



Many Voices Working for the Community

Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

2018 Annual Planning Meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board

DRAFT August 25, 2018, Meeting Minutes

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) met for its 2018 Annual Planning Meeting at 9 a.m. on Saturday, August 25, 2018, at the Black Bear Inn & Suites, 1100 Parkway, Gatlinburg, TN 37738.

The meeting was facilitated by Jenny Freeman, StrataG. Copies of referenced meeting materials are attached to these minutes.

Members Present

Terry Allen	Eddie Holden	Bonnie Shoemaker
Richard Burroughs	Shell Lohmann	Fred Swindler
Bill Clark	Marite Perez	John Tapp
Martha Deaderick	Brooke Pitchers	Rudy Weigel
Sarah Eastburn	Belinda Price	Dennis Wilson

Members Absent

Leon Baker	Deni Sobek	Ed Trujillo
David Branch	Leon Shields	

Liaisons, Deputy Designated Federal Officer, and Alternates Present

Dave Adler, Acting Deputy Manager, Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Office of Environmental Management (DOE-OREM)

Michael Higgins, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC)

Connie Jones, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 4

Melyssa Noe, ORSSAB Alternate DDFO, DOE-OREM

Others Present

Jenny Freeman, Meeting Facilitator, StrataG

Shelley Kimel, ORSSAB Support Office

Sara McManamy-Johnson, ORSSAB Support Office

Three members of the public were present.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Board Chair Dennis Wilson opened the meeting by welcoming new and returning board members and introducing DOE liaisons and regulators.

Ms. Noe briefly introduced the new members appointed to the board in July 2018. New members present at the meeting were: Terry Allen, Bill Clark, Sarah Eastburn, Marité Perez, and Brooke Pitchers.

Ms. Freeman introduced herself as the facilitator. She gave attendees an overview of the agenda and noted a change to the agenda, that there would be an additional break after the presentation by the DDFO.

Ms. Price asked for an explanation of the work plan for new members. Mr. Adler explained it was an annual plan

for areas of topics to be addressed by the board. He noted the board was chartered under a federal statute allowing the government to solicit input from citizens. The meeting is to discuss items DOE would like advice on, although the board is not limited to just those items and topics can change during the course of the year as needed, he said.

Ms. Freeman gave attendees direction on addressing comments during the proceedings and asked for questions.

DDFO Comments

Mr. Adler helped to orient new members to ORSSAB by providing a general introduction to the mission, vision, and goals of OREM's cleanup program in Oak Ridge. He discussed that OREM has cleanup operations at East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP), Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), and Y-12 National Security Complex (Y-12). A list of past accomplishments in the cleanup program was shown. He also provided a summary of DOE's sites across the nation as well as locations of other advisory boards like ORSSAB.

His presentation outlined current broad goals, which OREM refers to as "visions":

- Vision 2020—A goal to complete major clean up on the remaining portion of ETTP and reindustrialize the site. He emphasized that DOE would continue stewardship activities for parts of the site in perpetuity. Mr. Adler gave an overview of facilities that have been removed to date and what buildings remain. Some buildings, he said, would be particularly challenging due to the activities performed there and/or architectural issues.
- Vision 2024—An initiative to expand cleanup work to ORNL and Y-12 and address mercury contamination at the sites.

He also reviewed OREM's current near-term priorities:

- Complete planning for waste disposition and design of a new disposal facility
- Prepare excess facilities for future demolition, stabilize contaminated facilities, and maintain critical infrastructure
- Evaluate ongoing groundwater studies
- Complete cleanup of ETTP, including meeting historic preservation goals and facilitating redevelopment/reindustrialization of the site
- Construction of the Mercury Treatment Facility
- Begin processing of U-233 at ORNL
- Complete contact- and remote-handled transuranic waste processing

He went on to give an overview of Oak Ridge's current EM budget. Oak Ridge has done well in recent federal budgets and current prospects are good, he said. He mentioned one significant challenge is the way that Oak Ridge's funding is structured. A significant amount of current funding comes from the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund (UED&D), established for very specific cleanup purposes at ETTP site. Cleanup at other Oak Ridge sites will draw from the larger, but more competitive Defense Fund. He reported that Oak Ridge has been working with headquarters to smoothly transition a reduction the UED&D funds allocated to Oak Ridge with an increase in the defense cleanup budget.

Mr. Adler reiterated the progress (about 85 percent complete) of cleanup and reindustrialization at ETTP. Projects to support modernizing facilities and removing legacy materials at Y-12 and ORNL are also underway.

After the presentation, board members raised the following questions:

- Ms. Deaderick asked about shifting funds from current cleanup to future projects.
 - Mr. Adler reminded attendees that the lion's share of current funding is specifically for cleanup of gaseous diffusion facilities. Once Oak Ridge finishes cleanup at ETTP, those funds will transition to other sites that have facilities similar to ETTP. Different funds must be appropriated for use at ORNL and Y-12.

Work Plan Topics and Discussion

DOE Topics

Mr. Adler presented DOE's suggested topics for board focus this year:

- Efforts to Assure Sufficient Waste Disposal Capacity
- Extending Operational Life of Facilities & Reducing Surveillance and Maintenance Requirements
- Efforts to Address Excess Contaminated Facilities
- Ongoing Groundwater Efforts
- Input on Reuse and Historic Preservation
- Input into the FY 2021 Budget

He emphasized the board is not limited solely to these topics and encouraged members to share any subjects they would like to see presented. The top issue before the board this year, he said, is planning for disposal of the waste to be generated by future cleanup efforts at ORNL and Y-12. The current landfill is close to capacity, and a new one is needed. He emphasized that all high-risk waste is removed from Oak Ridge for storage off-site. Large amounts of contaminants are removed, but some materials – debris, equipment, etc. – that might have some residual contamination that is not high-risk would be stored in a new proposed landfill much like the current Environmental Management Waste Management Facility (EMWMF), which has operated for about 15 years with no issues.

The new facility, known as the Environmental Management Disposal Facility (EMDF), will not take waste from out of state or from any other DOE facilities. It will mostly be used for OREM demolition debris, he said. Several sites are under consideration for this project. Onsite disposal, he added, is both safer and more cost-effective than shipping waste to sites in the western U.S. for disposal. DOE's preferred alternative is known as the Central Bear Creek Valley Site. He noted that there is significant public interest in the new landfill project. Additionally, ORSSAB has submitted several recommendations on the topic, which have been taken into account.

A proposed draft plan for the project will be released in the coming weeks, Adler said, with a tentative timeframe of November. He noted that TDEC is requesting additional studies before supporting the plan, EPA has been neutral, and the City of Oak Ridge has asked significant amounts of questions and had a professional firm look over the engineering plans. He noted Amy Fitzgerald from the City of Oak Ridge was in attendance. He also said a private company has expressed interest in offering their services to transport the waste out west at perhaps a cheaper price, but has not yet given DOE full information on lifetime costs. He said that company was planning to attend an upcoming ORSSAB meeting and that DOE welcomed discussion. The board will next hear about the new waste disposal project at its November meeting.

Mr. Adler moved on to discussion of extending operational life of existing facilities and reducing surveillance and maintenance (S&M) requirements on buildings awaiting demolition. In East Tennessee, water leaks from excessive rainfall are one of the biggest challenges for S&M. He said DOE would like to bring in Bill McMillan, who is the federal project manager for ORNL, to discuss these issues in more detail with the board.

DOE would also like the board to offer input on efforts to remove excess contaminated facilities. He said preparations are underway to start demolition on the Biology Complex at Y-12. That project will stretch over the next couple of years. Most of the resulting debris and other material will be able to be disposed in a regular municipal landfill, he noted. Work is underway on decommissioning the Alpha 4 facility at Y-12, he added.

Groundwater challenges, he said, are a familiar topic to the board that DOE would like it to continue to address. He noted there is contamination at ORNL and with some former burial grounds. The most urgent decisions facing OREM are at ETTP, where brownfields with groundwater issues need to be fully remediated before businesses are encouraged to develop those properties. DOE is working with EPA and TDEC to create a plan and conduct feasibility studies. DOE would like to present on various approaches this issue to the board in the coming year.

DOE continues to desire the board's input into reuse and historic preservation activities at ETPP. Adler noted that about 80 acres at ETPP would be dedicated to the Manhattan Project Historical National Park. DOE would also like to find partners to maintain several hundred acres of land there that is not suitable for building or other commercial use, but is excellent for greenways, recreation and conservation.

As usual, he said, DOE would appreciate the board's support with input into OREM's annual budget request.

After the presentation, board members raised the following questions:

- Ms. Deaderick asked about contaminated sludge from the Mercury Treatment Facility being put into the proposed new landfill.
 - Mr. Adler said sludge is produced as part of the water treatment process, but noted that mercury in the water is in parts per trillion (ppt). He illustrated an example and said if you took all mercury from the water treatment process produced over a year that it would fit in the palm of your hand. That small volume of mercury is what would be present in the much larger volume of sludge. Regardless, the sludge would have to meet the safety standards of waste acceptance criteria for the landfill. The general objective is not to send liquid metallic mercury to the new landfill, but only materials with trace amounts of mercury.
- Mr. Allen asked about the waste acceptance criteria being developed for the new landfill and said he thought it would be a big discussion to determine those.
 - Mr. Adler said there were some laws under the Resource Conservation Recovery Act that define general terms for these types of waste into hazardous and non-hazardous categories based on established testing processes. Much of the material generated from cleanup with trace levels of mercury would fall into the safest measured category, which is not hazardous. However, RCRA does not address radiological contaminants. Those wastes fall under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).
- Mr. Clark asked if the recoverable mercury from cleanup operations could be reused.
 - There is not a big commercial market for mercury, Adler explained. He said most of the mercury would be gathered and disposed. He noted there is an effort underway to find a disposal method for some purified mercury that is currently in storage at Y-12 due to lack of demand. Adler emphasized that most of the mercury in excess contaminated facilities is recoverable and DOE is removing that. He noted that workers have removed a few tons of mercury from Y-12 facilities already. However, mercury that is associated with building debris is different. There are ways to heat materials to essentially evaporate the mercury and distill it out. Alternatively, materials may be pulverized and sifted to let the mercury drain out. However, at times it is better to leave trace amounts of mercury solidified in place to reduce the chance of additional spread of contamination.
- Mr. Weigel asked if there was a standard for mercury in water that could be used to illustrate current contamination levels.
 - Mr. Adler said mercury levels in water leaving Y-12 today meet federal drinking water standards. It's also below levels harmful to fish. However, another level in the Clean Water Act addresses the safety of consuming fish from potentially contaminated waters. Some contaminants, like mercury, accumulate in fish tissue at concentrations many times higher than concentrations in the water. DOE does not currently meet that level. He noted that Mr. Wilson had previously expressed interest in more information regarding methylation of mercury, which would further illustrate how mercury builds up in fish in a way that is not dangerous to the fish, but is harmful for human consumption. He agreed this could be addressed by DOE in one of its presentations to the board.

TDEC Topics

Mr. Higgins noted he was standing in for the board's regular liaison, Kristof Czartoryski, who could not attend. He thanked the board for its representation and helping direct cleanup actions. He provided TDEC's suggested topics:

- Proposed EMDF
- Processing/disposition of transuranic (TRU) waste
- Assessment of groundwater
- Mercury remediation
- Water management
- Molten Salt Reactor Experiment (MSRE)

On EMDF, Mr. Higgins noted that DOE prepared remedial investigation and feasibility studies under CERCLA. The draft proposed plan is currently under review by TDEC and EPA. Comments and questions from the agencies are being resolved under the formal Dispute Resolution Process with DOE. TDEC is concerned about the preferred site's suitability due to groundwater levels. He echoed Mr. Adler in saying that the proposed plan should be out in the next few weeks. The organization is also closely studying potential mercury-contaminated item disposal in EMDF due to its proximity to Bear Creek. Also, waste acceptance criteria for the site have not yet been fully developed. Additionally, plans for treatment and discharge of landfill wastewater have also not been finalized.

TRU Sludge stored in Melton Valley Storage Tanks represents one of the highest levels of risk to the public and the environment. However, the pilot study for processing of the sludge is still several years away. DOE and TDEC are considering accelerating this project, but design and construction of an actual processing facility will require "a steady fiscal environment." TDEC also remains concerned with removing and disposing of TRU waste in Trench 13 in Melton Valley, he said.

An ORR groundwater strategy was developed in 2014. Mr. Higgins noted there are a number of onsite plumes as well as offsite wells to ensure no contamination is migrating off the reservation. Groundwater is a difficult and technical issue, he said. A few months ago a Phase I evaluation was completed with recommendations for a second phase. ETPP Zones 1 and 2 plumes must be dealt with in the coming years even after contaminated buildings and soils are removed, he added. TDEC does not want the board to lose sight of the fact that these long-term issues remain, he emphasized. TDEC wants to maintain public awareness of these groundwater issues even after the visible cleanup of building demolition and soil removal are complete.

On mercury remediation, Mr. Higgins noted that mercury release from Y-12 has impacted streams. He praised the Mercury Treatment Facility, which will allow safe demolition of contaminated buildings. A mercury issue tied to the proposed landfill, he reiterated, is where the mercury-bearing waste will be treated and disposed. These issues should be discussed in depth in the coming months, and TDEC would like the board's input. Several current projects around the ORR involve water and wastewater management, such as ETPP Zone 2 decisions; the use of an onsite water treatment site; EMWTF landfill wastewater; and wastewater discharge limits at the proposed EMDF, he said.

Mr. Higgins gave some background on the MSRE: The reactor was used for research in the 1960s and then shut down. The waste fuel has been removed, however, residual contamination remains. There is feasibility study work going on now that the board should be aware of, he said. DOE is currently discussing the feasibility of in-situ decommissioning or entombment rather than removing residual wastes entirely, which is what the current Record of Decision specifies. Mr. Higgins agreed there are many safety issues for workers, the environment, and the wider community with waste removal at MSRE, but the safety of permanent disposal onsite must also be studied and compared before a closure decision is finalized.

After the presentation, board members raised the following questions:

- Ms. Price asked for more details of the MSRE study
 - Mr. Adler said MSRE was a multi-building facility that includes several defueled, but still contaminated tanks that are in concrete vaults. Mr. Higgins said TDEC is considering similar remediation projects at Savannah River, which used the in-situ closure method, to see if that approach would be appropriate for Oak Ridge.

- Mr. Weigel noted the tanks at MSRE are currently capped. He asked about radioactivity.
 - Mr. Adler said the remaining byproducts of fission in the vaults are very radioactive and acutely hazardous. Mr. Weigel noted that it's very unsafe for workers. Mr. Adler agreed and said DOE is concerned for worker safety during any removal activities. Even though risks could be managed, DOE is considering whether it would be safer to wait until the half-life of some of the radioactive materials has decayed.

- Ms. Lohmann asked if project success at Savannah River is what is driving a re-evaluation of the Oak Ridge decision. She asked if Savannah River was similar enough to Oak Ridge to merit the comparison.
 - Mr. Higgins said yes, the success at the other site was what motivated the re-evaluation at Oak Ridge and that TDEC would like to study Savannah River further to make sure the situation is an "apples-to-apples" comparison.

- Mr. Clark asked if the MSRE tanks and vaults were above or below the water table.
 - Mr. Higgins said it varies widely from place to place due to the unique geography of East Tennessee. Karst and fractured rock create additional challenges, he added.

- Mr. Wilson asked for additional information on discharge of wastewater and current discussions. He asked if TDEC felt wastewater was being handled improperly.
 - Mr. Higgins said that different types of wastewater above and below ground are handled differently. TDEC has concerns because significant rain events can overwhelm the treatment facilities, he said. The ongoing discussion is on current discharge standards as well as ensuring that treatment facilities can handle any major rain event that might occur, based on lessons learned at the current landfill, he explained.

- Mr. Tapp asked about concerns about the proposed EMDF site and whether TDEC preferred a different site than DOE had chosen
 - Mr. Higgins said TDEC agrees that DOE has chosen the most promising onsite disposal facility.

- Ms. Shoemaker asked about the underdrain requirements for EMDF that TDEC is proposing.
 - Mr. Higgins said underdrain use depends on the exact size and design of the facility. There are concerns whether the landfill can be constructed without underdrains. There are two streams at the site that would need to be redirected, he noted.

- Ms. Shoemaker asked for more information about water quality standards.
 - Mr. Higgins reiterated that some criteria are met by DOE and others are not yet. Additionally, he said, there are spikes in contamination due to rain events or other events that are unpredictable. Mr. Adler said that the goal is for DOE to meet the most stringent criteria.

EPA Topics

Ms. Jones began her presentation by saying EPA feels citizen input by the board is critical. EPA would like to board to address the following issues:

- Proposed EMDF
- Groundwater Projects
 - ETTP
 - Melton Valley/Bethel Valley
 - Groundwater Treatment Technologies

Proposed EMDF

Ms. Jones noted both DOE and TDEC had covered this issue. She went into additional detail on the draft report of technical investigations by DOE and discussed the site layout.

Groundwater Projects

DOE proposed the Perimeter Site Project at ETTP in 2017, she said, to address low levels of contamination is surface and groundwater throughout the site. EPA's concern is that OREM's projects are complex, with changing plans, and often the groundwater is the last to be addressed. A remedial site evaluation report is due later this year, and EPA would like the board to look at that and offer input, she said.

EPA's current concern is that more than 600 acres have been approved for transfer in ETTP Zone 1, where contaminated groundwater is located and where construction may occur in the future. That may pose a problem for contaminated groundwater that could become a vapor intrusion concern. Ms. Jones said EPA knows that DOE has a limited budget, but believes OREM should focus more funds for groundwater cleanup.

EPA believes more monitoring wells are needed in Melton Valley and Bethel Valley, particularly near the Clinch River in Bethel Valley. EPA would like the board to review the DOE monitoring plan. Final cleanup is planned for the area in 2023. EPA would like the board to again look at the groundwater strategy document and re-evaluate the ranking of issues to be addressed.

Lastly, EPA would like DOE to evaluate potential new groundwater treatment technologies, she said. The DOE Office of Engineering and Technology last evaluated contaminated plumes and potential technologies in 2008. EPA would like DOE to pursue funding for technologies to actively reduce contamination. DOE has an extensive monitoring program. She said that under CERCLA, once groundwater begins to migrate from the area of concern (contaminated source), the migration needs to be contained or remediated.

After the presentation, board members raised the following questions:

- Mr. Burroughs asked how much additional money EPA thought its suggestions would cost.
 - Ms. Jones said it would be up to DOE to estimate costs.
- Mr. Tapp asked about the list of priorities for groundwater referenced in the presentation and whether the list was static.
 - Ms. Jones said contaminant plumes were ranked based on risk of public exposure. Depending on the information received, DOE may reevaluate the ranking. Mr. Adler said DOE has spent about \$300 million dealing with the top priorities. It spends \$15 million to \$20 million a year managing current priorities through efforts such as monitoring wells, he added. He agreed there are areas where more wells are needed and that is a near-term priority for DOE. In addition to monitoring plumes, DOE has also made efforts to eliminate the sources of contamination so plumes do not get worse over time, he said. He noted this topic would be covered in depth in the next few months.

- Ms. Shoemaker asked about current technology evaluations. She also inquired about addressing burial grounds.
 - Ms. Jones said the next step is looking at what technologies could be utilized. Mr. Adler said, yes, the burial grounds are an issue. It was excavated in the past, but some solvents from that area had already penetrated the bedrock, he explained. DOE has looked at technologies to remove the solvents, however, it has not identified a technology to fully and safely address the contamination and has discovered that some options could actually make things worse in the long run. Ms. Jones noted DOE is allowed to propose a technical impracticability waiver if the groundwater cannot be cleaned up and be protective of human health and the environment. However, DOE must collect and present the data to demonstrate the areas cannot be cleaned up. EPA is interested in getting the full dataset to determine if a waiver is appropriate..
- Mr. Clark followed up and asked if there is a way to neutralize referenced contaminants. He asked if DOE had considered expanding the site footprint.
 - Mr. Adler said DOE has instituted controls so people do not drink contaminated water, but the contamination is so entrenched in the bedrock it would be near impossible to locate it all. However, since contamination generally goes out through surface water, that offers a way for DOE to treat it as it exits the Oak Ridge Reservation. He added that DOE previously offered free hookups to city water to any resident along the Clinch River with private wells who was potentially affected by contamination of water. In addition, DOE monitors the private wells. He noted this was a successful, popular project that was also very cost-effective.
- Ms. Price said DOE funded development of a groundwater model of the ORR. She asked if it is still being used for predictions of the plumes' movement. She felt it was an excellent tool to evaluate risk.
 - Mr. Adler agreed with Ms. Price. He noted the model might help DOE evaluate any future wells, perhaps one drilled by a commercial or industrial entity for manufacturing as an example, surrounding the site and their potential effects.

After the presentations, Ms. Freeman invited board member suggestions on additional FY 2019 topics.

- Mr. Wilson reiterated that he was interested in new information on methylmercury studies.
 - Mr. Adler said he agreed that was a good topic and noted it had been a couple of years since the board had addressed it specifically.
- Mr. Tapp noted the board had a long discussion on the budget this year. He asked about a software program that a DOE consultant was using that captured budget information in a more easily understood format. He said it would be beneficial to ORSSAB.
- Ms. Lohmann asked, regarding mercury, what stopgap efforts and triage methods would be used while the Mercury Treatment Facility is being built. She noted it is a few years away from operation, but water permits are changing based on its capabilities.
 - Mr. Adler said he would like to include additional information on the excess facilities topic that would address this issue.

Board Process and Plan for Issue Group Signup

Ms. Noe discussed the overall yearly work plan creation process. Each summer, the board chair sends a request to DOE, EPA, and TDEC to develop potential topics. Also at that time, new members come on to the board and are given a tour of the ORR and further education. The annual meeting provides an opportunity for DOE and regulators to discuss possible topics for the upcoming fiscal year and for ORSSAB members to make suggestions for DOE to consider in developing a work plan.

Following the annual meeting, DOE will develop the board's FY 2019 work plan and schedule of meetings, based on all of the input provided. It is then approved by DOE headquarters. The draft list of topics for FY 2019 should be available at the September board meeting, she added. The goal is for a work plan to be signed into effect, by both Jay Mullis and ORSSAB's chair, by the start of the fiscal year in October.

Ms. Noe explained that prior to the board meetings each month, the Executive Committee meets to review the scheduled work plan topic and discuss board business. On the second Wednesday of most months, ORSSAB holds a formal board meeting, which typically includes a presentation on the work plan topic to provide a general background and introduction for the board. Afterwards, a site tour is arranged to give board members "hands-on" experience with the issue. Following the site tour, the board's EM and Stewardship Committee meets, generally on the fourth Wednesday of the month, for more in-depth discussion.

The committee meetings (and issue group members) help guide the board in the process of making recommendations. A change this year, she said, would be requesting board members to submit their questions by email after the main board meeting and/or site tour, but prior to the committee meeting so that members arrive at the EM Stewardship meeting with all the information they need to discuss the topic and whether a recommendation is needed. She also said DOE will try to spread topics out with some issue topics and some info briefings only, so that the EM Stewardship Committee is able to focus on drafting a recommendation on one topic at a time if possible.

She also noted additional opportunities for supplemental training on issues to be considered by the board. If the board is interested in additional education/training opportunities, staff will need to be notified so that arrangements can be made. Once the FY 2019 work plan has been established, a sign-up sheet with options for issue group members, managers, and supplemental training will be distributed.

Plan for Issue Group Sign Up

Once the FY 2019 work plan has been established by DOE, a sign-up sheet with options for issue managers and supplemental training will be distributed, she said. Board members are encouraged to sign up for issues at that time. The draft plan will be distributed at the September meeting, but Ms. Noe encouraged members to think about the topics they've learned about today over the coming month so they can choose some that interest them. She reminded members that not every issue necessarily requires members to issue a recommendation, but can be just for board education. She requested members to sign up for at least one issue to start and reminded them that their choices could change throughout the year if needed.

After the presentation, members asked the following questions:

- Ms. Lohmann commented that she encouraged new members to attend every meeting they can, even if it does not touch on their issue.
 - Ms. Noe said members should not feel that they have to be active in every issue, but she does hope members will attend every meeting possible.
- Mr. Swindler asked when members could sign up.
 - Ms. Noe said initial issue group signups would be in September, but that members could sign up at any time by emailing DOE or staff. They could also drop from an issue group if they had conflicts or a change of interest.

Board FY18 Review

Mission and Accomplishments

Mr. Wilson reviewed the board's mission statement and gave members an overview of how a recommendation is made and mentioned the changes, first raised by Ms. Noe, to meetings to assist in this effort. He emphasized the importance of an issue manager to each issue group to provide direction and compile the group's thoughts effectively.

Ms. Noe noted that the recommendation process has not really changed, but that the process flowchart has been made to further clarify the process for members during meetings. For new members particularly, she said, the board knows it looks overwhelming. She asked new members to keep in mind that most background information is provided by DOE and staff helps develop the research and discussion points. However, board members are solely responsible for the actual recommendation points.

Mr. Wilson discussed the board's accomplishments for FY 2018 as detailed in his presentation. He also asked new members how they enjoyed the new member tour. Mr. Clark said he enjoyed it and was ready for more in-depth information.

Results of Member Survey

Prior to the meeting, board members were asked to respond to a survey about board operations. Mr. Wilson provided summary points of the group's answers. Full results were included in meeting packets.

Summary of Morning Discussions

Ms. Freeman said she hoped board members noted that all three agencies had emphasized the importance of the board. She asked if anyone had any questions. None were raised.

Public Comment

Amy Fitzgerald introduced herself as the government affairs director for the City of Oak Ridge. She thanked the board for its public service. She said she wanted to address how the city interfaces with DOE and how it would like to be more engaged with the board. She noted she had been on the selection committee for the SSAB in the past and understands its contributions.

The city has a city manager and council form of government with 400 city employees, she explained. The city interfaces a lot with DOE. She has been with the city for about 16 years, and much of the work of her current position is because of the diverse number of missions DOE has in Oak Ridge. For example, she maintains a list of more than 50 projects where DOE-related entities and the city collaborate.

The city is currently evaluating a new water plant that will be on reservation property, she said. The city is trying to replace aging infrastructure critical to both the city and DOE. She mentioned the K-25 history center project at ETTP where the city is remodeling the fire station, which DOE transferred to the city in 2006. With the Office of Science, the city is working on the transition of the American Museum of Science and Energy to its new location and the planned re-opening in October. The city also works with DOE to provide police and fire protection.

The city, through its citizen boards appointed by city council, also accepts input. In particular, it has an Environmental Quality Advisory Board (EQAB), which is becoming more engaged on DOE activities. EQAB is looking at the documents related to the proposed new landfill. Members have provided some comments on the project, which Ms. Fitzgerald provided to the board for the record. (Attachment 2). She noted the city has a grant through TDEC to establish the Oak Ridge Reservation Communities Alliance (ORRCA). In that group, elected officials from several local governments meet quarterly at the TDEC office in Oak Ridge, she said. She invited board members to attend those meetings. She asked the board to join the distribution list of minutes and materials for that organization.

She also noted a national group, the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) that represents communities affected by DOE operations. She said ECA plans to visit Oak Ridge next summer to discuss the Manhattan Project Historical National Park.

She said the city will meet next week on a new school in the Scarboro Community. One concern for the city is that the initial site for the proposed landfill was much closer to Scarboro. The city is happy that it was not selected. She showed members a copy of the DOE Public Involvement Plan and encouraged members to analyze

those efforts. She particularly noted the section describing the CERCLA process. One of the CERCLA criteria is community acceptance, she said. She noted almost the entire reservation is inside Oak Ridge city limits. There is concern in the community about long-term monitoring of DOE facilities in Oak Ridge, she added.

Ms. Fitzgerald said the city has a technical consultant who has looked at the initial proposed plan for EMDF. She provided a copy of his report to be included in the meeting record (Attachment 3). She noted some changes have been made to the plan since that report was created and for the board to keep that in mind. The city is also very concerned about mercury treatment and disposal as well as long-term management of disposal sites. From a community perspective, she noted, signs warning about mercury are of concern to visitors and those living in the city. The city would like these issues addressed before the final decision is made, because official decisions are very difficult to modify later.

Board Business

Motions

1. Meeting Minutes

Mr. Burroughs presented the June 13, 2018 meeting minutes.

Motion 8/25/18.1

Ms. Price moved to approve. Mr. Weigel said the minutes erroneously listed him as not present. Ms. Lohmann noted she attended via telephone and could hear the meeting although not speak. Ms. Price motioned to approve the minutes as amended to update Mr. Weigel and Ms. Lohmann's participation. Ms. Shoemaker seconded. The motion passed.

2. Recommendation on FY 2019 OREM Budget Priorities

Mr. Swindler presented the "Recommendations on the FY 2020 Oak Ridge Environmental Management Program Budget Priorities," developed by the EMS Committee for approval by the board.

Board members raised the following issues in discussion:

Mr. Weigel asked about a previous project to remediate East Fork Poplar Creek and what areas are proposed to being remediated now in the recommendation. Mr. Wilson said it was onsite only. Mr. Weigel requested that be added to the recommendation.

Mr. Tapp said the recommendation referred to "most contaminated areas." What about areas that have already been remediated, he said. Mr. Weigel responded that some areas have been remediated because there is no free-mercury contamination. Mr. Adler said the onsite areas are the most contaminated areas. There are areas off the Y-12 site on the flood plain that have been remediated, he added. There are other areas within the stream channel leaving the plant site that are still contaminated, however. Those at some point will need to be addressed. Mr. Adler said it might be useful to put in the word "onsite" to clarify the issue. Mr. Weigel noted that TDEC and EPA had approved some areas where mercury was allowed to remain because it is immobile and therefore safe.

Mr. Allen said he would like an update on the mercury contamination issue. Mr. Adler said this would be included in the discussion of methylmercury. He would like to bring in Mark Peterson and talk about the current contamination and ways to improve the cleanup.

Mr. Weigel said that when DOE and TDEC met, different levels of cleanup were presented to the public at the Pollard Auditorium and the public said it would prefer a lesser cleanup in that instance because to completely remove contamination would require destroying a mostly intact conservation area.

Mr. Burroughs said he thought Mark Peterson was studying that area. He asked if DOE is doing assessment for future remediation. Mr. Adler said DOE is looking at ways to improve things, for example, by introducing different fish species.

Motion 8/25/18.2

Mr. Swindler moved to approve the recommendation by removing the item relating to onsite contamination until the board receives additional information. Mr. Weigel seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Recommendation on EMDF

Ms. Lohmann summarized the "Recommendations on the FY 2020 Oak Ridge Environmental Management Program Budget Priorities," developed by the EM and Stewardship Committee for approval by the board.

Motion 8/25/18.3

Ms. Shoemaker moved to approve the recommendation. Mr. Swindler seconded, and the motion passed with one abstention from Ms. Price.

Election of FY 2019 Officers

Mr. Swindler presented a slate of candidates for board officers for FY 2019.

Chair: Dennis Wilson, Leon Shields, and Ed Trujillo

Vice-Chair: Bonnie Shoemaker and Michelle Lohmann

Secretary: Richard Burroughs (*note: Mr. Baker was originally a candidate on provided meeting materials, but withdrew his nomination shortly prior to the meeting*)

Ms. Freeman asked for any further nominations from the floor or comments. Ms. Freeman thanked the Nominating Committee for its work. She called for election of the chair. Mr. Swindler noted that additional nominations should be solicited. No other members introduced nominations.

In voting for chair, Dennis Wilson received a majority of votes and was elected chair.

In voting for vice chair, Shell Lohmann received a majority of votes and was elected vice chair.

In voting for secretary, Mr. Burroughs was accepted as secretary.

Closing remarks

Members were reminded to fill out and turn in the meeting evaluation. The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the August 25, 2018, meeting of the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board.

Richard Burroughs, Secretary



Dennis Wilson, Chair
Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board
DW/smk

M/DD/YY