



PORTSMOUTH EM SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

•OSU Endeavor Center• 1862 Shyville Road • Piketon, Ohio 45661 • (740) 289-5249 •

Proposed Agenda for the June 3, 2021 Board Meeting

Chair

Robert Berry

Co-Vice Chair

Carlton Cave

Board Members

Dr. Todd Burkitt

Jody Crabtree

Turman Helton

Jimmy Smalley

Beckie Thomas-Kent

Judy Vollrath

6:00 pm

Call to order, introductions

Review of agenda

DOE Comments

Federal Coordinator Comments

Liaison Comments

Administrative Issues

• Spring 2021 EM SSAB Chairs Meeting Review

Chairs Charge #1 Recommendation Path Forward

Chairs Charge #2 Recommendation Path Forward

• Recommendations on Chairs Charges

Deputy Designated

Federal Official

Joel Bradburne

Site Recommendation on Charge #1 Path Forward

Site Recommendation on Charge #2 Path Forward

DOE Federal Coordinator

Greg Simonton

Public Comments

Final Comments

Adjourn

Support Services

EHI Consultants, Inc.

1862 Shyville Road

Piketon, OH 45661

Phone 740.289.5249

Fax 740.289.1578



**PORTSMOUTH EM
SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD**

MINUTES OF THE THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 2021, SSAB MEETING • 5:30 P.M.

Location: The Ohio State University Endeavor Center, Room 160, Piketon, Ohio

Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Members Present: Bob Berry, Chair; Carlton Cave, Vice-Chair; Dr. Todd Burkitt, Jody Crabtree, Turman Helton, Jimmy Smalley

SSAB Members Absent: Judy Vollrath, Beckie Thomas-Kent

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and Contractors: Jeff Bettinger, Greg Simonton, DOE; Julie Galloway, Cindy Lewis, EHI Consultants (EHI)

Liaisons: Sean Kubera, Ohio Department of Health (ODH); Shannon Cook, Tom Schneider, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Facilitator: Eric Roberts, EHI

Public: Watched on YouTube

Approved by Bob Berry, Board Chair

Bob Berry

Call to Order:

Berry: I would like to call the meeting to order.

Roberts: I would like to welcome everyone, and I will be facilitating the meeting. There will be a public comment period after the presentations. The board should stay within its defined scope and follow the meeting ground rules adopted.

March 2020 Minutes:

Roberts: Your minutes from the last meeting are included in your binder. We are not going to approve the minutes. We are well past the 45-day period. We can make changes if needed, but we are past the date to approve them.

DDFO comments provided by Jeff Bettinger, DOE PPPO Portsmouth Site Lead:

- **Portsmouth Site Overview**
- **Portsmouth Ten Year Strategic Focus**
- **Portsmouth Lifecycle Baseline Strategy**
- **D&D Project Status**
- **X-326 Process Building D&D**
- **X-333 Process Building**
- **On-Site Waste Disposal Facility**
- **Landfills and Plumes Excavation**
- **X-740 Plume Excavation**
- **Portsmouth Land Transfer**
- **Portsmouth Priorities**
- **Draft National Chairs Agenda**

*A copy of the DDFO presentation is available on the SSAB website.
 (www.ports-ssab.energy.gov)*

<i>Question/Comment:</i>	<i>Answer:</i>
<p><i>Smalley:</i> How wide is the road going to the cell, three or four lanes?</p> <p>What is going on at the lake on the northeast end of the fog road?</p>	<p><i>Bettinger:</i> The road will be about the width of a two-lane.</p> <p>Do you mean the sludge pond? We are doing some dredging up there. [There have been] challenges with getting solids out of [the sludge pond], so what they are doing is dredging it out, to lower [the pond levels], and putting some material in there that will form a clear well. Then the lime will be able to settle in there better.</p>

Federal Project Coordinator comments provided by Greg Simonton, Federal Project Coordinator:

Simonton: Update on a few of the activities involving local students. This time last year we were getting close to the end of the Student Site Environmental Report. We had a meeting right before going remote and switching to telework. We did get that report, but the students did not get to give their presentation. We did get to work with local students this year; although, our meetings with the Eastern High School students had to be done remotely. The students will be finishing their report soon, hopefully by the next board meeting. Maybe we can have a discussion on that. If not, we will certainly get the written report soon after the next meeting.

Science Bowl – last year we had the science bowl and the next week is when we went remote. The Nationals were canceled because of the pandemic. This year they will have a Science Bowl at the National level, but it will be remote. We have been working on our regional Science Bowl. We had 20 teams enter again, and now we are down to the final four. We will have the winner crowned here soon. The Nationals’ will be held in May.

Last fall we had to cancel the Science Alliance, but we are making plans for one this year if allowed to have in-person events. If we have to cancel, we will. We will keep you updated on that as well.

Kelly Snyder was selected to serve as the Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for EM's Advisory Board and EM Site-Specific Advisory Board activities. Snyder will continue to support and facilitate EM’s stakeholder engagement efforts.

Question/Comment:	Answer:
Berry: What schools are left in the final four of the Science Bowl?	Simonton: I wish I had an answer to that, but I did not write the schools down when I was told. I will have to check.

Liaison comments provided by Board Liaisons:

Tom Schneider OEPA: Our air monitoring went live today sometime. I do not have the link with me, but I will send it to Julie. She can add it to the minutes.

<https://epa.ohio.gov/dapc/ams/amsmain/AMSSpecSam-DOE>

Sean Kubera, ODH: As soon as our data goes live, I will get you the information for where it can be found.

Administrative Issues:

National Chairs Meeting

Chairs Round Robin:

<i>Question/Comment:</i>	<i>Answer:</i>
<p><i>Roberts:</i> The National Chairs Meeting will be virtual this year on April 20-21, 2021. We will provide a link, so you may follow from home if you would like.</p> <p>Anything you want to add to the round-robin slide?</p>	
<p><i>Burkitt:</i> In the minutes from the last meeting, I had talked about the DOE providing support for other site areas across the United States. Did I hear correctly that Nevada was hosting this?</p> <p>Okay, I know that a school district in Nevada gets eight million dollars a year from DOE and has since 1978. I am also aware that the surrounding schools and the community are supported by DOE. I think that some of the community trust issue is because DOE has done all these things to help other communities, and they have not done very much for us. I feel like we are not as important to DOE as the people in Nevada or South Carolina. What do we need to do? I think it is a great question to ask people from around the country that have DOE support. For the past 10 or 15 years, I have heard politicians blame DOE and DOE blame politicians. I think our kids and our community is just as important, if not more important, than folks all over the country. I would just like to know— why do we get treated differently? The federal government is good at spending money, just not on us or in our area. I seriously do not understand why.</p>	<p><i>Berry:</i> Yes, Nevada is hosting the Chairs meeting.</p>

<p>I would love that. If Julie sends that to me, I will try to put something together and send it out to everyone on Monday or Tuesday.</p> <p>How much trust is there at these other sites? Do they have great relationships with DOE? I do not know. I am just kind of asking. You guys have had more experience with different boards.</p>	<p>Roberts: We can carry that message forward. Hopefully, Bob can relay it.</p> <p>Berry: Maybe we can write a recommendation for this point. I am sure that most of the board would approve it.</p> <p>Roberts: Todd, would you mind writing down some of your thoughts and ideas, and then typing them up for us? Julie, I think we have some previous recommendations on support for the community commitment plan and community giving. Can you pull those, send them to Todd, let him look at them, and see if we can compare what was said in the past and match it with what we would like to say going forward. How does that sound? Yes, send it out to the board and we will start working on it.</p> <p>Cave: I have listened to them at Hanford. Their board is constantly going at it with DOE. Nothing different from what we are doing. I think I understand the department to some degree; I have been around to see some of the others fight DOE. At the same time, you have always heard me say— we must have faith in each other. The word “distracts” is what gets me. We must take “distracts” out.</p> <p>Roberts: Do you like the word “affects” better?</p> <p>Berry: You will have to get rid of “from.”</p> <p>Crabtree: “Impedes the ability,” does that make it softer?</p>
---	--

Roberts: Carlton, how does that sound?

Cave: Let us take that last statement out and come up with something else.

Smalley: Carlton, I like the word “encourages,” but I do not think it actually fits.

Roberts: Jimmy, “encourages” is not a bad word. What if we went with “This encourages DOE to build trust with stakeholders?”

Smalley: That sounds better.

Cave: Yes, it does. DOE must continue to show support and expand information concerning the D&D process with all stakeholders.

Roberts: Julie, on that last line we need to lose the apostrophe “s” on DOE, and what do you think about adding all before stakeholders?

Cave: Yes, that is good.

Roberts: Jody, Todd, what do you think about it now?

Burkitt: If I heard correctly, I think Carlton said to strike the “small.” Is that right? We do have a subset. I think a lot of the local government personnel are asking questions. I do not know if it captures the concerns of the community if we say “small.” Again, that is my opinion.

Crabtree: Yes, I like it. That is a good edit.

Smalley: Yes, I agree. I think it reads better.

	<p>Roberts: Let me know if we are good, or if there is anything else.</p>
<p>Smalley: I concur with him, I agree. My buddy Dennis used to say Oak Ridge got a lot of money for their area. Piketon only got \$34,000.00, while Oak Ridge and some others are getting millions. Our future is our kids, whether it be S.T.E.M. or vo-tech, high school, grade school. We have children and grandchildren. I think we need to look into this. I agree wholeheartedly.</p> <p>I think Carlton has a good point here. We are the stakeholders.</p> <p>There must be a better way to present that last sentence. It is kind of hard, this detracts from DOE’s ability to build trust with stakeholders, and we are the stakeholders. We must voice concerns. People are very concerned about that cell out there, and I think they just need more communication. We need to communicate to the public more, however that should be done. That is how you build trust— when you communicate.</p>	<p>Roberts: So, what do you think, Jimmy. How would you fix this?</p>
<p>Crabtree: I just want to comment that that is exactly the direction we should go— building more conviction in the community and educating them.</p>	
<p>Cave: I am a little leery about that last statement, “The ability to build trust with stakeholders.” It looks like the SSAB called out a small subset of the community because they are voicing their concerns about the safety of the D&D in the project. It is not our problem as the board to help DOE build trust. I have a problem with that last statement.</p> <p>I must really think on that, but if anybody else has any ideas on wording....</p>	<p>Roberts: So, is there a better way to state that, or should we just strike it?</p> <p>Bob, Carlton, what if we change the words “has concerns” to “is aware?” The SSAB is aware of a small subset. Carlton</p>

<p>I think what I am more concerned with is where it says, “this detracts DOE’s ability to build trust with stakeholders.” What stakeholders are we talking about— EPA or the local community?</p>	<p>is right— when you use words like “concern” it triggers an emotion and a feeling, one way or the other, and I do not think that is what we are intending to do. Correct me if I am wrong.</p>
<p>Berry: I do, respectfully, disagree with one point. To the fact that it is our concern. I think we are kind of a liaison between the DOE and the public, to take public concerns and cares and expectations to DOE. It works vice versa— relaying DOE’s concerns to the public. It is our concern, not about getting everybody on the same page, but having an explanation for any questions people may have.</p> <p>I would like to say I have been to all seven sites and every site has stakeholders that have concerns.</p>	

Charge #1 – Advisory Board and Site Outreach:

Question/Comment:	Answer:
<p>Smalley: We only have eight members on our board right now. When are we going to get some new members? I know Covid has held us up, and everything going on with DOE, but it seems like we need some new members.</p>	<p>Roberts: Typically, new members are added in the summer. We are hoping sometime this summer we will have new folks. Unfortunately, everything is moving slower than we like, but we will move forward and do the best that we can.</p>
<p>Burkitt: I have heard the community commitment plan in Southern Ohio is different than others. Is there any truth to that? I just heard our contract was different than other clean-ups/projects that DOE is doing.</p>	<p>Roberts: The short answer to that is yes, but Jeff, Greg, would you like to speak on community commitment plans and how they work? Is there a two-minute explanation on it?</p> <p>Bettinger: I do not have experience with other commitment plans.</p> <p>Roberts: Greg, I will throw out a couple of questions and you can fill in the</p>

	<p>answers. The community commitment plan is based on what the contractor proposes when they do an RFP and bid a contract at the site, what they propose to do for the community. DOE cannot really require it or enforce it.</p> <p>Simonton: The community requested, and this board passed recommendations in 2009 when the draft RFP was being put together, to have a community commitment plan. The department did not say what had to be in the plan and did not evaluate the proposal against the specific community commitment plan; they left it up to the people putting in the bids to say how they would engage.</p>
<p>Crabtree: If my information is right a new RFP will be going up in 2023. Will the board be asked to make a recommendation on it?</p>	<p>Roberts: I do not know that you will be asked, but you will have the opportunity to make a recommendation. I do not know when it is, but you will know because suits and ties will show up at the meetings.</p>

Charge #2-SSAB Expectations/Guiding Principles:

Question/Comment:	Answer:
<p>Crabtree: I was rereading it, and it lines up with what I think. I like it.</p>	
<p>Cave: I am alright with the middle statement. I think we need to put a lot of importance right there.</p>	
<p>Roberts: If you are good, we will turn these in and let Bob and Carlton talk about them.</p>	

Subcommittee Updates:

None

Roberts: Draft plans for the next several months are as follows:

April - Chairs Meeting; link will be available.

May - Educational Session

June - Virtual Board Meeting

July - New board members training, possibly

August – Board Planning Session
September- In-person board meeting, hopefully

Public Comments:

The following statements were submitted in writing as public comments and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the U.S. Department of Energy.

Written statements need to be submitted either before or after the meeting as there will not be opportunities for live public comment during this online virtual meeting. The Deputy Designated Federal Officer is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business.

Written comment submitted prior to the meeting:

Pat Marida:

The Sierra Club remains concerned about the cleanup procedures at PORTS. Many different radioactive contaminants have been coming off the site since the beginning of enrichment. Plutonium, neptunium, americium, other transuranics, technetium, and radioactive isotopes of dozens of elements were components of the reprocessed high-level radioactive waste that was brought to PORTS for many years during the operation of the PGDP. Those elements are being found all around the site and are also contaminating the site. They are being stirred up and going airborne during the cleanup process. This operation needs to be covered to keep those very dangerous elements from being spread.

Also, we are concerned about what waste and radioactivity are going into Little Beaver Creek and its tiny tributaries, as well as directly into the Scioto River. There needs to be testing of what is being discharged. What plans are there for testing?

We are also concerned about what is being put into the landfill. There are too many transuranics in the DUF6 cylinders and the building pipes, and none of that belongs in a landfill so close to an important aquifer, particularly when there is cracked bedrock and animals have been known to chew through even the best of linings. Even those good linings cannot last more than 100 years.

Lastly, we are concerned about criticality, especially if workers who are not highly trained are working with the pipes. What vetting is there of the personnel who will be doing these dangerous jobs?

I may submit more comments after hearing the information at the meeting.

Additional comments submitted after the meeting will be added as attachments in Appendix A.

Statements from the following were received and submitted as public comment to the board:

- Pat Marida
- Steven Ledingham
- Terry Lodge

Chartered as an EM Site Specific Advisory Board under the Federal Advisory Committee Act

- Lee Blackburn

Final Comments from the board:
None

Next Meeting:

Action Items:

- EHI to send link to the monitoring system live data from OEPA.
- EHI to send Todd past community commitment recommendations.
- EHI to send out the link to view the National Chairs meeting.

On Friday, April 2, 2021, 2:56:27 PM EDT, Terry Lodge wrote:

Dear Mr. Simonton,

I would like to share my 3-30-2021 letter to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission as a public comment to the SSAB meeting that was held on April 1, 2021. The letter requests that the NRC conduct a nonproliferation review of the nuclear weapons, international and domestic terrorism implications of the PORTS American Centrifuge Plant proposal to enrich uranium to 19.75%, and that the NRC prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). A PEIS would bring in a wide set of issues, such as nuclear non-proliferation and the end use of the HALEU in various illusory reactor projects. A PEIS would also explicate the prospective effects on uranium extraction, which bear considerable portents for Environmental Justice, given the extent to which indigenous lands are affected by uranium mining. The link to the letter is here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1T-C5wjW1PEiTX1iuPuDnI7YLIF7CqvD7K8hfyIWFQ20/edit?usp=sharing>.

I have also attached it.

Please add this to the record and distribute to the SSAB members.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Terry J. Lodge

Subject: Evidence to present (Public Comments) for SSAB Board Meeting)

Dear Mr. Simonton,

We would like to acknowledge the comments portion of the SSAB Board Meeting of April 2nd, 2021.

We have included links to our case information and the examples to support the Walburn vs et al, filed September 3rd, 2020 with amendments.

Persons reviewing this meeting, without the revelations revealed from our lawsuit, that speak of serious contamination and worker exposure need to be shared with the board. We feel it is important for the SSAB, the community and any person reviewing the dialogue to know that there are points of contention, with the proposed plans and future projects, including the waste burial site, and the HALEU (High Assay Low Enriched Uranium) projects.

We understand public comments should be sent before 5:00 pm today.

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1I5vUFpT8aa6D8IQMOsTQvbtBw8agT1KJ>

Sincerely

Jeff Walburn and Charles Lawson
4/2/2021 2:25 PM Eastern Standard Time

Steven Ledingham
Technology & Evidence Integrator for
Walburn and Lawson
Portsmouth, Ohio

From: Pat Marida

I would like to share this video as a public comment to the SSAB meeting that was held on April 1. The Ohio Sierra Club Nuclear Free Committee held a webinar on 10-30-2020 which was an interview with Chic Lawson and Jeff Walburn, two former employees at PORTS who are the main plaintiffs in a lawsuit against the DOE and its contractors and former contractors. The lawsuit discloses events that caused considerable contamination and exposure to workers at PORTS. It is important for the SSAB and the community to be aware of the suit and of these events. Here is a hyperlink: [**Former Workers Talk about Massive Lawsuit at Portsmouth Nuclear Site.**](#) In case the hyperlink does not open, here is the full link: <https://onedrive.live.com/?authkey=%21AmQ8qmvFfVw0YPM&cid=A52323F57B0FA71B&id=A52323F57B0FA71B%216880&parId=root&o=OneUp>.

Thank you.

Pat

Patricia A. Marida
Member, Sierra Club Nuclear Free Core Team
Member, Sierra Club John Muir Society
614-286-4851
patmarida@outlook.com



“Anyone who would substitute plutonium for carbon needs to think again.” ~ S. David Freeman, past chair, Tennessee Valley Authority

Lee Blackburn

My name is Lee Blackburn and as a former member of the Portsmouth Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB), I am disgusted and appalled that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) would allow the Portsmouth EM SSAB to embarrass itself in front of the EM SSAB National Chairs meeting by letting them put forth a claim (Charge #2) DOE knows full well to be false. And the Board wonders why a "...subset of the community continues to voice concerns of the safety and wisdom of D&D and permanent waste placement."?

Charge #2 of SSAB Expectations/Guiding Principles, lists the "top three suggestions for improving stakeholder interactions during the next 10 years." Suggestion number one states: "The excavation of groundwater plumes and unlined landfills will not only provide fill material for the OSWDF, but also leave a healthier environment and cleaner footprint for future land transfer." This would only be true if DOE were excavating ALL the onsite landfill, but they're not; not by a long shot.

As currently proposed, over half the unlined landfills acreage-wise will remain untouched and subject to transfer under DOE's Environmental Assessment of June 2017 (EA-1856). Those unlined landfills contain among other things, organic solvents, known carcinogens, heavy metals and radioactively contaminated soils. Could there be any other reason why DOE doesn't want to dig them up? Instead, they leave them to become someone else's problem.

Take a look at the slide presented by Site Lead and DDFO Jeff Bettinger, entitled *Landfills and Plumes Excavation* (minute 37:13). The slide shows two maps of the site, one before and one after the cleanup. You will notice at the top of both maps three distinct yellow areas. These are the three X-734 landfills that DOE refuses to cleanup. By leaving these landfills, DOE is not leaving "...a healthier environment and cleaner footprint for future land transfer."

This also calls into question suggestion number two since leaving these landfills intact certainly can't be called "successful".

I learned in kindergarten that if you make a mess, you clean it up. DOE needs to clean up its mess!



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
ENERGY

OFFICE OF
**ENVIRONMENTAL
MANAGEMENT**

Portsmouth Site Specific Advisory Board June 3, 2021

*Jeff Bettinger, DOE Portsmouth Site Lead
Greg Simonton, DOE Federal Coordinator*



- Demo started May 17th, 2021
- Demo is expected to end in CY 2022
- Debris cleanup to end in CY 2023


Video 1

Video 2

First Set of Co-Located Monitoring Data Posted

<https://pegasis.ports.pppo.gov/pegasis/attachments/Quarterly/2020%20Q4%20ODH-DOE%20Data%20Package.pdf>

- Ohio Department of Health (ODH) posted independent air monitoring results for 2020 Q4 on April 26, 2021 from co-located monitors at the Portsmouth Site.
- Samples are independently collected and sent to separate laboratories for analysis, then qualified separately by each agency.
- ODH monitors sample for radiological contaminants.






- Construction continues on Cells 4 & 5




- First waste placement in the OSWDF took place May 24, 2021

Landfills and Plumes Excavation



- 5 landfills and plumes closed within Perimeter Road
- Fill for OSWDF
- Established regulatory commitment tied to OSWDF
- Offers large contiguous site for reuse
- Work continues as planned for excavation



Charge #1 - Advisory Board and Site Outreach

- Develop a best practices white paper that the Department could use as a guide to augment existing outreach programs and set expectations for future outreach activities
 - Each Board shall identify existing outreach practices performed at their site by both the SSAB and DOE (a template will be provided)
 - Outreach data should include, but not limited to, STEM, budget prioritization, and events
 - Determine if there are any gaps or need for additional outreach
 - Each Board will present their results during the Spring 2021 Chairs meeting
 - The Chairs will collaboratively discuss the individual Board results and develop the requested white paper. (Spring 2021 – Fall 2021)

Best practices: [insert information]

Improvement Opportunities: [insert information]

Best practices:

The Community Commitment Plan along with the contractual provisions for community engagement have made tremendous impacts to economic development in our impacted area. Quite literally millions of dollars have been donated that have turned into hundreds of jobs that would not be available without the CCP.

Improvement Opportunities:

While DOE and the SSAB have worked cooperatively on a plan, there is still a need to educate the local stakeholders on risk, environmental monitoring and health and safety protections provided by DOE and regulatory oversight.

Charge #1 Ad-hoc Committee

Charge 1 (Outreach):

- Frank Bonesteel (NSSAB)
- Fran Johnson (Pad)
- Victoria Caldwell (Pad)
- Carlton Cave (PORTS)
- Teri Ehresman (ID)

Someone from HAB Public Involvement Committee

Charge #2 – SSAB Expectations/ Guiding Principles

- Identify SSAB 10-year expectations and guiding principles that could be used as a complex-wide framework for DOE EM's interaction with stakeholders/communities
 - Utilizing the current EM 10-year Vision*, each Board will document their expectations for how DOE EM will interact with local stakeholders/communities to reach that 10-year vision (a template will be provided to each board)
 - Each Board will present their results during the Spring 2021 Chairs meeting
 - The Chairs will collaboratively discuss the individual Board results, identify commonalities and develop a complex-wide SSAB expectations and guiding principles framework (Spring 2021 – Fall 2021)
- * 10-Year Vision can be found at [DOE-Strategic-Vision-LR.pdf \(energy.gov\)](#)

Top three suggestions for improving stakeholder interactions during the next 10 years: [insert information]

Top three suggestions for improving stakeholder interactions during the next 10 years:

- The excavation of groundwater plumes and unlined landfills will not only provide fill material for the OSWDF, but also leave a healthier environment and cleaner footprint for future land transfer.
- While the successful coordination and completion of simultaneous waste cell construction, building D&D and landfill excavation are important, local stakeholders should hear more about monitoring efforts, the WAO and regulatory oversight benchmarks.
- The DOE and contractor workforce is a major source of pride for southern Ohio. Continued workforce training that produces safe, timely and quality work should be promoted to local communities for the benefits that it provides.

Charge #2 Ad-hoc Committee

Charge 2 (Strategic Vision):

- Shell Lohman (OR)
- Shelley Cimon (HAB)
- Bob Hall (NNM)
- Bill Murphy (Pad)
- Mike Kemp (Pad)

NEW TASK

Local Site Recommendation based on input from Chair Charge Submission. Convert slides into a PORTS SSAB recommendation.

Looking for volunteers for Charge 1 and Charge 2 to help spearhead this initiative.