewardship Committee and will be discussed at the committee's next meeting for scheduling on its work plan.

Mr. Adler noted that there is quite a bit of overlap among the agencies on the topics. EPA and TDEC had some suggestions beyond those of DOE. He talked about each one where all three had common interests.

Y-12 Mercury Cleanup Strategy and Plan for Water Treatment Plant

Mr. Adler said this topic will be a key focus in FY 2015 to control mercury leaving Y-12 in East Fork Poplar Creek, which runs through populated areas of Oak Ridge. A D1 version of a proposed plan for the project has been sent to EPA and TDEC for review. When their comments are received and addressed by DOE, a D2 version will be provided to ORSSAB and be available to the public for comment.

Mr. Hatcher asked if it's known how much mercury has already gone into the creek and how much remains at Y-12. Mr. Adler said that kind of information is known and will be made available in presentations.

Mr. Czartoryski said building the water treatment plant is to prevent mercury from going down the creek. Ms. Cange said the plant, to be built at Outfall 200 at Y-12, is one of DOE's highest priorities, and it's one of the highest priorities for all three agencies.

Ms. Jones said there is the additional concern of mercury in soils at Y-12 and it should not be left in place and alternatives need to be considered for removing it.

Sufficient Waste Disposal Capacity on the ORR

Mr. Adler said DOE wants a lot of public input on this topic. There was a lot of interest when the EM Waste Management Facility was being considered.

The proposed plan will be issued in 2015. There are two central issues:

- Whether to build another disposal facility and
- If so, where should it go?

Mr. Hemelright asked if much work hadn't already been done. Mr. Adler said some had been done. DOE has a site in mind for planning assumptions because it's in an area that is already designated for waste disposal. He said technical studies are being done and discussions are underway about the appropriateness of the site.

Ms. Cook asked why ORSSAB would disagree with anything the agencies agree on unless the EM & Stewardship Committee and the board have technical expertise on the topic. Mr. Adler said the board has issued a recommendation that stopped short of advocating building the facility and where it should go. The recommendation was to continue with planning assumptions, and it gave criteria for selecting a site, which generally favors the proposed site. He said it's near time to go from a planning discussion to a

decision discussion. The proposed plan will suggest a specific location and DOE will take comments on the location.

Ms. Cange said the board could have a role in the public acceptance of siting a second facility. When an alternative is selected DOE must look at nine criteria and one of those is community acceptance. She said the board can collect information and communicate to the public whether it is an acceptable solution or not. The community should know and understand the impacts of having, or not having, a second disposal facility.

Mr. Zhou asked if the board has participated in the site screening process. Mr. Adler said the initial screening was done for the EM Waste Management Facility in the 1990s and the same list was used again. Ms. Cange said DOE took all of the work done previously to identify the current proposed location. TDEC has concerns because of streams in the area, and the facility would have to be constructed over the streams in such a way to protect them.

Mr. Czartoryski said there are difficult decisions to make and the agencies are discussing the issue. He said there could be a change in kind of waste that can be disposed; if so, the facility could be smaller if some of the waste can go elsewhere.

Mr. Adler said discussion of this topic could be a lively one. Mr. Zhou said if it's publicized it could have significant public participation.

Completion of ETTP

DOE and EPA included this topic in their list of suggestions.

Mr. Adler said DOE has spent most of its money in Oak Ridge at ETTP. The goal is to convert it from federal ownership to private use. ETTP is divided into two zones with the core, Zone 2, as the main industrial area. A buffer zone, Zone 1, of about 1,400 acres around the Zone 2 offers an area for re-development.

He said a decision needs to be made on soils in the area. Decisions also need to be made on land use controls, water use, and development.

Mr. Adler said ETTP requires large scale budget requirements, but remaining cleanup should not be too big of a challenge.

DOE expects to issue a proposed plan in 2015 for cleanup of the land around the industrial area.

Ms. Jones said EPA want to make sure proper documentation is done to support cleanup actions.

Mr. Berry said there has been discussion about an airport at ETTP. Mr. Adler said if an airport is built it would be mostly in Zone 1. He said that is the kind of development DOE would like to promote.

Ms. Lyons asked where money will go when ETTP cleanup is finished. Ms. Cange explained that EM receives different kinds of funding. The two primary ones are defense and decontamination and demolition (or decommissioning, D&D). D&D funds are used to clean up ETTP. Defense funds are used for other projects. The assumption is that when D&D funds are used up, allocations would go to defense. Last year Congress put caps on how much can be spent on defense, so Ms. Cange said the assumption may not be valid.

Selection of a Remediation Strategy for Trench 13 in Melton Valley

DOE suggested this topic.

Mr. Adler said there is some remaining hazardous waste buried in a site call Trench 13. The waste was encountered during the remediation of the Melton Valley waste disposal area in the 2006-7 timeframe. He said to deal with the waste will be expensive and technically challenging.

TDEC believes the material should be removed and disposed like TRU waste. DOE is reluctant to take that approach because of previous challenges.

Mr. Adler said DOE would like to brief the board on the background and challenges of Trench 13 and perhaps take a field trip to the site.

Provision of Input into the FY 2017 Budget Prioritization Effort

Every year DOE Oak Ridge requests input from the board on its budget request to DOE Headquarters and related project prioritization. Mr. Adler said while there is general consensus among DOE, EPA, and TDEC on cleanup priorities it's helpful to get input from ORSSAB. He said the board should get a summary status on all cleanup projects from the federal project directors. With a renewed understanding of the projects perhaps there would be consideration of whether to continue with current priorities. Mr. Adler said this could be a more public meeting.

ORR Groundwater

EPA and TDEC suggested that ORSSAB consider the groundwater issues on the ORR.

Mr. Czartoryski said some of the groundwater plumes have gone beyond the ORR boundaries and there is some indication that there are contaminants related to the ORR in groundwater on the west side of the Clinch River. He said he hoped the board would engage in efforts to assess the situation.

Ms. Jones said the groundwater strategy that has been developed was informative, and EPA would like for DOE to evaluate plumes on site for remediation.

Processing and Disposition of Transuranic Waste

TDEC suggested this topic.

TDEC is working with DOE to establish a path forward to dispose of TRU sludge stored in tanks in Melton Valley while a disposal facility is available.

TDEC is concerned about DOE funding that could delay the project. Mr. Czartoryski said Trench 13 contains TRU material in drums. He reiterated Mr. Adler's statement that the two agencies disagree on how to proceed.

Mr. Paulus said this was the first he had heard of Trench 13. He asked why it hasn't been discussed. Ms. Cange said there is no eminent danger or risk. It's being brought up again because DOE has milestones to complete some studies and evaluations and make a recommendation on how DOE is going to clean up the trench. She said DOE and TDEC are in an informal dispute over the trench. This is an issue where DOE is in the planning stage and the two agencies disagree on how to proceed.

Mr. Paulus asked if there are similar problems the board is not aware of. Ms. Cange said there are, but none in the decision-making stage. Mr. Paulus asked if the board needs any insight on these kinds of projects. Ms. Cange said that might be something to add to the work plan to learn more about. Ms. Cook asked if the board could get a list of projects. Ms. Cange said that could be a component of a presentation on the universe of cleanup in Oak Ridge.

Mr. Hemelright asked what avenues are available for TRU waste disposition. Ms. Cange said the only place is the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, but it is currently shut down. In the meantime Oak Ridge continues to process TRU waste and get it ready for disposal, but it is being stored at ORNL until the plant reopens.

Mr. Hemelright asked about above-ground storage at WIPP. Ms. Cange said that has been considered, but nothing is feasible that wouldn't require a large investment.

Ms. Hagy asked if the waste in Trench 13 is being monitored. Mr. Adler said it has been stabilized with no potential for a problem unless it is exposed to air, and it is monitored continually. Mr. Czartoryski said the question is whether to deal with it soon or leave it in place where future generations may encounter it and be exposed to potential harm.

With the conclusion of the discussion of agency suggestions, Ms. Freeman asked if there were other suggestions from board members for consideration. A few were offered:

- Tours of the sites discussed, such as Trench 13, the proposed site of a new waste disposal facility, Zone 1 at ETPP.
- More information on challenges the agencies have worked through to reach a decision.
- More engagement in the budget process to include the public.
- More information on the cleanup universe.

Sign up of Committees

Mr. Hatcher described the mission of the EM & Stewardship Committee. He said many cleanup decisions have already been made and the primary focus of the committee is transitioning more to stewardship.

Ms. Lyons said the mission of the Public Outreach Committee is to inform the public about what the board is doing and try to engage the public in cleanup topics. That is done through the 'Advocate' newsletter, the ORSSAB exhibit at the American Museum of Science and Energy, brochures, news releases, newspaper ads about board meetings, staffing the Earth Day booth, and distributing videos of board meetings to local cable channels.

Mr. Paulus said the Budget & Process Committee is responsible, along with the EM & Stewardship Committee, with developing the annual budget and prioritization recommendation to DOE EM. It also reviews requests for member travel and other board expenditures.

Attending members did not signify intention to join or change committees, but they have the option to participate on committees of their choosing.

Board business

Mr. Berry, representing the Nominating Committee, presented a slate of candidates for board officers for FY 2015:

Dave Hemelright – Chair

Jan Lyons – Vice Chair

Lisa Hagy – Secretary

The candidates will be voted on at the September 10 board meeting. Other nominations from the floor will be taken at that time.

Lacking a quorum the board was unable to vote on EM SSAB recommendations (1) Publicizing EM Successes and (2) Funding to Support Cleanup and Expedite Milestones.

Public Comment

None.

Closing Remarks

Mr. Hemelright addressed the issue of where to hold annual meetings. He said board members were polled after last year's meeting about having the meeting off-site or at the Information Center. The

majority voted to hold the meeting at the Information Center. He noted that some of those who voted to hold the meeting at the Information Center did not attend this meeting. He thought going back off-site is beneficial for socializing among members.

Mr. Hatcher also thought off-site meetings were useful for interaction among members. He suggested a Friday evening topic of discussion prior to the Saturday meeting would be valuable.

Mr. Paulus said he was one who voted for having the meeting at the Information Center, but he now believes the off-site meeting is better.

Ms. Freeman asked for any other comments about the meeting. Mr. Chourey and Ms. Rowcliffe said they were looking forward to touring the ORR and learning more about the projects and getting to know the other members better.

Ms. Lyons said it was a good discussion on how to broaden outreach and engage board and community members.

Ms. Hagy and Mr. Hemelright said it was a productive meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25

(Attachments 4)

rsg