

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

**PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 6-7, 2021**

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAB – Citizens Advisory Board
D&D – Deactivation & Decommissioning
DDFO – Deputy Designated Federal Officer
DEIA – Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility
DFO – Designated Federal Officer
DOE – U.S. Department of Energy
EM – Office of Environmental Management
EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board
EPA – US Environmental Protection Agency
ETTP – East Tennessee Technology Park
FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act
FY – Fiscal Year
HAB – Hanford Advisory Board
HBCU – Historically Black Colleges and Universities
HLW – High-Level Waste
HQ – Headquarters
ICP – Idaho Cleanup Project
IWTU – Integrated Waste Treatment Unit
LM – (DOE) Office of Legacy Management
MSI – Minority Serving Institution
NNM – Northern New Mexico
NSSAB – Nevada Site-Specific Advisory Board
OMB – The Office of Management and Budget
OR – Oak Ridge
PFAS – per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substance
SRS –Savannah River Site
SSAB –Site Specific Advisory Board
STEM – Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
TRU – Transuranic Waste
WIPP – Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

PARTICIPANTS

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB): Shelley Cimon, Vice-Chair; Jeff Burrigh, Member; Gary Younger, Federal Coordinator; Ruth Nicholson, Facilitator

Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB): Teri Ehresman, Chair; Josh Bartlome, Vice-Chair; Jordan Davies, Kelly Green, Travis Moedl, Hayley Price, and Aaron James, Staff

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB): Frank Bonesteel, Chair; Anthony Graham, Vice-Chair; Barbara Ulmer, Staff; Jesse Sleezer, Navarro Strategic Communications Manager; Rob Boehlecke, DDFO Northern

Northern New Mexico (NNM) Citizens Advisory Board: Cherylin Atcitty, Chair; Elena Ferdinand, Vice-Chair; Robert Hull, Member; Lee Bishop, DDFO; Menice Santistevan and Bridget Maestas, Staff;

Oak Ridge (OR) Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB): Shell Lohmann, Chair; Leon Shields, Vice-Chair; Shelley Kimmel and Sara McManamy-Johnson, Staff

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board: Don Barger, Chair; Fran Johnson, Vice-Chair; Eric Roberts, Meeting Facilitator, Robert “Buz” Smith, Federal Coordinator

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board: Bob Berry, Chair; Carlton Cave, Vice-Chair; Greg Simonton, Federal Coordinator

Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board: Gregg Murray, Chair; Amy Boyette, Co-DDFO; de’Lisa Carrico, Federal Coordinator; James Tanner, Staff

DOE Headquarters:

Todd Shrader, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM)

Mark Gilbertson, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory & Policy Affairs, EM

Kristen Ellis, Acting Director of Regulatory Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement

Steve Trischman, Director, Office of Budget and Planning, EM

Joceline Nahigian, Director, Office of Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Programs, EM

Kelly Snyder, EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Michelle Hudson, Public Participation Specialist

Alyssa Harris, EM SSAB Federal Coordinator

MEETING MINUTES

The U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB or Board) chairs and vice-chairs met virtually on October 6 and 7, 2021. Participants included EM SSAB leadership, local and EM Headquarters (HQ) leadership and staff, EM SSAB contractor support staff, and presenters. The meeting was held via Zoom and was publicly livestreamed via YouTube.

The meeting was open to the public and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). Recordings of this meeting can be viewed on YouTube at the following links:

[EM SSAB Chairs Meeting Day 1](#)

[EM SSAB Chairs Meeting Day 2](#)

Day 1: Wednesday, October 6, 2021

Opening Remarks

Mr. Eric Roberts, contractor support for the Paducah and Portsmouth SSABs and EM SSAB meeting facilitator, welcomed all attendees and reviewed the ground rules and functionality of the virtual platform for the meeting.

EM SSAB Designated Federal Officer (DFO) Ms. Kelly Snyder welcomed everyone and thanked the Idaho Team for hosting the virtual meeting. She said she appreciated everyone taking the time to attend and to support their communities. She thanked Mr. Roberts and introduced Acting Director of Regulatory Intergovernmental and Stakeholder Engagement Ms. Kristen Ellis.

Ms. Ellis welcomed everyone and provided some background about her experience. She thanked everyone for joining via Zoom.

Mr. Roberts introduced the chairs and vice-chairs who were in attendance. He reviewed the agenda for the meeting and introduced Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Mr. Todd Shrader.

Update from Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Todd Shrader

Mr. Shrader thanked the members of the EM SSAB . He said in many ways, EM could not do what it does without the help and input of the boards, as the eyes and ears of the Department. He said he is hoping to get back to in-person meetings in the spring and misses the added value both participants and the Department get from in-person interactions. He recognized the subcommittees that have been working on outreach and said it is a priority for the current administration. Secretary of Energy Jennifer Granholm is a strong supporter of the EM program and is focused on working with the site communities on sustainable end states. Mr. Shrader said that communicating with communities about end states is going to be an important piece moving

forward. He said that these communities have been very supportive, and DOE must help transition them to the future. He said it's important to have these conversations about end states.

Mr. Shrader commented that there has been a lot of progress at the sites, which over the last year and a half has been somewhat impacted by COVID-19. He thanked the contractors, unions, and site employees for their hard work problem solving during the pandemic. He reported on COVID-19 numbers across the complex and referenced <https://www.saferfederalworkforce.gov> for guidance on mandates and other information. He said EM is striving for consistency in how mandates are applied to be fair and equitable.

He highlighted a few 2021 EM accomplishments:

- Demolished the Y-12 Biology Complex at Oak Ridge,
- Demolished the DOE buildings at Energy Technology Engineering Center in southern California,
- Awarded the Idaho Cleanup Project contract,
- Completed Salt Disposal Unit 7 at Savannah River Site (SRS),
- Conducted readiness activities for the cesium removal project at Hanford,
- Conducted readiness activities for the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) in Idaho, and
- Removed the 12 millionth ton of waste at Moab (by year's end).

Mr. Shrader said one of the keys going forward is the next generation workforce since many people are set to retire from EM. They are working to develop new pipelines for bringing people in through Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education tools, internships, and outreach to Minority Serving Institutions (MSI) across the country to ensure a strong, diverse workforce.

In terms of engagement, Mr. Shrader explained they are working on the 2022 strategic vision and will be asking for feedback. EM is looking at priorities for the next calendar year with input from the sites and the boards. This will be included in the Department-wide strategic document.

Mr. Shrader said while they don't have the final budget yet, the Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 budget request was \$7.6 billion. The current administration is supportive of the cleanup mission and has confidence that the money will be well spent for cleanup. Mr. Shrader said he thinks the budget request is indicative of the progress EM is making. He reported that the administration is working on environmental justice initiatives, and that the SSAB's are a model of successful for community outreach.

Mr. Shrader opened the floor for questions. Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) Chair Shelley Cimon said she was interested in the discussions the Department is having about what closure means, because it seems far away for Hanford. She asked if they are looking at creating a document that addresses closure. Mr. Shrader responded that there is a Comprehensive Land Use Plan that explores that. He said that at sites like Hanford and Oak Ridge, where they don't have answers for the entire site at this time, they may look at individual areas within a site in a

stepwise approach to land use, where small areas may be able to be transferred to the community.

Mr. Jeff Burright (HAB) said he recently tried to enter into conversation with the HAB about environmental justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion. He asked if there are people at the DOE Headquarters level who are uniquely focused on this and can help with these conversations at the site level. Mr. Shrader confirmed that there are staff assigned to these topics and discussions. He said some of these initiatives are being built based on high-level visions.

Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB) Chair Ms. Teri Ehresman asked if there was an update on a long-term high-level waste (HLW) repository. Mr. Shrader said that unfortunately, there was no update, but that the Department has reenergized the consent-based siting process, which is still in the early phases.

Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board (NNM CAB) Chair Cheryl Atcitty thanked Mr. Shrader for the information and asked how often sites have been moved to the DOE Office of Legacy Management (LM). Mr. Shrader replied that he believes it has happened at all the sites, although some may have been privatized. He said about 92 have been transferred to LM, and EM is down to 16 sites. Mr. Shrader added that the intent is for at least some part of the sites to be transferred to LM with some of the land being transferred to local communities for reuse, where possible.

NNMCAB Vice-Chair Elena Ferdinand thanked Mr. Shrader for his presentation. She agreed that the advisory boards need more visibility. STEM to DOE pipelines are becoming more established, but outside of STEM, there are more concerns about environmental justice. Ms. Ferdinand said she thinks it is important to work on EM's reputation regarding what they are trying to do, not just its visibility. Pipelines outside of STEM need to be cultivated and environmental justice's role explained. Mr. Shrader responded that a tenet of environmental justice is how communities closest to DOE sites are affected by what DOE does. He expressed that having people from those communities' work within EM helps improve understanding.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (OR SSAB) Chair Ms. Shell Lohmann thanked Mr. Shrader for acknowledging the next generation workforce and DOE's emphasis on STEM, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), and internships. She echoed others' comments on diversity, equity, and inclusion and agreed it is very important right now and should be about the broadest sense of inclusivity and opportunity. The retirement boom emphasizes the importance of looking at knowledge transfer programs and training the workforce where possible to keep continuity. Mr. Shrader agreed that knowledge transfer is important. He said there is an executive order that lays out the administration's priorities for diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA). They are working on implementation, but it is a strong priority for the administration and Acting Assistant Secretary for EM Ike White.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB) Chair Mr. Don Barger said as a board, it is sometimes hard to realize the Paducah CAB will not be around to see the final cleanup product, but that they are instead laying the groundwork for the future workforce. He said the Paducah CAB is proud of what it is doing to ensure an adequate workforce for the future. Mr. Shrader

shared that we are not the closers, rather we are starting pitchers. He said it's ok as long as progress continues.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB) Chair Mr. Gregg Murray thanked Mr. Shrader for the presentation. Given that the proposed budget is larger, he asked what is proposed for FY 2022 funding that hasn't been funded in last few years. Mr. Shrader responded that, for the most part, they are just fully funding activities.

Chairs Round Robin

Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB)

Mr. Frank Bonesteel, Chair, discussed several interests of concern to the NSSAB. The first was related to deterioration of roadways used for transportation of waste. He asked DOE to make concerns known to the U.S. Department of Transportation or other agencies if there is an opportunity. He discussed extreme weather conditions and impacts on closed sites. Weather events or climate conditions such as extreme fires and flashfloods are of concern in Nevada, and they would like to receive information on how closed sites will be maintained in the future to ensure they don't become a hazard. He said they would like an emphasis on communication for potential hazard from climate conditions and extreme weather conditions. Historic preservation is a concern and needs to be balanced with cleanup to minimize impacts to resources significant to the communities. He said they would like greater emphasis on preserving the landscape and sites if possible and an expansion of digital outreach. Mr. Bonesteel also thanked the Nevada staff for the hybrid format meeting room and its ability to make meeting virtually easier.

Mr. Shrader said Secretary Granholm is working on a Climate Action Plan. DOE is looking at how to ensure facilities stand up to climate change and extreme weather in the future.

Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board (NNM CAB)

Ms. Attcity, Chair, highlighted board activities and accomplishments. She thanked the staff for helping to facilitate virtual and hybrid meetings to continue the work that needed to be done. She said the NNM CAB had prepared and submitted two recommendations to EM Los Alamos and added that members attended several meetings and forums.

Ms. Ferdinand, Vice-Chair, discussed board challenges related to establishing the cleanup prioritization desires while the New Mexico Environment Department's Consent Order lawsuit against DOE is doing the same. She said delays in approval of membership nomination packages have created problems with having a full CAB to continue the outreach mission. Additional time for submittal of *Federal Register* notices is presenting another problem for recruitment. She added that challenges related to COVID-19 restrictions are impacting new member recruitment as well.

Oak Ridge Site-Specific Advisory Board (OR SSAB)

Ms. Lohmann, Chair, highlighted accomplishments of the OR SSAB. She said they submitted their FY 2022 membership package, are planning for a major groundwater decision/recommendation for East Tennessee Technology Park, and that they submitted budget recommendations and continued the discussion of needed on-site waste disposal capacity.

She reported challenges related to recruitment and meeting diversity targets during COVID-19 and said OR SSAB also had issues with too few members related to delays in membership resulting in postponement of meetings. She shared another challenge related to the inability to tour sites, which particularly impacts new members.

Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)

Ms. Cimon, Vice-Chair, described the HAB's successes for 2021. The HAB acknowledged their appreciation in a Tank and Pipeline Integrity Letter of Appreciation for work that has been accomplished and found consensus for advice focused on public involvement in vision and guiding documents. She said they identified priorities for 2021 and beyond. Their main priorities focus on bringing direct feed low activity waste processing to fruition in the 2022 to 2023 timeframe.

Ms. Cimon continued on to say that interpretation of the HLW designation and implementation of a program is also something the HAB is interested in. They are eager for more information and willing to join in discussions. She said the same is true for environmental justice issues, and they would love to help build a template for designing a board that represents the region. She would encourage including tribes in this discussion. Ms. Cimon stated that in terms of transparency, what has worked best is when they get timely information from DOE. She supports restructuring of the public comment process to be more inclusive at the start, to help provide the depth of information that is needed to develop actionable advice for DOE.

Paducah Citizens Advisory Board (Paducah CAB)

Mr. Barger, Chair, presented information about Paducah's new virtual museum. He said this is a first for Paducah and they are excited for its potential. They have scheduled a meeting this fall to discuss how best to utilize what it has to offer. Their priority is to figure out the best way to get it into the hands of potential users, while continuing to think about where they go from here. He invited everyone to look at the virtual museum and said they were excited to get comments back from others.

Mr. Barger commented that they are still working on how to advertise invisible successes. For example, over the last several years through pump and treat, they have been able to pull the plume back into their site more closely. They aren't finished, but they feel it's important to get the word out to the community about these types of accomplishments. Mr. Barger said it is important for the board to keep the public aware of what progress is being made.

Portsmouth Site-Specific Advisory Board (Portsmouth SSAB)

Mr. Bob Berry, Chair, said that DOE should actively communicate Portsmouth's successes associated with active demolition, plume excavation, and property transfer. Local citizens will see the benefit of their participation in the cleanup program. Site workers are looking for community recognition for their support to the cleanup program. Portsmouth SSAB members believe the site and community would benefit from the story being told about cleanup successes. Mr. Berry said Portsmouth doesn't have a lot of land so they have to get a lot of work done before they can start to reindustrialize. He added that DOE has always been supportive of the Board, and it is adequately funded. They are looking toward the end state to possibly get another DOE plant or reindustrialize with a private developer.

Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board (SRS CAB)

Mr. Murray, Chair, said that at its September meeting, the SRS CAB had to establish a procedure for breaking a tie in election votes. The board was down to six members and the vote ended in a tie for the vice-chair because they didn't have enough members.

Mr. Murray reported on the initial results from a stakeholder awareness survey conducted earlier this year. The scientific survey was conducted by a survey company based on a recommendation from the board. The survey collected information about what people knew about the site but also about how they wanted to be communicated with. He shared some of the findings of the survey.

Mr. Roberts said he would love to know more about the survey as it becomes available. He was intrigued that the survey found people were not interested in getting information from traditional news but were more interested in receiving news electronically. Mr. Murray said that family and friends were the most important means of receiving information to those surveyed. He said he thought a survey might be pertinent and interesting for people to do at a broader scale.

Public Comment Period

The Round Robin session was paused in order to observe public comment during the published time. Snyder read a comment that was submitted in writing by Mr. Dan Solitz:

"Thanks for taking time out of your busy lives to ensure a cleaner safer country. My concern that I place before you today, is probably weighing heavily on your minds also. The pathways to disposal sites that have waste acceptance criteria that match the characteristics of waste staged at various sites are blocked. If this continues orphaned waste will be stranded around the country at facilities that are unsuitable for long-term disposal. Would you please entertain this concern on a future agenda?"

Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board (ICP CAB)

Ms. Ehresman, Chair, reported that the ICP CAB received from DOE some great presentations at virtual meetings earlier this year, and that the board made some budget recommendations. She focused on detailed presentations they received about the Idaho Settlement Agreement, protection of the Snake River Plain Aquifer, and progress at the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU). She reported that ICP has been affected COVID-19, but they are working very hard to continue making progress. One goal she highlighted was the safe transition to the new ICP contractor. Ms. Ehresman said there can be a lot of uncertainty with transitions, and DOE has been very specific that they are focusing on safety during this time. She said they have had virtual meetings and have not been able to do in-person meetings and tours, which is challenging particularly for new members. They are looking forward to being in person again.

Ms. Ferdinand commented that she, too, is very interested in the survey conducted by SRS and that she thinks it's something all sites should consider. She added that with COVID-19 concerns, it might be beneficial to consider other outreach methods.

Office of Regulatory and Policy Affairs Update

Mr. Roberts introduced Mr. Mark Gilbertson, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for EM Regulatory & Policy Affairs.

Mr. Gilbertson thanked everyone for participating in the meeting and said he was looking forward to hearing the recommendations. He presented the latest organizational chart for EM and said that while there have been some moves and changes, there are a lot of familiar faces.

Related to sustainability and climate action, Mr. Gilbertson commented that the mission is aligned with the administration's goals. EM actively participated in developing the DOE Climate Action and Resilience Plan that is expected in the next week or two and is already moving forward with activities at the various sites to tackle important tenets of that plan. One of EM's challenges is to understand climate vulnerability of extreme weather events and other issues at the sites.

Mr. Gilbertson discussed upgrades to the Savannah River electric distribution system to improve resilience to outages, as one example of a climate action activity. He also mentioned they continue to plant fire-tolerant vegetation at Hanford and are seeing positive impacts from upgrades at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), such as using battery powered loaders underground. Mr. Gilbertson said Secretary Granholm wants DOE to be a leader for climate action, so they are actively looking at ways to build climate action considerations into operations.

Mr. Gilbertson said he was glad to hear people talking about environmental justice. DOE is working to ensure all impacted people have a seat at the table as EM's future is discussed. DOE is working to develop an action plan to strengthen tribal consultation. Based on input from tribes, there may be updates to orders and policies pertaining to tribal actions. He said EM is supporting

the Justice40 initiative to make sure 40 percent of benefits of climate energy investments flow to disadvantaged communities.

Mr. Gilbertson commented that another example is expansion of an MSI partnership program run through the national lab in Savannah River to a new STEM, manufacturing, and cyber security consortium. The program was designed to help address DOE's future workforce needs by partnering with academia, government, and DOE contractor organizations to mentor future minority scientists and engineers. It will primarily be focused on MSIs and HBCU with research streams needed to advance the EM mission. Mr. Gilbertson stated that they partnered on an environmental justice grant with Savannah State University to develop workshops to educate teachers about radiation to pass on information to students and encourage them to pursue careers in engineering and nuclear fields.

Mr. Gilbertson then briefly talked about emerging contaminants. DOE is coordinating with other agencies in supporting research to understand the usage and effects of PFAS (per- and poly-fluoroalkyl substances). He said EM had developed preliminary guidance to its sites on use, containment, and storage of PFAS-containing materials. The concepts were subsequently issued as a Department policy, which Ms. Snyder will share along with the results of a preliminary survey about PFAS usage at EM sites, when available. The safety and health of workers is of primary concern, and EM is working to make sure PFAS is not present in drinking water sources at any site.

Mr. Gilbertson also provided a brief update on the HLW interpretation. DOE demonstrated the interpretation last September and is building on the success at SRS. They are developing a draft environmental assessment for commercial disposal of a second waste stream and plan to issue a *Federal Register* notice requesting public comment.

Stakeholder engagement is always important, and Mr. Gilbertson said he appreciated hearing from the boards about their experiences. He said they have been continuing meetings through the last year in a virtual manner. Some aspects of the virtual format have made it easier to communicate on a more frequent basis. He stated the challenge will be how to blend virtual access in the future.

Mr. Gilbertson commented that last week, a climate resiliency webinar was held with LM and the tribes. On the international front, EM is collaborating with the United Kingdom and Canada to understand international practices with respect to stakeholder engagement. They are preparing for a virtual workshop on stakeholder engagement later this month. He noted that there has been a lot of interest regarding membership packages moving through the review process and reassured the EM SSAB that DOE continues to work on improvements to the process. He added that sometimes with a new administration it takes a while for people to come on board and be comfortable with their role in approvals. This administration is really focused on DEIA and is working to improve the process moving forward. He opened the floor for questions.

Ms. Atcitty said she was grateful to hear about the opportunities for engagement with the tribes. Every tribal government is different, and Ms. Atcitty commented that she is glad to hear they are working on reaching out and finding the right people to talk to within the communities. She

asked if there was any difference in performance with the battery-operated loader at WIPP. Mr. Gilbertson responded that it did not affect operations.

Ms. Ferdinand thanked Mr. Gilbertson for noting the vulnerability assessments for extreme weather events. She appreciated his perspective that actions to increase resilience could have benefits beyond the site to the community. She referred to Mr. Gilbertson's comment that DOE is partnering with other agencies and the community on PFAS. She asked if they would work with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to put in place protective regulations. Mr. Gilbertson responded that DOE is involved with a multi-agency group looking at those issues right now. EPA is the regulatory lead. However, as federal agencies we all want to employ the best technologies, something the national lab system could contribute to. He offered to set up another briefing for anyone that is interested.

Mr. Josh Bartlome (ICP CAB) asked about the timing for performing potential PFAS treatment at DOE facilities. Mr. Gilbertson responded that there are some treatment technologies available, but they aren't aware of a need to treat for it right now. He said they were not sure on timing but that it is not impacting drinking water on any site currently.

Ms. Cimon asked if the bubblers and equipment parts of the waste streams are the same waste stream that Texas has said they don't want. She added that she is curious about the number of new waste streams coming out of the Deactivation & Decommissioning (D&D) process and wondered if HQ is concerned. Mr. Gilbertson responded that with regard to Texas, the Texas legislature is focused on fuel from power plants and preventing that fuel from going to the proposed storage site. The Savannah River bubbler waste stream could be dispositioned in the Waste Control Specialists' licensed low-level radioactive waste facility since it meets the current waste acceptance criteria. Texas's concern with an interim storage facility is that waste will wind up stranded because there is no permanent repository. It is something the federal government needs to work on, and it is being monitored closely by EM.

Mr. Gilbertson said that emerging contaminants is something they will have to follow. Some of them can be disposed, but it is expensive and there isn't consensus on the best disposition approach. He said that they are following the Department of Defense's lead at this time because they use a lot more of these materials.

Ms. Cimon said there is a lot to consider how new waste streams can affect disposition. Mr. Gilbertson said one of the focuses is to look at physical and chemical composition and what the risks are. If the physical and chemical makeup of new waste streams are known, evaluated, and meet acceptance requirements, the waste can be disposed.

Mr. Burrignt asked about the *Federal Register* notice as it relates to the HLW interpretation. He commented that it seems to have taken the backburner for Hanford and that he assumes they will keep using the current and hope they don't run into any roadblocks. Mr. Gilbertson responded that decisions have to be in alignment with federal and state regulatory perspectives because there is not just one set of authorities that drive cleanup end states. When there are disagreements, the process is slowed. Part of the frustration is determining how to be transparent about the direction things are moving during negotiation. Mr. Gilbertson said DOE unfortunately

can't be fully transparent about things that are in litigation. Mr. Burright recommended that DOE share as much as they can to help the boards understand what is needed to make progress.

Ms. Cimon commented that she was a member of the Tank Waste Task Force. She said the chief negotiators laid out what they were trying to get to, and the task force gave them a lot of suggestions when they got stuck to help them negotiate. The process was new, but it showed a need for public perspective to be incorporated into those agreements. Ms. Cimon said she thinks there is an opportunity to use the existing boards for these types of negotiations to be in a collaborative, inclusive, and transparent space where they can talk seriously about cleaning up the sites. Mr. Gilbertson said that one of his frustrations is that, unfortunately, it is not just a DOE decision. There are multiple players involved. He said it's good to have these discussions and put ideas on the table.

Membership Recruitment and Package Education Session

Ms. Snyder said she understands the membership process is frustrating, so she wanted to provide some insight into the membership package approval process. She said it is her priority to make the process more efficient and added that it is an EM priority to keep the boards operational.

She gave an overview of the governing documents that must be followed in order to be compliant. These included FACA, the DOE manual for advisory boards, EM SSAB policy, and local-level board operating procedures and bylaws, among others. She reported that Executive Order 14035 has solidified DOE's attempts to meet goals of DEIA on the boards. EM developed a framework for identifying community makeup at each site to help ensure the boards mirror the communities around them.

Ms. Snyder elaborated on the many entities involved in the process, most of which are outside of EM. While changes to the EM process can be made, changes to the process outside of EM are beyond the advisory board team's control. There are more than a dozen offices and entities that review the package, requiring coordination. However, EM works hard to carry the package through the process. In addition, as Mr. Gilbertson mentioned, reviewers change when the administration changes, which can cause delays. Ms. Snyder said a lot of the new reviewers are in place now and several packages have been approved, so hopefully things will be quicker in the future.

With multiple packages in the system at the same time, reviewers must balance multiple packages at once. Currently, each site determines when they want to appoint new members. EM hopes to streamline this process so there won't be so many packages going through the system at once.

Ms. Snyder commented that the first step in the general process is recruitment. A proposed list is put forth and vetted through EM HQ for preapproval before the package is even submitted. After preapproval, the package is developed and submitted. She provided information about the process, including the schedule for when each site needs to begin recruitment. EM is required to

have the draft package 165 days before a planned appointment. Before the 165 days, the board must conduct outreach, advertisement, recruitment, and interviews.

During this early time, HQ and the site speaks about existing gaps and needs for targeted recruitment. Ms. Snyder added that each site conducts recruitment differently. Once recruitment is complete, the site provides a proposed slate of candidates. After conducting her own review, Ms. Snyder sends the proposed slate of candidates on for preapproval. Once preapproval is given to the field, the site develops and submits the membership package and then coordinates with EM HQ to make sure it is in the right format. The final package is then submitted and enters DOE routing for approval. These are living documents that are constantly reviewed and revised.

Ms. Snyder covered the contents of the membership package. She said it includes various forms that must be filled out to meet each offices' requirements as well as multiple tabs with additional information.

- Tab A includes a summary of what is in the package.
- Tab B describes the composition of the board and shows the attempts made to meet the diversity goals. It includes the board framework, goals of recruitment, what was done to reach those goals, and the results of the outreach.
- Tab C contains the membership criteria matrix, which is another version of the various components of the board. It also includes the biographies of proposed and existing members. If requested, any term limit exceptions would also be included in this tab. Ms. Snyder provided clarification about the six-year terms and explained that no one has blanket approval to go beyond six years. Board members must individually be approved each time they apply for an extra term, which can add to the processing time. She said this also applies to the contractor exception because extra work is required to make sure there is no conflict of interest. She said a copy of the charter is also included, as are all the appointment and re-appointment letters.

Ms. Snyder said that these are components of the membership package, which together give the whole picture of what the board looks like. She explained that this process has been streamlined over the years.

Ms. Snyder then described the review process. She said it begins at the site level, then moves to EM HQ, then the broader Department including legal review, and the White House liaison. Then, it goes back to the Assistant Secretary for EM for signature and is sent back to the site level for distribution of notifications. She reminded the EM SSAB that the review process outside of EM is beyond control. Once it enters this formal review it is hard to estimate the length of time before it will be completed as many things can affect the length of the review process. If a reviewer makes a change that affects other packages, that change has to be applied to all other packages in the system.

Ms. Snyder explained that they are trying to create efficiencies and improvements on the EM side, where they have more control. They have started to involve leadership earlier in the process and keeping other DOE entities informed of what is going on with the boards. She asked for input and questions from the boards.

Mr. Murray asked when the DEIA Executive Order was issued. Mr. Bonesteel said it was issued on June 25. Mr. Murray asked for a copy of the SRS CAB's framework, where their latest package is, and how many term exceptions there are in the EM SSAB. Ms. Snyder gave him an example of an exception and explained the process. She then said she believed there were currently four to five exceptions, excluding Hanford. Michelle Hudson (DOE EM HQ) reported that the SRS package is being prepared to go out for DOE review.

Mr. Murray asked what later reviewers are catching that early reviewers don't. Ms. Snyder said EM reviewers' questions are typically down deep in the weeds, while other reviewers' comments are based on new policies and procedures or new administration or legal questions. Mr. Murray said he hopes the reviewers know they are throwing boards in disarray and hopes Ms. Snyder is making them aware of that. Ms. Snyder responded that they are communicating the impacts of the timeline and the importance of the boards to all reviewers.

Ms. Lohmann said they don't have frustration with Ms. Snyder, and they see she is working hard to get packages processed. She said the OR SSAB appreciates everything Ms. Snyder has done to make it possible for them to participate in the EM SSAB meeting. Ms. Lohmann added that she is confident the process will improve in the future. Mr. Leon Shields, OR SSAB Vice-Chair, added that he hopes streamlining will make it easier for all involved.

Mr. Berry commented that his board was down to a very low number of members at one point, so he asked for an extension. They are hoping to get some membership built up to move up through the process, but it takes time to train members for the chair and vice-chair positions. He added that it's hard to get volunteers because of the time commitments. He said he appreciates Ms. Snyder's efforts, but that he is unsure how fruitful they will be with all the bureaucracy. Ms. Snyder said she is always looking for efficiencies and ways to streamline.

Mr. Gilbertson asked Mr. Roberts to make sure these comments are captured to lend weight in the future and help drive improvements for the membership package process. DOE EM has to have these conversations with other offices, and these could help them feel Ms. Snyder's urgency.

Mr. Carlton Cave, Portsmouth SSAB Vice-Chair, said he also has an extension. He joined because he had a desire to serve in the community and has stayed on to provide continuity and help new board members. He said he hopes they can resolve this issue and continue working to improve the process.

Mr. Barger commented that eventually they will be unable to chair a meeting because the membership packages have not been approved. He said he understands they are making sure to check the boxes, but that the boards must work. He thanked Ms. Snyder and her team for their work behind the scenes. Ms. Snyder responded that she understands his perspective and agreed that the boards should mirror the community. However, if members don't show up and want to participate, then the benefit isn't there for recommendations that do come in.

Ms. Atcitty asked about the criteria for accepting or rejecting a package aside from the diversity portion. Ms. Snyder said some packages are rejected if they don't include all information

required or if forms are not filled out correctly. She said other reasons for rejection include nomination of a federal employee, contractor, or even a term-limited member who did not appropriately request an extension. A conflict of interest is also a reason for rejection.

Mr. Cave asked if there are security issues involved with any applicants. Ms. Snyder said she was not aware of any. Ms. Hudson added that site staff should look at that before putting an applicant forward. Mr. Cave clarified that security could play a part, but it might be at the beginning of the process. Ms. Snyder said they all want boards to be safe and comfortable with no security issues, so if it was known at the beginning that there was a security concern, that person probably wouldn't be put forward. Ms. Snyder said that several boards meet in federal facilities, so potential members would have to be able to get a security badge.

Ms. Atcitty asked if postings on social media influence decisions for acceptance or rejection. Ms. Snyder said she does not look into people's postings, but that the sites are asked to look at who would be a good fit for the board. They are asked to look at what organizations a candidate is involved with, and social media is a way to learn more about a candidate.

Ms. Amy Boyette, SRS CAB Co-DDFO, said most of these things are looked at the local level. She added that local sites do use social media to find out more about people and look at their backgrounds. Someone may be rejected for hostile or inflammatory political statements on social media. Ms. Snyder concluded by summarizing that there are many considerations that take place at multiple levels.

Ms. Ferdinand expressed her gratitude to Ms. Snyder and the NNM CAB staff and said it would be helpful to have a flow chart to visualize and follow the process. She asked about the diversity of reviewers and wondered who they are. She also commented that COVID-19 has provided more people the opportunity to view meetings online and said that if they could increase outreach via other tools, as well, that would be great.

Ms. Snyder said she would gather the information and send it to the EM SSAB. She agreed that some positives have resulted from COVID-19. Having virtual meetings that are broadcast to YouTube is useful, as they can be viewed from anywhere in the world. DOE wants to continue to offer virtual access in the future to improve accessibility. She reiterated that Executive Order 14035 addresses accessibility and section 5E specifically addresses advisory boards. Ms. Snyder said she is relying on the federal hiring process to address diversity of reviewers.

Mr. Anthony Graham, NSSAB Vice-Chair, noted that the digital format increases participation while at the same time reducing public engagement. He said that the NSSAB has a hard time retaining members when they don't see each other in person. He asked if there are plans for COVID-19 related membership exceptions. Ms. Snyder said a decision was made that no packages coming forward with an exception because of COVID-19 would be approved. This could change in the future and if it does, she will let all boards know. Mr. Roberts added that it is easy to do a virtual meeting but hard to do it well. He said this meeting seems better in terms of engagement because of ease and comfort with using the platform. Mr. Graham commented that he is concerned hybrid meetings will focus more on the people in the room than those on video.

Ms. Cimon thanked Ms. Snyder for her work on getting the packages through review. Ms. Snyder recognized that there is a lot of teamwork involved. Ms. Cimon asked where the Hanford package is in the review cycle, adding that the HAB had an upcoming meeting and a board meeting in December. Ms. Snyder reported that the HAB's package was toward the end of the review process, with the Office of General Counsel. She added that they are communicating with reviewers that the board had to meet with a low number in the last meeting, and she let the reviewers know they have a meeting coming up in October.

Ms. Cimon requested that Ms. Snyder also let reviewers know that the HAB cannot reach a quorum right now and are therefore not voting. She stated that cleanup continues whether or not there is public input and recommendations. She also commented that a case should be made for institutional knowledge with overlap and continuity between old and new members. Ms. Snyder said the charter includes staggered membership to ensure coverage and continuity. At least for the first year, members are overwhelmed with how much information there is, and it takes time to understand the process.

Ms. Cimon said some of the boards are large and they need to stick to the process to have multiple skill sets available. She added that it's an unwieldy process and 165 days is too long; they have lost interested candidates because of the delay in processing membership. She asked if the chairs and vice-chairs need to put together a letter about the consequences of the current process. Ms. Snyder said it would be good to collectively communicate common concerns about how the boards are being impacted.

Mr. Gilbertson added that EM boards are unique. Ms. Snyder's challenge is to educate new staff on the Board's mission. Ms. Snyder said she has tried to educate and lay groundwork for new reviewers as they come on.

Mr. Burrigth referred to the framework that attempts to be data based on DEIA. He asked how they are incorporating diversity and other data for Oregon DOE and Hanford boards. Ms. Snyder explained that the HAB does not have a framework because they have a Memorandum of Understanding. In the future, that could change. Mr. Gilbertson said that one reason it takes so long for Hanford packages to go through the process is because Hanford's board is so unique.

Ms. Ehresman thanked Ms. Snyder for approval of the ICP CAB membership package. She asked about the size of the other CABs. Ms. Snyder said some boards have 12 to 13 members, but most have 15 to 25 members. Hanford has a little over 30 primary members plus alternates, so in total around 70. Each board gets to identify their own size. Mr. Bartlome said the ICP CAB has not experienced a significant impact from membership packages, but that it is good to understand how complex the process is. He said he and Ehresman would pass the information back to their board.

Mr. Roberts asked everyone to put together some initial thoughts about the membership process and its impacts and send them to Jordan Davies (ICP CAB Support Staff). Mr. Roberts said they would compile the feedback and create formal documentation to move forward to DOE.

Day 2: Thursday, October 7, 2021

Mr. Roberts welcomed the group back for day two of the meeting. He explained some changes to the agenda before turning it over to Mr. Murray to present a recommendation from the SRS CAB.

Mr. Murray briefly introduced SRS CAB Recommendation 370, “Revised Membership Appointment Process”. He said he thought this recommendation would help to take pressure off the system. The recommendation for a revised membership appointment process has three parts:

- Part 1 formally defines lapsed membership. This is defined as a member with an expired term who hasn’t reached the six-year term limit. The appointment process should take all reasonable steps to avoid this.
- Part 2 provides a temporary solution for when lapsed memberships aren’t avoided. Site members should be given power to extend the terms of lapsed members until new members can be formally appointed when losing a member would drop board membership below 75 percent. Furthermore, if membership is still below 75 percent after approving temporary members, site managers should be given power to appoint temporary members to get membership to 75 percent. This provides a mechanism for keeping credible levels of membership. This is a power site managers already have.
- Part 3 states that DOE should publish the appointment process and take feedback from the public and from the EM SSAB to promote transparency.

Mr. Murray explained that DOE Savannah River partially accepted this recommendation. They accepted Part 1 but said Part 2 was outside of their purview and should be considered by the full EM SSAB. They said they forwarded Part 3 of the recommendation to Ms. Snyder for review. Mr. Murray commented that he does not believe anyone is satisfied with the appointment process. Site managers already have the power to appoint members under certain circumstances. This recommendation simply extends that power to address lapsed membership, and to address problems and disruptions they create.

Mr. Roberts reintroduced the chairs and vice-chairs in attendance and then introduced EM’s Director of Budget and Planning, Mr. Steve Trischman.

EM Budget Briefing Presentation

Mr. Trischman began by discussing the budget timeline and noted they are always working on multiple budget years at once. They will begin planning for FY 2024 soon and are working with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for FY 2023 now. That budget will be released in February 2022. Congress is currently looking at the FY 2022 budget. They issued a continuing resolution for the next budget year since they could not agree on a budget before end of the FY.

Mr. Trischman said the FY 2022 budget request of \$7.6 billion is very strong and in line with what Congress has been enacting. This will help bring together long-term planning and help with consistency. They are getting consistent support from both the House and Senate. He presented a

historic perspective on the requests, looking at requested versus enacted. He stated that getting the requested amount makes planning easier for things like contractor staffing and being ready to perform the work. Consistency in the budget is very helpful for execution.

He shared the primary mission areas and where the budget goes. Tank waste is the largest part of the budget, but they are also making significant investments in infrastructure. In addition, they spend a lot of money on transuranic waste (TRU), WIPP operations, the shipping of waste and facility D&D. Other areas of spending are soil and groundwater cleanup, site services, spent nuclear fuel, special nuclear materials, and fuel storage and operations.

Mr. Trischman shared the enacted budget request by site. He said it shows where there is strong support or if a committee is driving something at a particular site. It is helpful to know what the priorities are to know what to focus on. It also shows that the House and Senate come very close to enacted or the request for the prior year for most sites.

Mr. Trischman highlighted FY22 budget accomplishments.

- Complete construction of direct feed low activity waste facilities at the Office of River Protection, commission those facilities, and getting them up and running.
- Remediate under the 324 Building from a past leak at Richland.
- Begin IWTU operations in Idaho.
- Operate the Salt Waste Processing Facility at SRS.
- Implement infrastructure improvements at WIPP and increase shipments.
- Cleanup excess facilities at Oak Ridge and Y-12 National Security Complex.
- Demolish first gaseous diffusion plant building at Portsmouth.
- Complete remedial investigation of C-400 building to address trichloroethylene plume at Paducah.
- Accelerate disposal of uranium mill tailings at Moab.
- Remediate DP Road contamination at Los Alamos.
- Demolish excess facilities at Lawrence Livermore.
- Demolish Main Plant Process Building at West Valley Demonstration Project.
- Create a consortium of HBCU and other MSIs to build a diverse and inclusive workforce.

Mr. Trischman touched on communication with the sites. He encouraged open lines of communication running both ways between stakeholders and sites to ensure everyone is aware of where we are with the budget process, where to influence priorities, and what is happening. Mr. Trischman opened the floor for questions from the chairs.

Mr. Burright talked about the HAB's desire to see more detailed budgets and history to understand the past versus the present. Mr. Trischman said that internal budget deliberations are embargoed, so how they reach funding for a particular year cannot be shared. Mr. Burright said it is hard to have a list of priorities if they don't know the relative cost between things and to make tradeoffs without all the information. He said he feels the public should be involved in this aspect of budgeting. Mr. Trischman said that the lower-level summary will show the major pieces of

funding and within that is the scope that can be done, giving a relative sense of what can be accomplished.

Ms. Ferdinand asked if there will be continuing improvements on monitoring of ventilation and filters at WIPP. She added that these were found as deficiencies by the Accident Investigation Board. Mr. Trischman responded that he did not know the specifics, but they are building a new safety contaminant ventilation system.

Ms. Ferdinand added she hopes there is money for DP Road in case something else is found. Mr. Trischman said it looks like extra funding will be available for remediation. Ms. Ferdinand said she was glad there is funding earmarked for the consortium for MSIs. She said they also need to look at people in STEM-adjacent and STEM-supporting organizations, not just strictly STEM, to improve diversity and make for a better, fuller mission.

Mr. Murray asked the difference between this year's budget and what was asked for in the past. Mr. Trishman said the larger budget (approximately \$1.5 billion more) would allow EM to make significantly more progress, such as continuing and completing work that has already been started. It would allow DOE to make more progress at smaller sites by fully funding projects.

Ms. Cimon said that they used to get more budget information earlier in the process and it made them better activists for getting funding to further projects. She asked if Mr. Trischman ever sees the boards having the opportunity to see more planning and budgeting again in the public realm. Mr. Trischman said they need to figure out a way to make more information available, but there is an OMB policy that says the detailed information cannot be shared.

Ms. Cimon said that it comes down to risk and how to reduce it. Mr. Trischman responded that they should be able to look at risk at least in terms of the relative cost of things. The site should be able to tell them what scope can get done with the budget that they have even if they don't know the exact dollar amount. He added that when they try to prioritize within the budget request, they have to try to decide on tradeoffs if one thing is more important than another.

SRS CAB Recommendation Continued

Mr. Murray began the conversation by stating that he believes this recommendation is a mechanism that would be helpful.

Mr. Barger asked if it is possible someone would be appointed that could serve for just one meeting and then leave. Mr. Murray responded that he thinks it's possible that could happen. However, a lapsed member whose term is temporarily extended would presumably be up for reappointment. Mr. Barger asked about the implications of having a person attend only one meeting. Mr. Murray said he is not familiar with any implications and added that he did not see an issue from his perspective.

Ms. Fran Johnson, Paducah CAB Vice-Chair, asked if the temporary member could be someone that had served on a past board versus someone who does not have any knowledge. Mr. Murray replied that it seems likely it would be a lapsed member who is up for reappointment, so he

thinks it would be someone with some experience or relevant knowledge. He said he thinks the site manager would have incentive to appoint someone with experience. However, he added that it could conceivably be a new person with no experience.

Ms. Cimon said this recommendation would be difficult to implement with the HAB because they are a board of organizations. The organizations decide who sits in the seats on the boards. She suggested that maybe they should focus on helping in some other way to streamline the package process. She said they could form a subcommittee to work with Ms. Snyder and her team to get a roadmap that shows the steps to see if there is a way to streamline the process. They could couple that suggestion of streamlining with explanations about the importance of the boards.

Mr. Roberts said that in terms of membership, there are seven boards plus one because Hanford is so different. They have to be cognizant that some of the EM SSAB recommendations might not fit Hanford. So we might need to clarify language to make it fit globally. He asked Mr. Murray if his intent with the recommendation is to have DOE address the situation and find a solution going forward or to accept the recommendation as the right solution. Mr. Murray said he thinks it's both. It is a mechanism for keeping the boards populated. The SRS CAB is a full board of 25 with only six appointed members currently, so the system is not working. He believes everyone has an incentive to keep their boards populated.

Ms. Cimon said she understands Mr. Murray's frustration. The HAB has had people waiting over a year to join the board. She said she is interested in a permanent fix, rather than multiple temporary fixes. She asked Ms. Snyder if there are opportunities to leverage some of these steps to streamline the process, and if the boards can help. Ms. Snyder said they are trying to understand their options. She reminded the members that she has most control over the EM part of the process, but that unfortunately most of the process is dictated outside of EM so there is not much opportunity to implement change.

Regarding the recommendation, Ms. Snyder said that if the chairs want to write a recommendation rather than trying to fix the process itself, it would be helpful for people to know the impacts on boards and communities that lapsed memberships create. It would have more weight coming from the board members rather than from Ms. Snyder herself. She said she thinks the recommendation has a lot of potential. The first step is to find out if it can be pursued. Ms. Snyder can then find out how it could work within the system. She said what they need is the overall recommendation at this point, with a suggestion as to one way to fix it. They are hearing that they want it fixed, and this is a suggestion for how it could be done, but another solution could work as well.

Mr. Murray clarified that he does not see this recommendation as a fix for the lengthy review process. Rather, he sees this as a temporary fix for lapsed membership when the review process fails. He commented that he does not believe they can fix the whole process because so much of it is beyond their control. Allowing site managers to address lapsed membership is an easy solution.

Ms. Lohmann agreed that a temporary solution where members in good standing can be extended is necessary because of the egregiously long approval process. She added that the recommendation should state that the EM SSAB also wants to see some revisions and streamlining to the process. This would allow the boards to do their job with the temporary extension. Ms. Lohmann said there should also be a bullet in the recommendation that discusses the impacts, such as erosion of public trust. She said they can address both things with this recommendation.

Ms. Ehresman said that about a year ago the ICP CAB was concerned about whether they would be able to have a meeting because they were stuck in the approval process without enough members. She said she appreciates Ms. Snyder's efforts to streamline the process.

Mr. Burrignt asked whether a form of continuing resolution to keep members on the boards might be an appropriate solution. He said he didn't feel this recommendation would apply to Hanford, but he didn't want to stand in the way if it would help other boards. He would like to see the process diagrammed, with dates and durations. If the process is put on paper, perhaps they can better identify which parts need to be ironed out. Mr. Burrignt added that if the EM SSAB does send the recommendation, he said he would like to have a section that includes how it is affecting the boards included in the background.

Mr. Roberts asked Mr. Burrignt if there is a way to make this work for Hanford. Mr. Burrignt said it would come down to whether they want to draw a line at people who have been on a board for more than six years, which is the situation at Hanford. Site managers would need to have some discretion. He said that currently they don't have a chair or vice-chair on a particular committee, which makes it hard because they don't have any leadership for those groups. Mr. Burrignt said the proposed fix wouldn't work for longer term serving people at Hanford if the six-year limit is part of the process. Ms. Cimon said she likes the idea of site managers being able to let people continue until the process is completed.

Mr. Berry said the Portsmouth SSAB has had extreme trouble keeping full membership. He agreed it sounds beneficial to extend people who are on or have been on the board before but asked if these are the only people they are talking about. He said he doesn't see how they could fill a position with anyone other than someone who has been vetted and/or has been in position previously. It seems like it could only be current or former board members who have been through the process, and he asked for clarification on this point.

Mr. Murray responded that his perspective is that site managers would not temporarily appoint someone who is not qualified. He anticipates that most of the time it would be someone who has been on the board and is waiting for the appointment process to be completed. Mr. Berry asked Ms. Snyder if DOE would let site managers appoint someone to the board who has not been through the vetting process. Ms. Snyder responded that she did not have a firm answer but described current practice. She said Mr. Murray mentioned that site managers have power to appoint members in certain situations. If a member has to leave early without filling the whole two-year term, then a manager can appoint someone. So, in that situation the person is not fully vetted. They would then discuss who they would want to appoint for the remainder of the current

term. She said this represents a situation where someone can be appointed without going through the full membership process. She also said there are situations wherein people are not renewed, and she reminded the group that renewals are not automatic. She said she didn't know specifically if they could do what is being included in the recommendation because it is not just an EM decision. She doesn't know if HQ would support this, but EM is interested in finding a solution that would help the process.

Ms. Hudson clarified an administrative point about interim appointments. She said they are vetted through DOE HQ General Counsel after the DFO determines someone is an acceptable candidate. After DOE HQ General Counsel gives approval, then the site may appoint to fill a vacant term.

Mr. Roberts asked about the path forward. He said it is complicated and made more difficult by individual site procedures and policies. Additionally, membership is a federal responsibility and there are lots of rules they have to comply with. When a package slips and we struggle to have enough members to meet, there are consequences.

Mr. Gilbertson said that they want the individual board members to share the feedback about what the impacts are when the process lags and when they can't meet. He said Mr. Murray and the SRS CAB have written a great starting point that he thinks can move forward with some tweaks to make it more holistic to fit everyone. Mr. Murray said that he thinks they should send it on to DOE with a couple of suggested minor changes. DOE can then decide what to tweak or do with it. He said this is a way they can see to address the membership package problem, and if not, DOE should come up with another way to address it.

Mr. Bonesteel made a motion to proceed after reworking the recommendation slightly to forward it to DOE for consideration. Mr. Cave seconded the motion.

Ms. Cimon asked if other things should be added before it is forwarded to DOE, such as how burdensome the current situation has been. Mr. Roberts asked how quickly this would need to be sent on. Ms. Snyder said it would have to go back to each board to be discussed at a public meeting. She said she thinks the EM SSAB can vote to move forward and send it on for votes at the individual boards.

Ms. Lohmann said she agreed with moving forward and that the background piece should include the adverse impacts.

Mr. Berry asked if the decision to exercise this option would be left up to site managers. Mr. Murray said that was their intention. It is not mandated, but it's an option.

Mr. Roberts asked if the group was comfortable with the recommendation and the ability to bring together a small group for editing, and then bringing it back to their individual boards after the changes are made.

Mr. Burrig asked how the individual boards will vote if they don't have a quorum. Ms. Snyder said a quorum is 50 percent plus one of appointed members, not the target number of board members each board has spots for.

Ms. Ferdinand said that at one point she was the only active member of the board and would have been the only person able to vote. Ms. Snyder said that in that scenario, one would have to consider what the right thing would be to do in consideration of what is best for the whole board.

A vote was held. All boards approved moving forward with the recommendation. Mr. Murray, Ms. Cimon, and Ms. Lohmann volunteered to work as a committee incorporating the minor edits. Ms. Snyder and Ms. Alyssa Harris, EM SSAB Federal Coordinator, will be looped into the committee.

Ms. Snyder said the SSAB charter is up for renewal in April. This recommendation should be included. They start that process well in advance because it goes through the same process as membership packages. She suggested they target having it done by end of this calendar year so it can be included in everything moving forward including the charter. Mr. Murray committed to trying to turn it around in the next week or so.

Public Comment Period

Ms. Snyder said no comments were submitted for the second day of the meeting.

Charge #1 | Outreach Best Practices

Mr. Bonesteel took the lead discussing Charge 1. Mr. Bonesteel said Ms. Johnson, Ms. Ehresman, Mr. Burrignt, Mr. Cave, Mr. Murray, Mr. Berry, Mr. Bob Hull (NNM CAB member), Ms. Georgette Samaras (OR SSAB member), and Ms. Victoria Caldwell (Paducah CAB), were on the committee. Charge 1 was to develop a best practices whitepaper that the Department could use as a guide to augment existing outreach and set expectations for future outreach activities. The committee prepared a draft that was recently disseminated. Mr. Hull described the first draft process. Each board came up with information that touched on outreach best practices and opportunities for improvement. Information was compiled and they met several times to discuss the charge. They used three things (all included as attachments to the recommendation):

1. Outreach Activities List
2. Improvement Opportunities
3. Compiled Charge Responses (along with meeting notes)

Mr. Hull said they used these three documents to prepare a recommendation that could be actionable. He described the sections of the recommendation as including background and observations, as well as the recommendations for thematic areas of improvement agreed upon by all the chairs.

Mr. Burrignt described that he took the recommendations created by Mr. Hull and attempted to put the collection into thematic areas. Mr. Bonesteel thanked Mr. Hull and Mr. Burrignt for their explanation of the process and the entire team for their help.

Mr. Roberts opened the recommendation up for discussion.

Mr. Graham said it is what he was expecting, and he fully supports the recommendation.

Mr. Barger said he was very impressed with the document and that he supports it.

Ms. Ehresman said she had the privilege of helping and she supports it.

Ms. Lohmann said she had no concerns with it.

Mr. Roberts asked if any tweaks or changes were needed.

Mr. Murray thanked Mr. Bonesteel, Mr. Hull, Mr. Burrig, and the rest of the committee for their work. He recommended a revision to bullet 7 in the document. Everyone agreed to the suggested change.

Ms. Cimon said thanks for synthesizing this down. She thinks the attached excel spreadsheets are of tremendous value and she was glad they are going to be included as attachments because they provide a good perspective of each site for the future.

Mr. Bonesteel moved to adopt and move forward. Ms. Lohmann seconded. Mr. Barger said it was ready to be voted on. All agreed they were comfortable taking it back to their individual boards.

Charge #2 | 10-year Strategic Plan Development

Ms. Snyder gave the group a heads up that DOE is getting ready to talk about the 10-year strategic vision. The chairs and committees have been working on this for several months. She said she would be sending an email with this information and soliciting comments. She talked to leadership about the current charge and explained that this charge is related to the strategic vision. She has informed leadership that it may take some time for the recommendation to be approved. She said the recommendation will be considered no matter when it comes in.

Ms. Lohmann introduced the draft recommendation for Charge 2. She said it overlaps with the recommendation from Charge 1 because the strategic vision is a key communication tool or product that would be shared with various stakeholder communities. The committee wanted to create greater understanding and value for various stakeholders and to think about what needed to be seen in the vision and its timeliness, so they defined who the stakeholders are. The drafted version has three main components:

1. Plan Development (and specific tasks related to that)
2. Communication
3. Public involvement

Ms. Lohmann said that Mr. Hull, Ms. Cimon, Mr. Mike Kemp (Paducah CAB member), and Mr. Bill Murphy (Paducah CAB member) all helped draft the recommendation.

Mr. Roberts opened it up for thoughts from the members.

Mr. Graham said he fully supports the recommendation.

Ms. Atcitty said it was well thought out and she thanked everyone who helped draft it.

Mr. Roberts asked if there were any changes needed for the recommendation. No one had any changes.

Ms. Cimon said she knows the sites are being asked to start preparing their 10-year plans. She asked Ms. Snyder about the window for submitting this to EM for consideration if they all agree with the recommendation. Ms. Snyder said she talked to Mr. Shrader about this, and he is aware and anticipates reviewing the recommendation in draft form.

Ms. Lohmann made a small edit to the recommendation.

Mr. Bonesteel moved that this recommendation be moved forward. Ms. Atcitty seconded. Everyone voted to move it forward.

Board Business

Mr. Bonesteel informed the EM SSAB that DOE and the State of Nevada reached a mutually beneficial resolution to all regulatory actions resulting from the July 2019 issue involving certain waste shipments from the Y-12 Facility in Oak Ridge, Tennessee to the National Security Site. The final settlement agreement was the result of many months of conversations between representatives of the Department and the State. The NSSAB shares the Department's belief that the final agreement enhances the rigor of DOE's waste management activities for protection of the workforce, public, and the environment. The results of the Y-12 Investigation and Corrective Action Plan as well as 16 evaluations performed by DOE have been shared across the DOE complex to strengthen waste characterization and the verification process. Mr. Bonesteel said the NSSAB wanted to make the EM SSAB aware because as representatives of communities interested in and impacted by environmental matters at NNSS, this agreement demonstrates a productive working relationship between the office of EM and its regulators in Nevada. Mr. Bonesteel thanked the Department and State of Nevada for reaching this agreement and hopes for future successful collaboration.

Mr. Roberts asked if there was any other board business and opened the meeting up for questions or thoughts on other topics they would like to discuss at future board meetings. Mr. Murray asked if anyone would be interested in a survey like they did at SRS. Ms. Ehresman asked if they could get a copy. Mr. Murray said he thought it could be shared at some point. Ms. Boyette said it would be vetted first and shared with the SRS CAB, then shared with everyone else.

The chairs and vice-chairs provided their final comments. Mr. Roberts said that he thought there was an excellent level of active participation and discussion at this virtual meeting. He thanked Ms. Davies and the Idaho team for hosting and supporting the meeting. Ms. Davies thanked everyone for their help and said it was a team effort. EM's Director of Intergovernmental & Stakeholder Programs, Ms. Joceline Nahigian thanked everyone and congratulated Mr. Gilbertson on his retirement. She thanked him for his many years of service. Mr. Gilbertson

thanked the EM SSAB members for their service. He said the work is really important to the Department and the quality of the work over last couple of days has been outstanding.

Ms. Snyder said she was proud of how much had been accomplished with the charges and that everyone should be proud of their work. She added that this is one of the best, most productive virtual meetings she had participated in. She thanked the Idaho team for volunteering to do the meeting and said they did a great job. She thanked Mr. Roberts for facilitating and Ms. Harris and Ms. Hudson for supporting the meeting.

Mr. Roberts adjourned the meeting.