

**ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE-SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD  
to the  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

**PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

**Sun Valley Inn  
2 Sun Valley Road  
Sun Valley, Idaho  
October 29-30, 2019**

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS**

DOE – US Department of Energy  
D&D – Deactivation & Decommissioning  
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer  
EM – (DOE) Office of Environmental Management  
EMAB – Environmental Management Advisory Board  
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board  
EPA – US Environmental Protection Agency  
FY – Fiscal Year  
Hanford – (DOE) Hanford Site  
HAB – Hanford Advisory Board  
HLW – High-Level Waste  
ICP CAB – Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board  
INL – Idaho National Laboratory  
NNM CAB – Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board  
NNSA - National Nuclear Security Administration  
Nevada SSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board  
OR SSAB – Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board  
Paducah CAB – Paducah Citizens Advisory Board  
Portsmouth – (DOE) Portsmouth Site  
PORTS SSAB – Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board  
SRS – (DOE) Savannah River Site  
SRS CAB – Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board  
TRU – Transuranic Waste  
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant  
WIR – Waste Incidental to Reprocessing

## **PARTICIPANTS**

Hanford Advisory Board: Susan Leckband, Chair; Shelley Cimon, Vice Chair; James Lynch, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO); JoLynn Garcia, Federal Coordinator

Idaho National Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board: Trilby McAfee, Chair; Brad Christensen, Vice Chair; Jack Zimmerman, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) and Idaho Cleanup Project Manager; Connie Flohr, Deputy DDFO; Bradley Bugger, Federal Coordinator; Danielle Miller, DOE-Idaho Public Affairs; Kelly Green, Staff; Jordan Davies, Staff;; Lawrence Schoen, Member

Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board: Steve Rosenbaum, Member; Don Neill, Member; Kelly Snyder, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO); Barbara Ulmer, Staff

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board: Max Baca, Chair; Robert Hull, Vice Chair; David Nickless, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO); Bridget Maestas, Staff

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board: Shell Lohmann, Chair; Bonnie Shoemaker, Board Secretary; Shelley Kimmel, Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Victoria Caldwell, Vice Chair; Don Barger, Member; Eric Roberts, Meeting Facilitator; Jennifer Woodard, DDFO; Buz Smith, Federal Coordinator

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Bob Berry, Chair; Carlton Cave, Vice Chair; Greg Simonton, Federal Coordinator; Julie Galloway, Staff; Rick Greene, Staff

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board: Gil Allensworth, Chair; Douglas Howard, Vice Chair; Amy Boyette Co-DDFO; James Tanner, Staff

### DOE-EM Headquarters:

Todd Shrader, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management  
Betsy Connell, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory & Policy Affairs  
Mary Kruger, Acting Director, Office of Regulatory, Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement  
Robin Osik, Office of Budget and Planning  
Robin Gautney, Office of Budget and Planning  
Leonard Spearman, Senior Advisor to the Assistant Secretary for EM  
David Borak, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer, EM  
Alyssa Harris, Contractor Staff, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs

### Other participants:

Ken Niles, Assistant Director, Office of Nuclear Safety and Energy Emergency, Oregon Department of Energy

## **MEETING MINUTES**

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB or Board) Chairs met October 29-30, 2019 at the Sun Valley Inn in Sun Valley, ID. Participants included EM SSAB officers and members, DOE staff, and contractor support staff. The meeting was open to the public and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

### **Day 1**

#### **Opening Remarks**

Mr. David Borak, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer, welcomed meeting attendees to the EM SSAB Chairs meeting. He recognized that 2019 marks the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the formation of the EM SSAB. He encouraged the Chairs and Vice Chairs to focus on sharing their experiences and creating recommendations that are helpful across the EM complex.

Mr. Borak introduced Mr. Todd Shrader, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary; Ms. Betsy Connell, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory and Policy Affairs; Ms. Mary Kruger, Acting Director, Office of Regulatory, Intergovernmental, and Stakeholder Engagement; and Ms. Robin Osik, Office of Budget.

Mr. Borak complimented the DOE Idaho site tour the day prior, and thanked the site staff for their help in planning this meeting.

EM Idaho Cleanup Project Manager Mr. Jack Zimmerman welcomed attendees to Idaho. He noted that Idaho's Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Facility has been a success over the past 15 years of operations. He emphasized some of the site's major accomplishments, such as shrinking the site's footprint significantly, and shipping 60,700 cubic meters of transuranic (TRU) waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), closing 11 of 15 on-site tanks.

Mr. Zimmerman added that only one spent fuel pool is left on-site, and it is compliant with regulatory commitments. Regarding buried TRU waste, he said that they have exhumed 9,000 cubic meters so far and will close the waste management complex where it is housed within the decade. He said that deactivation and decommissioning (D&D) of over 200 surplus contaminated facilities has taken place in the history of the Idaho National Lab (INL).

Mr. Zimmerman played a video for the audience commemorating the accomplishments of INL.

Mr. Eric Roberts, contractor support for the Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) and Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (PORTS SSAB) and the facilitator for this meeting, thanked Mr. Zimmerman for his update and thanked the Chairs and Vice Chairs for volunteering their time to come together at this meeting. The Chairs and Vice Chairs each introduced themselves. Mr. Roberts reviewed the agenda for the day.

## **EM Program Update**

Mr. Roberts introduced Mr. Todd Shrader, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM. Mr. Shrader noted that Mr. William “Ike” White, Senior Advisory to the Undersecretary of Science for EM, would have liked to be there were it not for a prior engagement, and that he is looking forward to meeting the group. Mr. Shrader was most recently the Carlsbad Field Office Manager before assuming his current role.

Mr. Shrader acknowledged the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the EM complex and discussed some of the major accomplishments of the program. He said that EM started with 107 sites and is currently down to 17, but those 17 are sizable. He noted that the Hanford River Corridor is a great example of recent progress. He also noted the progress the East Tennessee Technology Park at Oak Ridge and the treatment of over 20 million gallons of waste at Savannah River Site (SRS). He mentioned the progress at WIPP, receiving 13,000 shipments from across the complex, and at Moab, remediating 10 million tons of soil.

He pointed out that all the sites are interconnected and depend on one another. He emphasized the importance of sharing resources and knowledge between sites. He said that this is an exciting time for EM – the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit at Idaho and the Salt Waste Processing Facility at SRS are both starting up soon.

Mr. Shrader said that end state contracting is meant to drive performance and focus on getting the best value for the government. He said that a significant amount of contract work is coming up across the complex with the opportunity to implement this approach.

Mr. Shrader thanked the Chairs and Vice Chairs for their support and reminded the audience that ultimately everyone wants the same thing at our sites – a safe and efficient cleanup. He opened the floor for questions.

### *Discussion*

Ms. Susan Leckband, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) Chair, said that the HAB has been trying to better understand end state contracting and what it will mean for Hanford. She said that they are also concerned about the interpretation of High-Level Waste (HLW) and the potential of more waste being kept on-site long-term.

Mr. Shrader said that DOE is looking to apply the original intent of regulations to get cleanup done faster. He said that they are focused on SRS currently. Ms. Connell said that the goal is to get waste off-site, potentially at Waste Control Specialists for some of the low activity waste. Mr. Shrader said that the interpretation will allow for waste at SRS to leave the site and be disposed of sooner.

Mr. Gil Allensworth, Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) Chair, said that the Savannah River community members typically don’t recognize the difference between EM and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) projects at the site, referencing the fact that pit production is an NNSA activity that the EM SSAB doesn’t work with since they are

an EM board. He said that this leads to some confusion and frustration from the community when the EM SRS budget doesn't increase.

Mr. Allensworth asked if EM will eventually turn over SRS to NNSA. Mr. Shrader responded that this is a possibility because EM's mission at SRS will eventually be completed. However, there are no current plans to do so.

Ms. Shelley Cimon, HAB Vice Chair, asked Mr. Shrader to speak about the TRU program and Hanford's desire to ship to WIPP. Mr. Shrader said that the concentration is currently on Idaho, but will be coming to Hanford.

Ms. Cimon asked if the processing facility at INL could be used to process waste from other sites instead of being decommissioned. Mr. Shrader responded that EM looks at the capabilities and costs of all facilities across the complex. He said that DOE believes the EM complex has the facility capability, workers, and infrastructure to support the mission.

Ms. Leckband asked what issues Mr. White may want the EM SSAB to look at. Mr. Shrader said that understanding the communities' priorities goes a long way to helping with the cleanup mission.

### **Chairs Round Robin**

During this period, individual Chairs were given the opportunity to express any challenges, issues, or achievements of the local boards. Mr. Roberts recommended five minutes per person.

### Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB) – Trilby McAfee

Ms. Trilby McAfee identified the Snake Plain Aquifer as the top priority. She said that their current work priorities are to act as a vital communication and information link between DOE and the community, monitor and track cleanup progress and milestones related to compliance with the Idaho settlement agreement and other regulatory and legal agreements, and ensure adequate funding for activities such as identifying a HLW repository, increasing the number of TRU shipments to WIPP, starting up the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit and retrieval of buried waste.

Ms. McAfee said that a tremendous accomplishment of the site has been processing over 65,000 cubic meters of TRU waste in the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project over the last 15 years. She thanked DOE for recognizing the hundreds of workers that made this happen.

### Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) – Gil Allensworth

Mr. Allensworth discussed the potential for a workload increase at H Canyon and disposition of fuel from L-Basin. He noted that the SRS CAB put forth a recommendation asking DOE to speed up the cleanup of L-Basin and processing of the fuel there, and DOE accepted. He said that DOE created an integrated project team to research how to increase H Canyon's workload and dispose of fuel from L-Basin.

Mr. Allensworth said that the site is accelerating D&D of Building 235-F to be completed by 2026. He mentioned the military training currently taking place on the site as alternative land use.

Mr. Allensworth discussed DOE's STEM outreach in the community which explains the SRS mission to K-12 schools and higher education institutions. He said that the SRS CAB is happy to be involved in these activities.

### Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (PORTS SSAB) – Bob Berry

Mr. Bob Berry thanked DOE for the continued funding support for the Portsmouth site. He said that the community hopes to repurpose the site for new missions, small modular reactors, and integrated heat systems. He said that the site will D&D some old buildings and build on-site disposal facilities in their place. He said that the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has given permission to move the site's five existing landfills into on-site disposal. This will create space for new land use and missions.

Mr. Berry said that the PORTS SSAB, community members, elected officials, and economic development groups are supportive of a ten-year cleanup completion timeline. The site is currently on a 20-year track.

Mr. Berry outlined the PORTS SSAB's ongoing goals to engage the community on the results of the EM program, partner with DOE on communicating environmental monitoring results, and provide input to DOE on cleanup issues.

Ms. Connell asked Mr. Berry if he could comment on the alternative methods necessary to communicate with the public due to the lack of internet in some rural areas of Ohio. Mr. Berry discussed the PORTS SSAB's semi-annual public informational meetings in each of the four surrounding counties.

### Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB) – Victoria Caldwell

Ms. Victoria Caldwell explained that the Paducah site does not have any major D&D of facilities coming up, which can typically lead to a lack of community interest. She said that the CAB is working to keep the community interested in the work that is being done, such as groundwater cleanup. She said that the CAB would like to work with DOE on risk communications with the public.

Mr. Don Barger said that a major challenge for the CAB is connecting with every community member even when they don't utilize the internet. He asked the other boards to let them know if they have suggestions.

#### Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) – Susan Leckband

Ms. Leckband began by acknowledging the HAB's 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary, recognizing over 300 pieces of advice submitted. The HAB is focused on the upcoming D&D completion of one of the site's most contaminated buildings, the Plutonium Finishing Plant. She discussed the 2020 focus areas of the HAB which include Direct Feed Low Activity Waste (DFLAW), tank monitoring and tank-side cesium removal, vitrification, and the necessary funding increases to meet milestones.

Ms. Leckband also discussed the coordination between Hanford's two offices, Office of River Protection and the Richland Operations Office. She said that the manager of both offices, Mr. Brian Vance, reached out to the HAB for their input on the public communication of Hanford's five-year plan.

Ms. Cimon spoke about coordinated closure between regulating agencies and DOE, which would provide a streamlined permitting process. She noted that the regulatory process at Hanford is extremely complicated due to the nature of the work.

Mr. Allensworth asked why the vitrification process gets held up at Hanford, while SRS has been doing it for many years. Ms. Leckband responded that the waste feed is more complex at Hanford than at SRS, due to high levels of cesium and other contaminants. Mr. Shrader added that Hanford operations are a much larger scale.

Mr. Roberts recognized both Ms. Cimon and Ms. Leckband for serving on the HAB since the beginning and continuing to volunteer their time.

#### Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) – Shell Lohmann

Ms. Shell Lohmann acknowledged the ORSSAB's 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary as a board. She discussed the ORSSAB's current activities, including a recruitment drive focused on social media. She said that they have updated their recommendation process and have seen more active participation as a result. She said that the Board is getting more engaged with the new missions at the site.

Ms. Lohmann discussed the new K-25 History Museum, which is a milestone for several previous recommendations from the ORSSAB. She also said that the Board will be making a recommendation in regards to the recent groundwater milestone feasibility study.

Ms. Lohmann identified the ORSSAB's 2020 focus areas as mercury remediation, Oak Ridge National Laboratory cleanup and environmental remediation efforts, and future waste disposal capacity. She said that it is encouraging to see the contractors partnering with the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, to develop radiation technology programs.



Ms. Leckband asked what the ORSSAB is doing to support future workforce planning through their recommendations. Ms. Lohmann said that they have not yet submitted any, but they are interested and excited to potentially advise on this in the future. Mr. Allensworth said that the SRS CAB has submitted recommendations on college recruiting efforts. He said that the SRS CAB is very concerned about the site's aging workforce.

Mr. Roberts noted that this issue has been discussed by the EM SSAB on many occasions and he suggested that it may be a topic EM would like their collective input on as a recommendation.

Ms. Cimon asked Ms. Lohmann if the ORSSAB is weighing in on groundwater monitoring optimization efforts at the site. Ms. Lohmann said that the feasibility study results are key for helping the Board make a recommendation on this.

Mr. Doug Howard commented that the military will be a great source of future employment across the EM complex.

Ms. Caldwell commented that getting the word out about job openings to millennials will be important. She acknowledged that it is hard to get highly educated young people to move to Paducah but offering a job with long-term security does help.

#### Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board – Max Baca

Mr. Max Baca discussed the transition to a new contractor at the site. He emphasized the importance of the NNM CAB's public outreach. He said that they created a new active committee structure with three new committees headed by members passionate about each topic.

Mr. Baca said that Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and Sandia National Laboratory are fortunate to have a highly educated population and workforce, but they still have staffing challenges. He discussed the generational differences that must be considered.

Mr. Bob Hull said that SRS also has hiring issues and high turnover at LANL. He discussed the challenge of public outreach to the pueblos on very complex cleanup issues.

Ms. Lohmann said that younger generations need multiple experiences while they work for an employer, not necessarily multiple employers.

#### Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) – Steve Rosenbaum

Mr. Rosenbaum said that the NSSAB conducted an outreach survey which helped them draft an effective outreach plan.

Mr. Rosenbaum discussed the infrastructure associated with the movement of radiological waste. He acknowledged the hazardous conditions such as communication dead zones and poor road conditions.

Mr. Rosenbaum also discussed the aging workforce and brain drain that concerns the NSSAB. He said that it is a challenge for the site to compete with high paying jobs in Las Vegas.

Mr. Barger asked how Nevada's revegetation efforts are coming along. Mr. Rosenbaum responded that they have a collaborative mission with a coalition of tribal partners that are familiar with the land. He said that they have seen success transplanting seedlings from other areas.

Mr. Hull asked how the closure of certain areas of the site is progressing. Mr. Rosenbaum said that it is going well, progressing toward long-term management with the Office of Legacy Management.

### **EM Budget Update**

Ms. Robin Osik from EM's Office of Budget and Planning introduced herself and gave an overview of the budget process and schedule. She noted that she appreciated hearing the Board's priorities during the round robin session and recognized that they match up with EM Headquarters' budget priorities.

Ms. Osik explained continuing resolutions, which allow EM to keep operating at the same funding levels as the previous year on a short-term basis while the budget is being finalized. She said that if the House and Senate are supportive of certain initiatives of the previous budget, it is likely that EM will continue to move forward in these areas.

Ms. Osik said that the Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 budget has been supported by both the House and the Senate and that this trend will likely continue as long as the EM program can show tangible progress to Congress.

Ms. Osik said that EM has submitted the FY 2021 budget to the Office of Management and Budget and that there have been positive and energized conversations surrounding this budget. She said that EM is trying to continue to build on successes and make real progress. She noted that the goal is to continue striving for greater efficiency and cost savings will follow.

### *Discussion*

Mr. Baca asked who determines EM's priorities. Ms. Osik responded that the priorities are established by the stakeholders and the site leadership, first. Then, site leadership meets and discusses the holistic strategy, taking Departmental priorities into consideration.

Mr. Allensworth said that he is glad to see SRS receiving budget support this year, as they have typically received less than their requested amount in previous years. He noted that this is still less support than other sites are getting. He asked if there is anything the EM SSAB can do to help support EM's budget request. Ms. Osik responded that the members should communicate with their congressional leaders. Mr. Shrader added that EM leadership does their best to prioritize issues to obtain maximum progress. He said it is important for leadership to know the stakeholders' priorities at the site level.

Ms. Leckband commented that the HAB provides budget advice each year, but she believes they need more detailed information to make meaningful recommendations. Mr. Allensworth, Ms. Leckband and Mr. Lynch discussed the level of detail that would be appropriate. Mr. Allensworth noted that the SRS CAB keeps their voice to DOE clear by limiting themselves to approximately five priorities.

Ms. Osik said that the Office of Budget and Planning is happy to come speak to the local boards to help the members understand the concepts that were discussed.

Ms. Caldwell asked if a continuing resolution would affect the ability for DOE to hire. Ms. Osik said that she has not seen any issues with this in the past.

### **Waste Disposition Update**

Ms. Betsy Connell thanked the attendees for a productive discussion thus far. She identified commissioning and startup of several waste processing facilities, all related to the treatment of HLW, as EM's top priority. She said that state of Washington, DOE, and EPA have begun holistic discussions regarding Hanford cleanup. Regarding on-site disposal, she said that DOE's position is to do what is the best value for the government, which leaves only low-level waste on-site.

Ms. Connell said that EM's Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement values the power of STEM education in EM's communities. She suggested that this may be a future topic area for the EM SSAB to give input on. She also said that EM is trying to work through the incoming EM SSAB membership packages as expeditiously as possible.

Ms. Connell explained that EM recently participated in NNSA "Deep Dives" to gain a deeper understanding of NNSA's prioritization system for their aging infrastructure. She said that they are also looking to the international community to see how other countries deal with similar challenges. She acknowledged that several land transfers supporting economic development took place this year. She said that D&D of high-risk excess facilities at Oak Ridge and Lawrence Livermore has been well-supported by Congress and that progress is being made.

Ms. Connell discussed EM's agreement to D&D Naval Reactor facilities, specifying that EM will not own these facilities and that it will not add to EM's environmental liability.

Ms. Connell also discussed the interpretation of HLW and first step of examining the potential to dispose of a DWPF recycled waste stream offsite at a low level waste disposal facility. Through finalizing an environmental assessment, DOE determined that it may treat waste on-site, then dispose of it at a commercial site; treat waste at a separate site, then dispose at a commercial site; or send waste directly to a commercial site for treatment and disposal. She noted that a decision has not yet been made.

Ms. Connell addressed Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR), or the determination that previously managed HLW is safe for processing as low-level waste. She noted that EM has done this many times at a variety of sites. She explained that the HLW interpretation applies to

dispositioning waste to go to commercial disposal, while the WIR applies to waste that remains on-site, such as residues in tanks that would be closed.

She said that in 2019, WIPP received 315 shipments. She added that DOE is working with the EPA on the recertification of WIPP. In 2020, EM expects to ship waste from Argonne National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Sandia National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Oak Ridge National Laboratory, INL and SRS. She said that in FY 2018, DOE conducted over 7,700 hazardous shipments with no recordable Department of Transportation accidents.

Ms. Connell mentioned the work of the Low-Level Waste Disposal Facility Federal Review Group, which is reviewing disposal documentation for Portsmouth and Oak Ridge, and working on performance assessments for the Integrated Disposal Facility at Hanford and the Salt Waste Processing Facility at SRS.

She said that Nevada National Security Site's Area 5 is the only DOE disposal facility that can accept both low-level waste and mixed low-level waste from offsite generators.

Ms. Connell said that it has been an active year in regard to the National Environmental Policy Act work in EM, publishing a Record of Decision for building demolition associated with Area 4 of Santa Susana Field Laboratory. She added that there are only 18 remaining buildings of the original 270 which carry very low-level waste.

Ms. Connell thanked the EM SSAB for their last recommendation on technology development and innovation, noting that the National Academy of Sciences conducted an extensive review on EM's current efforts. She also thanked them for their recommendation on milestone tracking, which has been taken up by EM leadership.

### *Discussion*

Mr. Allensworth asked for clarification of the EM organizational structure. Ms. Connell said that the field offices report to the Office of Field Operations, which reports to the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary and the Assistant Secretary. Mr. Allensworth asked if a new H-Canyon is something being discussed. Ms. Connell responded that down the road there will likely be a need, but talk of this is in extremely early stages.

Ms. Leckband asked if there is a desire to streamline the EM SSAB membership package approval process. Ms. Connell responded that there is an interest to be more efficient across the board in EM. Mr. Borak added that DOE takes membership on its boards very seriously and takes care to look at each member of each board, which can sometimes be a lengthy process. However, he said that he and Ms. Connell are working hard to keep things moving on schedule.

### **Public Comment Period**

Mr. Larry Schoen, member of the ICP CAB, introduced himself and welcomed attendees to Idaho. He emphasized the importance of the ICP CAB to DOE and to Congress. He suggested

that all of the local boards coordinate and send letters to Congress to address roadblocks to the disposition of waste.

### **Working with DOE on Transportation Planning**

Mr. Borak identified that Mr. Joe Martinez from EM's Office of Packaging and Transportation was on the phone to answer any questions that may arise from this presentation.

Mr. Ken Niles, Assistant Director for Nuclear Safety, Oregon Department of Energy, discussed the state regional organizations that work with DOE on waste transportation planning. They also meet each year collectively at the National Transportation Stakeholders Forum.

Mr. Niles focused the first part of his presentation on the radioactive material shipments that occurred prior to active state engagement in shipment planning. About three quarters of the spent fuel shipments in the United States occurred during this time. He said that began to change with shipments of the reactor core from Three Mile Island to Idaho in 1986, when DOE initiated contact with the route states.

Mr. Niles also explained the many elements of the WIPP transportation safety program, which was developed jointly between DOE and the Western states. It incorporates "common sense" elements in accident prevention and emergency preparedness, while also recognizing the inherent safety offered by the shipping containers, which are designed to withstand serious accident conditions.

The accident prevention measures include high quality trucking companies; well-trained, experienced drivers; rigorous and consistent independent inspections; bad weather protocols; pre-identified safe parking locations and criteria; and designated routes.

The emergency preparedness measures include well-trained, well-equipped and well-informed emergency responders; realistic training exercises; satellite tracking of the shipments; advance notification of shipping schedules; and updated emergency plans and procedures.

He noted that some people within DOE and within the transportation industry suggest that all these safety measures may not be necessary.

Mr. Niles discussed the public and media concern about radioactive shipments on the roads, noting that the program has a sterling transportation safety record.

Mr. Niles said that there are currently many discussions currently underway with DOE, states, and Tribes about spent fuel transportation planning.

### *Discussion*

Mr. Baca noted that Mr. Niles' presentation did not address the condition of the roads and asked whose responsibility it is to maintain them. Mr. Niles responded that it is each state's responsibility because DOE shares this road with other local industries such as oil and gas. Mr. Baca commented that the oil and gas trucking has contributed to the damage of the roads in Carlsbad, NM.

Mr. Howard asked about the pros and cons of air transportation. Mr. Niles said that any accident would have much greater consequences and the cost would be much higher. Mr. Howard asked if WIPP has trouble recruiting drivers. Mr. Shrader responded no, because there are approximately 24 drivers and the pay is above average for a truck driving job.

Mr. Barger asked how Mr. Niles would suggest responding to negative press that causes fear in the community. Mr. Niles responded that good risk communication practices would have DOE and the states emphasizing all the things that are being done to make the shipments safe and letting the public draw their conclusions as to whether or not those measures are sufficient.

Mr. Martinez commented that there are many resources available to the public, specifically DOE Order 460.2, "Departmental Materials Transportation and Packaging Management."

### **Recommendation Development Discussion**

Mr. Roberts facilitated a discussion between the Chairs and Vice Chairs regarding three potential recommendations.

The first recommendation drafted by Ms. Leckband suggests that the local boards should receive budgetary information in a timelier manner in order to make meaningful recommendations. She noted that sometimes the HAB gets information after their scheduled meeting and it is then too late for them to discuss the matter in time to make a difference. She added that it was suggested that the HAB focus on priorities rather than numbers, but they would still need a deeper dive into planned activities and their funding.

Mr. Brad Christensen suggested expanding the scope beyond just budget priorities and including all site priorities.

Mr. Borak offered some clarification on the typical timeline for local boards to weigh in on budget priorities, which would be in the early part of the calendar year.

Mr. Allensworth commented that for the SRS CAB, the site is very open and willing to share information. He didn't believe this issue affects their board in the same way as the HAB. Ms. Caldwell agreed on behalf of the Paducah CAB.

The second recommendation drafted by Ms. Cimon recommends that DOE prioritize the development of final disposition sites to reduce interim storage at the sites and develop a transportation program to support this mission. Ms. Lohmann noted that this may be too broad as written. Mr. Allensworth worried that this recommendation may be premature, since a final disposition site has not yet been determined. Mr. Christensen disagreed, adding that the EM SSAB should be urging DOE to prioritize final disposition.

Mr. Borak commented that this recommendation may be out of the scope of the EM SSAB if its purpose is to urge DOE to open Yucca Mountain or alternative site, since this is not an actionable item for EM. A group discussion occurred regarding the scope of the EM SSAB.

Ms. Cimon agreed to review the recommendation and bring an edited version the following day.

The third recommendation drafted by Mr. Rosenbaum suggests an inter-agency dialogue regarding transportation issues and infrastructure used to transport EM's nuclear waste and materials.

Mr. Shrader commented that there are working groups between agencies on these topics and EM can explain how they interact with them and what their scopes are.

The members discussed the scope and applicability of the recommendation. During the remaining time, the members began to wordsmith the recommendations.

Mr. Shrader recognized Mr. Brad Bugger's upcoming retirement and thanked him for his service to the Department.

## **Day 2**

### **DOE Headquarters News and Views**

Mr. Borak welcomed everyone back to the second day of the meeting. He briefly explained the EM organizational chart.

Ms. Kelly Snyder, NSSAB DDFO, updated the Board on the next EM SSAB Chairs meeting logistics. The next meeting will be held at the Golden Nugget in Las Vegas, Nevada on March 30 and April 1. Mr. Borak added that the next fall 2020 meeting will be held in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Mr. Borak gave an update on the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB)'s current work. The EMAB currently has two focus areas: human resources challenges related to the end-state contracting approach, and community engagement during transitions to site closure. Next, the EMAB will address EM's technology development and innovation strategy.

Mr. Borak addressed Executive Order 13875 which called for the elimination of one-third of federal advisory boards across the government. He said that the deadline for DOE to submit its plan for its advisory boards was September 30, which has passed. He did not have a concrete update on any decisions being made regarding the EM SSAB.

Mr. Borak suggested that the EM SSAB consider voting on bylaws or operating procedures for the Chairs. He noted that all local boards have bylaws. He also said that he will work with EM leadership to determine new charges and topics for the Board to provide input on.

Mr. Allensworth and Ms. Cimon discussed the need for the sites to have a holistic approach to tank waste across the complex and asked for more information at a future meeting on EM's philosophy and strategy.

Ms. Leckband presented the recommendation that she drafted and edited. The Chairs voted to take this recommendation to their local boards for their consideration.

Ms. Cimon presented the recommendation that she drafted and edited. Mr. Allensworth expressed his concern that the SRS CAB would not approve of this since SRS has interim

storage that would potentially get held up from being shipped out as a result of this recommendation as written. The group discussed and edited the verbiage. The Chairs voted to also take this recommendation to their local boards for their consideration.

Mr. Rosenbaum presented the recommendation that he drafted and edited. The group continued to wordsmith the recommendation and discussed its scope. Some believed that the recommendation was outside of the scope of the Board because it implied that EM should be responsible for road and infrastructure improvements on transportation routes. Mr. Rosenbaum responded that it is simply recommending that EM keep this issue on their radar and communicate this concern to the parties that are considered to be responsible. The Board voted not to proceed with this recommendation.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:53 AM MT.