SRS CAB Full Board Meeting

Columbia, SC

March 26-27, 2012

Attendance; Monday, March 26:

CAB Members

Thomas Barnes
Artisha Bolding
Dr. Donald Bridges
Ed Burke
Louie Chavis
Mary Davis-*Absent*
Robert Doerr
Kathe Golden
Dr. Rose Hayes
Nina Hazen
Stanley Howard
Travis Johnson
Cleveland Latimore
Clinton Nangle
Dr. Marolyn Parson
Dr. William Rhoten
Dr. Paul Shieh
Earl Sheppard
Harold Simon
John Snedeker
George Snyder
James Steeter
Ed Sturcken
Dr. Gerald Wadley
Sarah Watson

Agency Liaisons & Regulators

Mary Bright, SCDHEC
Van Keisler, SCDHEC
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC
Kim Newell, SCDHEC
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Rob Pope, EPA
Kyle Bryant, EPA

Contractors

Doug Dearolph, NNSA
Dwayne Wilson, SRNS
Paul Sauerborn, SRNS
Jeannette Hyatt, SRNS
Nancye Bethurem, SRR
Ginger Dickert, SRR
Steve Thomas, SRR
Erica Williams, V3
Ashley Whitaker, V3
James Tanner, V3

Stakeholders:

Tom Clements
Jacob Stone
Bobby Golden
Karen Patterson
Sonny Goldston
Dawn Gillas
Tiajuana Cochnauer
Nancy Bobbitt

DOE

Dr. David C. Moody, DOE-SR
Pat McGuire, DOE-SR
Doug Hintze, DOE-SR
Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR
Karen Guevara, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Soni Blanco, DOE-SR
Rich Olsen, DOE-SR
Bill Taylor, DOE-SR

Erica Williams, V3 Technical Services and Meeting Facilitator, welcomed everyone to the CAB meeting, reminded everyone to sign-in, and reviewed the meeting rules of conduct. She asked that everyone speak in the microphones when making comments, and asked everyone to be brief. She reviewed public comment times, instructing everyone to sign-in on the pink public comment sheet located in the back of the meeting room and that CAB members cannot respond to public comments; she provided instructions on what form to fill out in order to receive a written response from DOE. She then called the first presenter, Dr. Dave Moody, SRS Manager.

PRESENTATION: Enterprise SRS-Dr. David C. Moody,SRS Manager

Dr. Moody thanked the CAB for an opportunity to provide an update on Enterprise SRS. He said they were still moving forward with a focus on three integral areas: Environmental Stewardship, National Security, and Clean Energy. He said Enterprise SRS is really about the future of America, about restoring a prowess in quality-level manufacturing that will come from Clean Energy programs at SRS, and creating jobs for the future.

He then reviewed a slide concerning the Nation and the world, and the complex challenges being faced. He said the country is facing a number of challenges and SRS can offer solutions in areas such as clean energy, safeguarding and securing nuclear materials, maintaining national security, providing a clean environment, and leveraging science, innovation and technology. He spoke about the Ameresco Biomass celebration that occurred a few weeks prior. He said a third of the Site's electricity needs are being met by this new plant, which has lower impacting emissions, and therefore moves the Site forward in its clean energy goals. He said Enterprise SRS is a partnership between all aspects of the Department of Energy. He said the two aspects that have been the most involved so far is Environmental Management and NNSA; he said they have also been working with Nuclear Energy and the Office of Science. He continued by reviewing the mission, budget, people, and enterprise value set against the national need from 2009 to 2014, and noted the accomplishments made possible by ARRA funding.

He spoke about Environmental Stewardship, stating the Site will transform liabilities to assets. He highlighted two areas in which the Enterprise SRS would assist, including leading development, validation, and assessment of breakthrough technologies to accelerate current DOE national cleanup priorities, and the capitalization of SRS competencies to solve the nation's nuclear materials disposition issues. He said the Site's job is to provide environmental cleanup, and to do it well. He spoke about projects going forward with SRNL and other groups. Dr. Moody spoke about Clean Energy, stating SRS would accelerate the deployment of nuclear energy. He reviewed three areas in which the Enterprise SRS would be involved, including the acceleration of small modular reactor technology, the demonstration of clean energy systems, and the development and leading of the nation's used nuclear fuel initiatives. He then reviewed the topic of National Security, stating ESRS will enhance it. He reviewed three areas in which Enterprise SRS would be involved, including leading proliferant materials disposition, leading global nuclear nonproliferation and threat reduction systems solutions through R&D, analysis, forensics, and demonstrations, and leading national deterrence programs, including Research and Development (R&D), and management of tritium and helium-3 for the nation.

Dr. Moody reviewed a graph of Enterprise SRS and what its success will look like, and spoke briefly about the 12 Enterprise SRS Initiatives. Regarding the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL), Dr. Moody stated it is a multi-program National Laboratory and is the safest laboratory in the DOE Complex, with about 1,000employees and a budget of $260 million. He said SRNL has three focused missions: Environmental Stewardship, Clean Energy, and National Security. He then referred to a Mission Development Support Flow chart for the Enterprise SRS missions, which listed the 12 Strategic Initiatives "champions."

Dr. Moody then spoke about small modular reactor (SMR) research and partnerships, stating that SMRs are factory-fabricated and can be transported by truck or rail to nuclear power sites. He said SRS is an ideal location for SMR research and development, and that DOE has signed three Memorandums of Agreement with private companies and five more are in discussions.

He said DOE-SR will pursue top priority objectives, stating not all 12 Strategic Initiatives would move forward with the same speed or emphasis. He said they plan to reshape cultural, organizational and business practices, and will build strong business interagency support networks.

CAB member Rose Hayes asked Dr. Moody, for the sake of the Board's newer members, to discuss SMRs and how these reactors contribute to clean energy. Dr. Moody said the thousand watt reactors that are being built at Plant Vogtle are extremely complex systems, and are safe; however, these reactors require power to operate the safety systems. He said one of the principle advantages of SMRs is in the area of safety. He said many SMRs have a gravity flow loop, so they can lose all power, but by convection will cool themselves. He said two big advantages of SMRs are that these reactors are less susceptible to earthquakes and have smaller footprints, and many operate for a long period of time before you have to exchange the fuel. He said one model can operate on one charge of fuel for 10 years, and others can run on three to five years, and don't need nearly as much water so they can be placed on areas other than the coast. He said they have no carbon footprint as well. CAB member Hayes asked how many

watts a SMR normally puts out. Dr. Moody said the smallest teaching reactor that DOE-SR is talking with companies about puts out 10 megawatts, and the largest in discussions puts out a few hundred megawatts. He said some companies install them in "pods."

CAB member Ed Burke asked how many separate technologies the Site plans to work with at any given time. Dr. Moody stated there is no limit to the number of Sites that could be made available, but there is a limit to the Site's resources and manpower; he said he estimates about three to five projects could be worked on at one time.

Ms. Karen Patterson, public, stated that when Dr. Moody speaks about project champions, most of them are employed at SRS. She asked if Dr. Moody was looking for champions outside of SRS contractors or DOE. Dr. Moody stated they are looking for individuals to partner with DOE-SR overall on the Enterprise SRS mission. Ms. Patterson asked who were the SMR and nuclear vendors, and what were they interested in seeing, or doing, and what do they want DOE to help them with. Dr. Moody said some of the vendors are interested in power purchase agreements, land leases, both onsite and offsite, security, nearby land to build industries on, cooperative research agreements with SRNL, and more. He said it's not just about the technical abilities of the workforce, but also intellectual property.

CAB chair Donald Bridges asked if DOE found anything different within the budget process when looking at Enterprise SRS. Dr. Moody said there is always interest in the budget process. He said many of the initiatives are beyond the EM mission, and DOE has to be careful in its budget process as it presents its work scope as it relates to EM and its funding. He said the funding for many of the initiatives are private-public partnerships. He said if they had to rely solely on the federal budget, it would be difficult to pull off.

PRESENTATION: The Importance of CAB Membership-Pat McGuire, DOE-SR

Mr. McGuire, co-DDFO for the CAB, outlined the importance of being a CAB member. He said DOE really wants CAB input, and values the input the Board gives DOE on EM scope at SRS. He referred to Dr. Moody's presentation, stating that partnerships between DOE and the community are very important. He said DOE will make better decisions with community input. He referred to the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) Final Report, and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), which he said was an example of community involvement working out well.

He continued that CAB members should actively participate in CAB activities, and reach out to the community. He spoke about active participation, listing activities the CAB members should get involved with such as committee and full board meetings, reading reports, sharing perspectives, and developing recommendations; he said CAB members are not expected to be experts, and that the Board is diverse. He then spoke about community outreach, stating it ensures that the CAB continues to act as a primary means to receive community input. He suggested that CAB members invite others to meetings, welcome different perspectives, and to communicate the role of the CAB with others in the community.

He spoke about how CAB members can obtain assistance, stating that new CAB members are assigned to mentors on the Board, and that committee chairs, the CAB chair, CAB vice chair, CAB Support Team, DOE CAB liaisons, and co-DDFOs are all available to offer help to CAB members. Mr. McGuire summarized his presentation by stating the DOE wants community input concerning issues affecting the EM Program at SRS. He said DOE wants CAB input because citizen involvement results in more informed decision-making, and that the CAB is a primary means through which DOE receives public input.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation (FD&SR) Committee Overview-Marolyn Parson, Chair

CAB member Marolyn Parson began her committee update by listing its past members, stating CAB member Tom Barnes would be vice chair, and encouraging other CAB members to sign-up for the FD&SR Committee. She reviewed the committee's focus, and briefly reviewed the last FD&SR Committee Meeting. She spoke about the FD&SR 2012 Work Plan, as well as the status of FD&SR Recommendations; she said there was one "open" recommendation, #279, and addressed the DOE Response. She stated there was also one "pending" recommendation, #283. She then introduced a draft recommendation, titled "Reallocation of Funds for Regulatory Support in FY2012 Appropriations and Request for Increase in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013." She announced when the next scheduled committee meeting would be held, and the planned topics to be discussed.

FD&SR Draft Recommendation Discussion: "Reallocation of Funds for Regulatory Support in FY2012 Appropriations and Request for Increase in FY 2013"

CAB member Parson opened the discussion of the draft recommendation, and then turned the discussion over to CAB member Tom Barnes, the Recommendation Manager. CAB member Barnes briefly read over the recommendation, and asked for comments.

CAB member Parson said there were so many new people, she asked Facilitator Erica Williams, V3, to go over the process of editing and voting on recommendations. CAB member Parson then gave a brief background of the recommendation, which was put forward by the FD&SR and Strategic & Legacy Management (S&LM) committees. She said the recommendation has the support of the EPA and SCDHEC. She read aloud the following excerpt from the SRS CAB January Full Board meeting minutes:

> "CAB member Parson asked if the funding within the community and regulatory PBS is not restored, how would it affect the oversight from EPA and SCDHEC. Mr. Hintze said that at first glance there is potential for significant impact. Mr. Pope, EPA, said that for EPA, SRS is a National Priority Site, so EPA will always have Project Managers assigned to SRS until the cleanup is completed which is still some time away. He said the number of Project Managers EPA can assign to SRS will be impacted by the funding that DOE provides. He said during the ARRA funding, DOE gave more funding so that EPA could assign more project managers that were dedicated to SRS, but now that ARRA funding is coming to a close, EPA has fewer Project Managers working on the Site. He said if they were to completely lose all the funding from DOE, they would have even fewer Project Managers. He said at the moment they have three full-time and one part-time Project Managers working at SRS, and if funding dropped, it would probably be cut down to one full-time and one part-time Project Manager working at SRS. He said this would severely impact EPA's ability to review all the documents, keep up with its work, and to interact with the CAB. He said the first things to go would be EPA's interaction with the CAB, Environmental Justice meetings, and the Super Fund Job Training Initiative. He said they would have to dedicate themselves to the more technical work first, and would only attend CAB meetings when directly requested. He added there was a time in the past where DOE did not provide any support to EPA for Project Manager support and EPA did have issues with not having enough people dedicated to SRS with the level of work SRS was turning out. He said EPA hopes to not return to that situation. Ms. Wilson, SCDHEC, said that from a state perspective, the amount of money DOE gets and decides to spend is up to DOE management and priorities. She said if SCDHEC received less money or no money, the CAB would see SCDHEC's ability to oversee cleanup grinding to a halt. She said it would 'slow or stop.'"

CAB member Parson said that prior to drafting the "Reallocation of Funds for Regulatory Support in FY2012 Appropriations and Request for Increase in FY 2013" recommendation, she sent an email to Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC, and Rob Pope, EPA, asking them to look at the draft recommendation and if they agreed with asking DOE to restore funds for regulatory support. She said both responded, supporting the recommendation.

CAB member Barnes asked if anyone had questions. CAB member Ed Burke said the recommendation addresses reducing the budget by $8 million. He asked how much of that $8 million will be restored for regulatory activities. He commented that currently America is $16 trillion in debt and going into debt at an increasingly large rate every year. He said he looked at the recommendation, and the key point is where it says "requesting information on strategies that will be initiated so that oversight from the regulators is not weakened." He said they understand that budget cuts need to be made, but they need to ensure that these cuts will be done in such a way so that the current oversight is not weakened.

CAB member Parson said they couldn't ask for the specific dollar amount in the recommendation because they are not sure what it is; she said they tried to come up with wording that suggest they restore funding to an appropriate level to cover cleanup work that needs oversight. She asked Doug Hintze, co-DDFO, to speak on that.

Mr. Hintze said CAB member Parson was "exactly correct." He said the part of the recommendation that asks for funding appropriate for the work being completed comes from input gathered in discussions. He said the wording of the recommendation is clear to DOE and they understand what the CAB is asking for.

Ms. Wilson, SCDHEC, said the funding SCDHEC receives does not cover everything they do and if all funding was removed, SCDHEC would still fulfill its basic oversight functions; she listed these functions, which she described as "protective." She said the real area where the funding makes a difference is in clean-up and legacy waste (TRU); she said these activities would suffer if the funding was lost.

Karen Patterson, public, commented that if the EPA or SCDHEC could list some activities in jeopardy in the event of a loss of funding, and the CAB could point out the ones they are most concerned with, the recommendation would be stronger.

Suzanne Rhodes, public, commented she supports the recommendation, and spoke about the federal budget deficit. She said the MOX program is huge, but also finds funding. She said SCDHEC also suffers from State budget cut-backs.

CAB Vice Chair Jerry Wadley spoke about item number one in the recommendation, asking if they can quantify the work. He asked if there was a work plan or stated objectives that they could add to the recommendation. Ms. Wilson said the SCDHEC does have a work plan that it submits along with its budget request. She suggested the CAB wait to hear the current status of the funding before changing the recommendation. She said the current situation may be in a "good place" in terms of funding.

CAB member Rose Hayes said she is confused over item number four in the recommendation; she asked if they can't specify monetary amounts or activities, the CAB should give a benchmark. CAB member Parson said the language in item one and four was put together after the help from EPA, DOE, and SCDHEC. She said she understands it is vague, but it is difficult to understand exactly what amount is needed. She asked Mr. Hintze if there was any additional wording that could be added. Mr. Hintze said DOE is in the midst of tight budgets, and during the course of the budgets the programs get reduced and so the scope of work that can be done is smaller. He said, in effect, the regulatory support needed to support that scope will be reduced as well. He said the reason why they don't want to list actual monetary amounts is if the site budget gets reduced overall, and in effect, the work scope, listing a number amount for regulatory budgeting would not do the site any good. He said the regulatory support must be scaled appropriately to the technical work scope planned to be completed at SRS. He said if the scope for the work goes down, the regulatory support will go down as well; the regulatory protective scope will continue. He said DOE understands exactly what the CAB is asking for, and the presentation he plans to give will address CAB concerns.

Discussion over DOE Response to CAB Recommendation #283

CAB member Parson briefly read over Recommendation 283, and DOE's response to it (both documents are attached). She spoke about the response's "Web Improvement Strategy." She said the objective this document discusses is not necessarily what the CAB Recommendation asked about; she said it is not specific to the SRS website for the most part, and that it mostly focuses on cost-savings. She said the public will see improvements through the initiatives outlined in the "Web Improvement Strategy," but it does not address CAB Recommendation # 283.

Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee Overview-Rose Hayes, Chair

CAB Chair Bridges welcomed National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Manager, Doug Dearolph, who would be providing an overview of NNSA.

CAB member Hayes welcomed the new CAB members, and listed the NM Committee members. She provided a brief overview of what the committee addresses, and spoke about NM recommendations being discussed in 2012. She said the committee was currently talking about a new recommendation it wanted to put forward, focused on Yucca Mountain. She spoke about "transmutation," stating certain new technologies are looking into the prospect of reactors that will produce energy without leaving waste. She said transmutation addresses the production of energy and the disposition of waste.

She continued that the NM Committee has had three recommendations listed as "open" since September 2011; this includes Recommendations 280, 281, and 282. She briefly reviewed what these three recommendations address.

CAB member Hayes then encouraged CAB members to sign-up to be on the NM Committee.

Tom Clements, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (ANA), commented that he is curious if the CAB has heard anything concerning consolidated interim storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) at SRS. CAB member Hayes said that to her knowledge, no one on the NM Committee has heard anything about that. Mr. Clements encouraged her to ask questions about the topic.

PRESENTATION: National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) SRS Overview- Doug Dearolph, NNSA Manager

Mr. Dearolph introduced himself, and thanked CAB Chair Bridges for inviting him to present at the CAB meeting, and CAB member Hayes for explaining what NNSA does at SRS. He continued by stating what his presentation would cover, including how NNSA relates to EM activities at SRS. He explained that NNSA was separately organized in 2000 by an act of Congress.

He overviewed NNSA's "Mission Areas," which include Defense Programs, Naval Reactors, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Emergency Operations. He then reviewed a graph showing the "Nuclear Security Enterprise," which is distributed across the Nation. He reviewed the Defense Program Mission, which is to "provide the nation a safe, secure, and effective nuclear weapons stockpile without underground testing." He spoke about the Nuclear Nonproliferation Program Mission, which is to "reduce the global nuclear threat by detecting, securing, safeguarding, disposing and controlling nuclear and radiological material worldwide, as well as promoting the responsible application of nuclear technology and science." Mr. Dearolph then showed a graph of Emergency Operations, with the Emergency Response Team and Nuclear Incident Team at the center of operations. He said they arrange Emergency Operations into two groupings: Crisis Response and Consequence Management.

He continued by reviewing the NNSA SRS facilities, including the Tritium Complex and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Mixed Oxide (MOX) and Waste Solidification Building (WSB) Projects. He stated the Tritium Complex is under Defense Programs, and is a 25 acre compound. He said the Tritium Complex has four mission sects, including Tritium Supply, Nuclear Stockpile Maintenance, Nuclear Stockpile Evaluation, and Helium-3 Recovery. He said the Nuclear Nonproliferation MOX and WSB Projects convert weapons-grade plutonium (Pu) to mixed oxide fuel so it can be used in commercial nuclear reactors. He continued to provide an overview of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Program, highlighting projects such as Pit Disassembly and Conversion (PDC), the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility (MFFF), and the WSB.

Mr. Dearolph gave the PDC status, stating DOE's preferred alternative for pit disassembly and conversion of surplus Pu metal to feed the MFFF, is to use some combination of other facilities at SRS, rather than to construct a new stand-alone facility. He then gave the MFFF status, stating they began construction in August 2007. He said 60 percent of the total project has been done, 50 percent of the facility construction has been completed, 76 percent of the process building structure has been completed, 11 of 16 facilities are finished, and three additional support buildings are in construction or planning phases. He said 2,609 people are currently employed on the project, and the scheduled date of completion is October 2016, and.

He then gave the WSB status, stating it began construction in December 2008 and is 76 percent completed. He said 67 percent of the facility construction has been done, and the process building concrete is completed. He continued that the installation of piping, ductwork, cable tray, and long lead equipment is in progress, and the overall project is scheduled for completion in 2012. He said there are currently 170 people employed with the project.

Mr. Dearolph concluded his presentation by showing a graph of the SRS Federal Organization, with organizational information included about DOE-SR and NNSA.

CAB Vice Chair Wadley said the Enterprise SRS is starting to decommission reactors. He asked how many are being decommissioned. Mr. Hintze, DOE-SR, said there are six. CAB Vice Chair Wadley asked who is responsible for the decommissioning of these reactors. Mr. Hintze said all six reactors are the responsibility of the Office of Environmental Management. CAB Vice Chair Wadley asked if SNF will be coming to SRS from those six reactors. Mr. Hintze said it would not come to SRS.

CAB Chair Bridges commented that the WSB does not contribute to the site waste activity. Mr. Dearolph said that comment is correct.

CAB member Parson spoke about complaints against the MOX Facility. She asked what was the issue with MOX and why it is contested by some. Mr. Dearolph said there are various opinions on how best to secure Pu materials, but essentially there are many ways to meet nonproliferation goals, but the nation feels that the MOX Facility is the correct method.

Administrative & Outreach (A&O) Committee Overview-Kathe Golden, CAB

CAB member Golden encouraged CAB members to join the Administrative and Outreach Committee, and listed members who were previously on the committee. She gave an overview of the A&O Committee responsibilities. She stated the CAB has a new Facebook page; its address is facebook.com/SavannahRiverSiteCAB.

She continued by reviewing other activities the A&O Committee was working on, including the Speakers Bureau, creating an outreach CD, and membership activities. She reminded all CAB members to join at least one issues-based committee. She said there were CAB membership packets on the back table; she encouraged all CAB members to take packets to interested friends. She encouraged everyone to attend the online committee meetings, and said the CAB's website is cab.srs.gov.

Strategic & Legacy Management (S&LM) Committee Overview-Harold Simon, CAB

CAB member Simon listed the previous S&LM members, and encouraged CAB members to join the S&LM Committee. He reviewed the S&LM Committee mission, and spoke about the draft recommendation the S&LM Committee co-wrote with the FD&SR Committee. He listed specific areas of interest for the S&LM Committee, and reviewed the last S&LM Committee meeting, noting which committee members were in attendance. He thanked Rich Olsen for his presentation, professionalism, and patience. He announced that the next S&LM Committee meeting would be held on May 1, 2012, at the DOE Meeting Center in Aiken. He said all of the S&LM Recommendations were closed, and then briefly reviewed the 2012 S&LM Work Plan.

He continued by stating two recommendations came before the S&LM Committee at its last committee meeting; one is being co-sponsored with the FD&SR Committee and the other was tabled. He encouraged those who could not attend in person to attend online. He called upon Doug Hintze to give his presentation.

PRESENTATION: Environmental Management Program Funding-Doug Hintze, DOE-SR

Mr. Hintze stated the purpose of his presentation was to provide an update on the FY2013 Congressional Budget Request in February 2012. He said the fiscal year goes from October 1 to September 30; the government works on a fiscal year schedule rather than a calendar year schedule. He said for most of the year they are in three budget years at the same time: execution year, budget year, and planning year; currently, they are in the execution year of FY12. He said the president submitted the budget request in February for FY13, and in February, DOE started asking for input from the CAB for FY14. He referred to a chart concerning the EM budget at SRS.

Environmental Management Budget Savannah River Site

EM BUDGET ($M)	FY 2011 Plan	FY 2012 CBR	FY 2012 CBR w/ Adj	FY 2012 Appropriations	FY 2013 CBR
SR Site Risk Management				343	
PBS 11C Nuclear Materials.	261	235	235		274
PBS 12 Used Nuclear Fuel	28	40	40		44
PBS 13 Solid Waste	0	30	51		67
PBS 30 Soil & Water Remediation	0	38	50		59
PBS 14C Radioactive Liquid Tank Waste	605	678	645	638	698
PBS 14C Salt Waste Processing Facility	261	203	203	203	23
Environmental Cleanup	1,155	1,224	1,224	1,184	
PBS 100 Community & Regulatory Support	17	10	21	10	17
PBS 20 Safeguards & Security	128	130	119	130	122
SRS EM Programs Budget Authority	1,300	1,364	1,364	1,324	
Federal Program Direction	50	52	52	50	50
Total SRS EM Budget Authority	1,350	1,416	1,416	1,370	
ARRA Appropriation (2009-2012) $ 1,615M					

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY enterprise-srs

Waste Management (WM) Committee Overview-Ed Burke, Chair

CAB member Burke encouraged all CAB members to sign-up for the WM Committee. He briefly reviewed what the WM Committee addresses, and stated the principle goals of the committee. He went over the WM Committee recommendation status, reviewing # 278, and recommended closing it. He asked if any CAB members had thoughts or comments on this recommendation; CAB Chair Bridges recommended CAB member Burke close the recommendation, stating DOE was not "kindly dispositioned" to the recommendation. CAB member Hayes made a motion to close Recommendation 278; CAB member Simon seconded the motion. The recommendation was closed.

CAB member Burke reviewed Recommendation 258. He then asked co-DDFO Pat McGuire to review, or give an update, on the types of waste that were set to go inside the TRU-Pack 3 containers. Mr. McGuire stated there are some changes needed for the TRU-Pack 3. He said DOE has one that is complete, and a total of five to six to be in operation soon. He said they are making about six shipments per week to WIPP and they're still "driving towards" completing the legacy TRU by this calendar year. He said the Legacy Mixed is complete. CAB Chair Bridges asked how far along DOE is on the "large materials" that goes into a TRU-Pack 3. Mr. McGuire said they're still actively working on that; he said the less they have to size-reduce, the better and less hazardous it is. He said this is all part of the Legacy TRU they plan to have completed by the calendar year. Dr. Dave Moody, Site Manager, said the TRU-Pack 3 is completely certified and that one production unit has been in use. He said they are shipping about one shipment a week of TRU-Pack 3s leaving the site. He said the production of the five additional units has been delayed due to some slight differences in the drawings that are going through the NRC for changes. He said one unit is operating; meanwhile, he said they have continued to characterize the standard large boxes that slide inside, and have reduced the number from 350 to 200. He said the expectation is that there will be around 200 TRU-Pack 3s to ship out. CAB member Burke asked if he could have a motion to close Recommendation 258; CAB member Simon gave a motion and CAB Chair Bridges seconded the motion. The recommendation was closed.

Public Comments

Sonny Goldston commented that the group he represents is an organization, DOE-wide, of all contractors that do work for DOE. He said they have been planning a Waste Incidental to Processing workshop, so that the lessons-learned can be transferred to other groups. He said this would be held in Phoenix, Arizona, at the 2013 Waste

Management Conference. He said they are very interested in having CAB participation because the CAB has made much of it possible. He introduced Ginger Dickert, SRR, who was the planning person for the conference. Ms. Dickert commented that they would have a workshop that will be on Thursday of the conference, but it will start on Monday with several different themes. She said the entire network of actions that are necessary to dispose of waste or close tanks will be represented. She said they plan to celebrate the closure of two tanks at the conference, led by Dr. Moody. She added that there will be a session on "The Voice of the Stakeholder," and she encouraged CAB members to submit papers for that and to attend the conference.

Tiajuana Cochaneur, USDA Forest Service-SR, announced she would be retiring that week. She thanked everyone for the communication the Forest Service has with the CAB. She said the next time she sees the CAB, she may be an applicant for membership.

Tom Clements, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (ANA), said his group is an umbrella group that has member groups at most of the DOE sites around the country. He said there are about 30 member organizations and they just spent a week lobbying in DC. He said one thing ANA has been lobbying is to "hold the line" on the DOE and EM budget. He said every year they go up and lobby for programs the CAB discusses. He said the budget that has been presented is in pretty good shape, although they have recommended the transfer of some of the funding. He continued that one of the issues he has had a lot of meetings on is MOX. He said the CAB saw a presentation that day about the MFFF, which had the "noble" goal of getting rid of Pu. He said if the CAB looks at the "out-years," the cost of the program has skyrocketed; he said there is a lot of concern over the cost of the program. He left a letter with the CAB with comments from several groups on the Supplemental EIS.

~Meeting Adjourned

SRS CAB Full Board Meeting

Columbia, SC

March 26-27, 2012

Attendance; Tuesday, March 27:

CAB Members

Thomas Barnes
Artisha Bolding
Dr. Donald Bridges
Ed Burke
Louie Chavis
Mary Davis
Robert Doerr
Kathe Golden
Dr. Rose Hayes
Nina Hazen
Stanley Howard
Travis Johnson
Cleveland Latimore
Clinton Nangle
Dr. Marolyn Parson
Dr. William Rhoten
Dr. Paul Shieh
Earl Sheppard
Harold Simon
John Snedeker
George Snyder
James Streeter
Ed Sturcken
Dr. Gerald Wadley
Sarah Watson

Agency Liaisons & Regulators

Mary Bright, SCDHEC
Van Keisler, SCDHEC
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC
Kim Newell, SCDHEC
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Jennifer Hughes, SCDHEC
Greg Mason, SCDHEC
Rob Pope, EPA
Kyle Bryant, EPA
Diedre Lloyd, EPA

Contractors

Dwayne Wilson, SRNS
Paul Sauerborn, SRNS
Jeannette Hyatt, SRNS
Susan Blas, SRNS
Dave Olson, SRR
Nancye Bethurem, SRR
Ginger Dickert, SRR
Steve Thomas, SRR
Stuart MacVean, SRR
Eric Nelson, SRNL
Erica Williams, V3
Ashley Whitaker, V3
James Tanner, V3

Stakeholders

Tom Clements
Jacob Stone
Bobby Golden
Karen Patterson
Sonny Goldston
Dawn Gillas
Tiajuana Cochnauer
Nancy Bobbitt
Jim Hussey
AMN Howard

DOE

Dr. David C. Moody, DOE-SR
Pat McGuire, DOE-SR
Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR
Karen Guevara, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Rich Olsen, DOE-SR
Bill Taylor, DOE-SR

Erica Williams, Facilitator, led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance. She then reminded everyone to sign-in, reviewed the meeting rules of conduct, and introduced Dr. Dave Moody, Savannah River Site (SRS) Manager, to give an update.

Dr. Dave Moody, SRS Manager-Department of Energy-Savannah River (DOE-SR)

Dr. Moody welcomed all of the new CAB members, and said he looked forward to getting to know them better. He thanked the CAB, stating it plays a vital role in getting the word out to the community. He also thanked the DDFOs, the CAB Federal Coordinator, and the SRS CAB Support Team. He addressed the CAB recommendation "Revising the Department of Energy Websites & Using Plain Language to Communicate with the Public More Effectively," which asked for improvements to the SRS and DOE websites. He said his daughter, who has a business degree in marketing and finance, has toured SRS and asked him if he had looked at the website. He said she said they really need to spend some time on the website. He said that Dwayne Wilson, SRNS, has taken on the challenge of addressing the website's issues. He said they are not done yet, but have started the work.

Dr. Moody said the three companies SRS and DOE can "go public with," concerning small modular reactors (SMRs), are Hyperion, Power Generation, and New Scale; a fourth agreement has just been signed and they will go public with that company soon. He said they are working with each of the companies, and to expect many more SMR agreements in the future. He spoke about the Biomass Cogeneration Facility, stating it is up and running, producing steam and power for SRS; he said it produces a third of the power for SRS. He spoke briefly about the green initiative and criteria at SRS. He said there is a new facility in Jackson, SC, that shreds tires for the Biomass Cogeneration Facility, which is what it will use as fuel. He said there are a lot of jobs associated with the project, and he spoke about the truck shipments that bring in woodchips for fuel. He said SRS is no longer burning 161,000 tons of coal, and will formally shut down its last coal-fire plant this summer. He said they look forward to other Biomass Facilities being built on Site. He then spoke about tank closures on Site, highlighting Tanks 18 and 19, and about a federal notice concerning these closures. He said everything is on track and they are moving forward.

Chair's Update-CAB Chair Donald Bridges

CAB Chair Bridges asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the January 2012 CAB Full Board meeting. There was a motion and a second. No changes were made to the minutes, and the minutes were approved as transcribed.

CAB Chair Bridges welcomed the new CAB members, Artisha Bolding, Nina Hazen, Dr. William Rhoten, Earl Sheppard, Edward Sturcken, Robert Doerr, James Streeter, and Dr. Paul Shieh, and gave a "general members update." He said being on the Board is something to be proud of, and is noble. He said that at present, the CAB has 16 new members with one year or less of experience.

He continued by stating that since the last CAB Full Board meeting, there have been four committee meetings. He reminded everyone of the new committee schedule for 2012, which has every committee meeting independently for two hours each meeting; there will be no joint committee meetings in 2012. He spoke about the eight Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSAB), and said there was a SSAB Chairs' conference call on Feb. 23, 2012, where he learned that there will be a 1 percent Environmental Management (EM) budget reduction in FY13, and that EM wants to involve the SSABs on budget priorities in FY14. He said there would be a Chairs' meeting in Paducah, Kentucky, on April 17-19, and that he and Marolyn Parson would attend on behalf of the CAB.

He reviewed the BRC Final report, which was issued in January. He said it would take months for DOE to sort the BRC Final report out, and decide how it would impact the Site. He asked Pat McGuire, DOE-SR, to give the CAB an update on the BRC Final Report when appropriate and feasible. He spoke about the Pu Disposition Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) hearing, stating the CAB provided input; the hearing was held on Feb. 2, in New Mexico. He then spoke about the Environmental Justice (EJ) program, stating CAB member Simon recently attended an EJ meeting. CAB Chair Bridges asked him to give a brief summary of the meeting he attended.

CAB member Simon stated he attended an EJ meeting on Jan. 26, in Augusta, GA. He said there were approximately 60 public members in attendance, and there were four topical break-out sessions. He said he joined the Site Cleanup and Environmental Monitoring session because it was of interest to him. He shared the questions and concerns that came out of the session. He said when the EJ meetings are being conducted, a representative from

Emergency Preparedness, relevant to the area, should be present. He said this is something for the CAB Administrative & Outreach Committee to work on and address. He said the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) provided a community feedback report at the meeting; he said he asked Rob Pope, EPA, for a copy to be provided to the CAB. He spoke about the SRS emergency plan, asking if SRS had one, and if so, asked that the CAB receive an informational presentation on it. He said this would not constitute a change in the work plan as it is just an informational brief; he requested that the briefing be presented at a Full Board meeting. Mr. McGuire said they would be happy to provide a brief on the Emergency Preparedness Plan, and to go out to the community, if necessary.

CAB Chair Bridges said he attended a SRS Community Forum on Jan. 27, 2012, sponsored by Savannah River Site Community Resource Organization (SRSCRO) and Aiken Technical College, in connection with the annual National Nuclear Science Week. He said the forum was a "good and informative session." He then spoke about the American Nuclear Society (ANS) Position Statement on SMRs, which was approved in June of 2011. He briefly addressed the Fukishima Nuclear Power Plant accident, which occurred on March 11, 2011. He said the ANS put together a special committee to provide clear and concise explanation of what happened, with some recommendations. He stated the ANS has issued a report and it is available at http://fukishima.ans.org/. He encouraged CAB members to take a look at it.

CAB Chair Bridges gave his "emphasis for the year," which placed CAB focus on more input from Board members, more public involvement, and more recommendations to DOE. He said the CAB would like to address the concerns of the public, and encouraged meeting attendance.

Mr. Dwayne Wilson, Savannah River Nuclear Solutions (SRNS) President

Mr. Wilson said he appreciated CAB Chair Bridges' comments about the SRS Community Forum. He gave a brief overview of what makes up SRNS, and what the company is responsible for under the management of DOE. He showed a slide of the SRNS management team, listing all members and what they're responsible for. Mr. Wilson said everyone values safety at SRS. He said the Site had just been awarded its 10th Star of Excellence Award from DOE for its voluntary protection program at SRS, and the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) has gone eight years straight as the safest lab in the complex; he said the lab recently celebrated 10 million hours without a loss-time incident. He continued that under Dr. Moody's leadership, SRNS started another safety campaign in 2012. He reviewed what the campaign entailed, stating it includes all of the Site contractors. He spoke about SRNL, stating it is a very recognized lab, listing the awards and recognitions it has received. He reviewed meetings held at SRS concerning the Fukishima disaster, and said the meetings were held in-part for representatives associated with Fukishima to understand what SRNL can do.

He reviewed some activities happening on Site concerning H-Canyon. He said it was on the "idle list," and now has a new life with opportunities in processing about three tons of Pu; he said this will be done under SRNS EM operations. He said they maintain the facilities that store Pu, stating they have expanded the storage capabilities of the facility to store a majority of the nation's surplus Pu on Site. He said SRNS is responsible for maintaining the L-Basin, and that they are storing domestic and foreign research reactor fuel there for future disposition. He then spoke about Recovery Act work, stating they have accomplished the majority of work assigned under the Recovery Act funding. He said out of about 5,200 cubic meters of TRU Waste, they have shipped more than 2,700 cubic meters off site (some units out of this number have been prepared to be moved off Site, but have not been removed yet). He said the remaining Transuranic (TRU) Waste will be shipped off site later in the year and about 200 cubic meters will remain after 2012. He said they also closed two reactors and continue to reduce the footprint associated with the Legacy Operations at SRS. He said they are about 74 percent complete with reducing the operational footprint on the Site; this is about 230 square miles out of the 310 square miles. He showed a map of SRS, highlighting the Lower Three Runs Creek. He said when that area is completed, as well as some areas in the C-Area, they will have reduced the operational footprint at SRS by 85 percent.

Mr. Wilson then spoke about Enterprise SRS, stating it is a "beacon," and addresses the need for safety and success. He referred to the DOE Champion Organizational chart Dr. Moody addressed the day prior. He then spoke about partnerships, stating he comes from the "commercial world" where partnerships are typically different than what goes on within the "government world." He said this all changed when he saw how they were able to partner with

DOE and other Site contractors in order to achieve success with Enterprise SRS. He said the partnership meant the contractors and DOE had to work really close together; he said it was a strong partnership.

CAB Chair Bridges asked, relative to the Fukishima accident, have any opportunities opened up in areas that will allow the Site to expand its vision or develop new technologies. Mr. Wilson said he doesn't think there is anything they can say about it at the moment.

CAB member Hayes said the CAB spoke about SMRs the day prior, and that whenever the Board talks about SMRs, there seems to be a focus on how the SMRs will accommodate the needs in rural areas or lesser developed countries. She said she asked Dr. Moody about the SMR role in replacing old nuclear energy plants, which she sees as a critical role the SMRs can play, but she doesn't see that focused on very often. She asked if she was wrong in thinking the SMRs could replace the old nuclear reactor plants. Mr. Wilson said that question would be better answered by companies with fleets of reactors, such as SCANA, because he is not qualified to say what they should be doing with their fleet.

Dr. Moody, DOE-SR, said that because of the state of development, they really don't know yet if they can produce the large quantities of electricity as cheaply from the SMRs as they currently can from the larger ones. He said the only site he knows of currently that is looking to replace shutdown reactors is the Clench River Site, where Oakridge has partnered with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). He said that site is one of the proposed sites for a SMR cluster. He said they have been looking at coal fire plants as possibly being replaced by SMRs.

Dave Olson, Manager-Savannah River Remediation (SRR)

Mr. Olson welcomed the new CAB members, and spoke about the upcoming closures of Tanks 18 and 19. He said there are 49 more tanks to close. He spoke about safety on site, saying it is paramount to SRR's work. He said they measure themselves in millions of hours from the last time a worker got hurt, and zero is the number of accidents or incidents; he said they are doing very well. He stated they are going to do a safety survey in order to address any concerns. He continued that in terms of productivity, SRR is facing budget challenges and trying to maximize the amount of work it accomplishes in 2012. He reviewed the progress of the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF), stating that last year it made 266 canisters of glass, which was a record for the 16 years the facility has been in production. He said they are on pace to produce 275 this year, which is a new record, and may even challenge 300 by the time they get to the end of September. He reviewed the "salt side" of what SRR does. He said they are making some upgrades to their interim plant, which is the predecessor to the Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF). He said this plant had a great first quarter. He then spoke about the Salt Stone plant, which is the backend of SRR's cycle, stating it is going through a complete overhaul of its production facility line and will start up again in August. He said they are building disposal units to keep up with the pace of salt stone output; the next one of those comes online in the June or July timeframe. Mr. Olson then reviewed the Recovery Act work, stating SRR wrapped up the last of its Recovery Act projects in December. He briefly reviewed what the SRR presentation would cover later in the day, and said a lot of good work and progress is going on. He said they are trying to find a way to finance a Small Column Ion Exchange, which would be another supplement to the salt treatment capability.

Pat McGuire, DOE-SR

Mr. McGuire, co-DDFO for the CAB, began his update by giving a safety topic; he urged everyone to stay hydrated while outdoors. He talked about security at SRS, stating that on April 22-26, SRS would be hosting the 2012 Security Protection Officer Training Competition (SPOTC); he briefly spoke about the competition, including what events it would include. He continued by reviewing the Liquid Waste Program, stating they have already produced and poured 150 canisters this fiscal year and are on the pace to produce 275 canisters, which will beat the previous year's record. He spoke about TRU Waste, saying the day prior he said they were shipping six packages a week, but it is actually four and one is a TRU-Pack 3 container. He said they are working to fabricate the remaining five TRU-Pack 3 containers. He said they continue to make progress in the disposition of TRU Waste.

Mr. McGuire said that in regard to H-Canyon operations, the SRS CAB has been very supportive of H-Canyon and as Mr. Wilson stated, they are continuing to position H-Canyon to begin processing of the Pu for the the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility. He said they expect the preparations to be complete this fiscal year, and then starting in FY13, they will be producing Pu at about 200 kilograms and will be ramping up to about a metric ton per

year to provide to the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility. He said they will be operating that process through 2017, but there are additional capabilities if they can continue to partner with NNSA to provide additional Pu through that facility. He continued to speak about H-Canyon and the L-Area Used Nuclear Fuel (UNF) storage basin, stating they were undergoing preparations to process Sodium Reactor Experimental Fuel. He said this is a small subset of vulnerable UNF that is in the spent fuel storage basin. He said "vulnerable" does not present an imminent safety risk to workers or the public, but as it continues to degrade, it will provide a cleanup challenge if it decayed in the basin and got out of the isolation containers it is currently stored in. He said they are well-versed in vulnerable fuel. He stated they are making preparations to begin transferring that material from the L-Area storage basin to H-Canyon so it can be safely dispositioned in H-Canyon and then disposed of in the High Level Waste (HLW) Tanks. He said they expect to have the preparations complete this summer and hopefully a decision will be made to process that material near the end of this fiscal year or early next fiscal year. He said there is no usable or recoverable Uranium in the material so that is why it will be dispositioned as waste. He said Maxine Maxted, DOE-SR, would give a presentation later in the day on the condition and assessment program that SRNS is implementing.

CAB member Hayes asked for an update on the additional glass waste storage building at DWPF. Mr. McGuire said they will definitely need additional capacity as they produce additional glass logs. He said they are looking at alternatives to building a third stand-alone building, such as modular storage. Mr. Olson said that at the current production rate for DWPF planned for the next three years, they will fill up the second building in late 2016, so they are looking at alternatives to constructing a third building. CAB member Hayes asked if the material that has been vitrified and stored in these buildings grows "old and cold" like the material in L-Basin. Mr. Olson said that Cesium remains the dominant source term and it has a reasonably short half-life. He said the hotter material is going to be generated through DWPF when SWPF comes online. He said it does cool over time relative to radioactivity.

Robert Pope, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Mr. Pope welcomed the new CAB members, and explained what he and EPA do at SRS. He updated the CAB on Appendix E of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA), which is the enforceable and long-term schedule for the work SRS will perform in regard to cleanup. He said it has received conditional approval from EPA and South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC). He said they look at it every year and it changes year by year as the budgets and scopes shift. Mr. Pope said they currently stand as conditionally approved for the next two years. He addressed a question from Mr. Tom Clements, public, the day prior who asked if DOE gets with EPA and SCDHEC to do out-year planning based on budget cycles through 2014 and 2017; Mr. Pope said this is one of the big ways DOE, EPA, and SCDHEC get together to look at the schedules of work to be accomplished for cleanup. He said they look way beyond 2014 and 2017-they look beyond when the work will be done. Mr. Pope said the EPA has been waiting to hear how the waste determination is going, in regard to getting the DOE Secretary to sign it and move forward with tanks 18 and 19; he said they are on the "precipitous" of moving forward with that work. He said the last time EPA had a formal dispute at SRS, in 2007, was over tanks 18 and 19. He said they sat down with the three agencies in the FFA agreement and worked out a way forward. He continued that EPA expects that at the end of the calendar year, the date that was worked out for tanks 18 and 19, will be met by SRS. He said the EPA is happy to see that move forward.

He stated that Mr. Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR, would be giving a presentation that day on the Lower Three Runs and some work that is being done there. He said SRS was able to do some great investigative work due to the Recovery Act funding and there is some Cesium-contaminated sediment to be cleaned up at Lower Three Runs. He said the EPA was happy to see that work being moved ahead in the schedule and it was always something they wanted to be done. He said that is a part of SRS that is most accessible to the public and is the easiest to trespass. He said it dovetails nicely with the EPA's focus on children's health. He then spoke about Franklin Hill, who is the director of Super Fund for Region 4. He said that Mr. Hill would be visiting SRS on March 23 to sit down with Dr. Moody, SRS Manager, and Daphne Neal, SCDHEC. He said they try to get those people together once a year.

Mr. Pope said he got to attend the Biomass Cogeneration Facility Celebration. He said EPA is very glad to see the facility completed and starting work at SRS. He said it will allow them to go into D-Area and complete the cleanup in that area. He said EPA is very happy that DOE is getting out of the coal fired power plant business; he spoke about these plants, including the consequential ash piles, and why they are undesirable.

He then spoke about the Environmental Justice meetings, stating they are designed to be more informal and free-wheeling than CAB Full Board meetings. He said they asked the Georgia Emergency Preparedness Division (GA

EPD) to attend, but it was not able to attend. He spoke about an upcoming EJ meeting in Denmark, SC, stating they asked the Bamburg emergency preparedness personnel to attend. He said Gail Whitney, DOE-SR, has also been attending meetings and is a wealth of information. He added that SCDHEC would be attending the Denmark EJ meeting. He said the next EJ meeting after the Denmark meeting would be in May, in Edgefield, SC. He gave a brief history of the EJ meetings and then asked Kyle Bryant, EPA, to come up and talk about the EJ meetings.

Kyle Brant, EPA, said the next EJ meeting would be on March 29, 6-8 p.m, at Denmark Technical College in Denmark, SC; he reviewed what presentations would be given. He said Kim Newell, SCDHEC, would be in attendance to give a presentation. He said this would be the fifth community meeting; he listed where the other meetings were held. He said this meeting would be the second time with break-out sessions; he reviewed what break-out sessions would be held. He said it is great that the CAB sends representation to the EJ meetings.

CAB member Parson asked if EPA has projected out enough to determine when SRS will be cleaned up enough so that it will be taken off the National Priority List (NPL). Mr. Pope said they do have a final date for the last Record of Decision (ROD) and then from there the EPA would do a "construction complete" and proceed with de-listing SRS from the NPL. He said he did not have that final date on him at the moment, but it does exist and it is far in the future; he stated it as approximately 2036. CAB member Parson asked Mr. Pope, for the benefit of the new members, to explain what the NPL is. Mr. Pope said originally the NPL, as part of the Super Fund Hazardous Waste Cleanup Law for the United States, was the list of approximately 400 facilities out of around 1,000 that were the most dangerous in the nation. He said that more sites have been added since the original 400 were selected; he said SRS was not on the original list of 400 but was added on in the 1989-1991 timeframe. He said the NPL is a list of the worst hazardous waste facilities to be cleaned up in the nation based on risk, possibility of release, and proximity to a community.

CAB Chair Bridges asked what Mr. Hill's scope of work is for the Super Fund Program. Mr. Pope explained that Mr. Hill is a division director, which is a senior executive level position. He said he controls the budget for the cleanup of private facilities under Super Fund for all eight states in Region 4. He continued by stating that Mr. Hill is the authority for cleanups done at Federal facilities that are NPL sites and at sites where a company has agreed to pay for its own cleanup but is doing it under EPA and State authority. He said Mr. Hill controls the budget, authority, and an oversight staff of approximately 300.

CAB member Burke asked Mr. Pope to talk about the distinction between the regulatory responsibilities for the nuclear waste versus the non-nuclear waste. Mr. Pope said SRS is probably one of the more complicated facilities as far as that goes because of the nuclear issues. He said anything that is considered hazardous waste at SRS that was allowed to get out into the environment falls into the category of the FFA or the State Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit. He said as SRS generates new hazardous or mixed waste during its ongoing missions, it's handled through the State RCRA permit. He said the FFA picks up everything that is in the ground water, etc. He explained how and why things are divided between the RCRA and the FFA. He said DOE has its own authority under the Atomic Energy Act to dispose of its low level waste and to deal with, to a certain extent, high level waste. He said the tanks fall under a state waste water permit while they are operational. He said the tanks exit the permit as tanks are grouted, and will move into the FFA to be addressed first as individual tanks and closures, and then finally as the whole tank farm is closed out, it will be addressed by the FFA.

Shelly Wilson,-South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC)

Ms. Wilson welcomed all the new CAB members, and then spoke about the NPL. She said many sites in South Carolina did not make the list but still need to be cleaned and are listed on SCDHEC's website. She said she was excited about progress in relation to the high level waste tanks at SRS. She said SCDHEC's focus is on the treatment of tank waste and then getting those tanks to closure status in order to reduce risk. She said the first two tanks closed in the entire DOE Complex was in 1997 at SRS, and SCDHEC is incredibly excited to see two more tanks coming up for closure. She said SCDHEC approved the closure module for Tanks 18 and 19 on March 7, 2012, and the State regulatory process has been completed. She continued that, on the same day, SCDHEC approved a sampling and analysis plan for the residuals in the entire F-Tank Farm as well as a quality assurance plan. She said although that area had ongoing groundwater monitoring, SCDHEC approved a specific plan for the F-Tank Farm; she said Mr. Van Keisler, SCDEHEC, approved that plan in February.

Ms. Wilson said SCDHEC has a new director, Catherine Templeton; she said she started work on March 15. She then spoke about Earth Day, in April, and said Earth Day activities are listed on the SCDHEC website. She then congratulated SRS on the Biomass Cogeneration Facility; she called it a "huge step forward." She then introduced Mary Bright, SCHDEC, who she said could answer questions about SDCHEC's emergency preparedness plans and its state of readiness to help out in an emergency event. She then introduced Kim Newell, SCDHEC, to give an update.

Ms. Newell welcomed the new CAB members, and said she works in the Aiken office for SCDHEC; she said they cover six counties and listed them. She said she is the Public Information Director for a program SCDHEC has that is federally funded by SRS where SCDHEC samples around SRS and compares those results with the samples collected by the Site. She said each year SCDHEC puts out a data report.

Ms. Wilson then asked Heather Cathcart to come up and give an update on cleanup activities. Ms. Cathcart said that since the last CAB Full Board meeting in January, SCDHEC, in conjunction with the EPA and DOE, attended seven meetings. She then said that SCDHEC is looking into consolidating several units in D-Area into two area Ash Basins, which will involve a more protective cap for the area and will streamline some of the groundwater in the area. Ms. Cathcart also stated that SCDHEC has reviewed 10 documents since the January CAB Full Board meeting.

Public Comments

Tom Clements, ANA, commented that he has been monitoring SRS activities for more than 30 years. He said he is from Savannah, has lived in Waynesboro, and now lives in Columbia, SC. He welcomed the new CAB members and encouraged them to be curious about Site activities and to ask DOE questions; he said he doesn't feel there is enough of that from the CAB. He said that as a member of the public, he is concerned about the cleanup at SRS, and that is where the CAB member focus should be. He said they should be focused on the cleanup activities SCDHEC and EPA are conducting, not the Enterprise SRS or SMRs. He said the waste tanks propose a real risk to South Carolina and Georgia; he said this is the biggest environmental concern in the states. He encouraged CAB members to not get distracted by speculative future programs. He said SRS is not a jobs program. He said there is a cleanup mission at the Site and that is the "king" of the budgeting, and that is where the CAB should be focused. He said he would be available to talk to CAB members anytime in order to stimulate questions and dialogue.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation (FD&SR) Committee Overview-Marolyn Parson, Chair

CAB member Parson encouraged CAB members to sign up for the FD&SR Committee, and reviewed the purpose of the committee. She then introduced Mr. Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR, to give his presentation on the Lower Three Runs (LTR).

PRESENTATION: Lower Three Runs (LTR) Integrator Operable Unit (IOU) Action Update- Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR

Mr. Hennessey first stated the purpose for his presentation, and reviewed the IOU Program. He said IOU is another term for "streams"; there are six at SRS that fall within the IOU Program. He said the streams in the IOU were added to the FFA in 1997, and the IOU includes surface water, sediment, soil, and biota. The six streams in the IOU are LTR, Fourmile Branch, Upper Three Runs (UTR), Steel Creek, Pen Branch, and the Savannah River. He stated the purpose of the IOU Program is to determine and monitor contaminants in SRS streams, assess the health of the stream systems, evaluate human health risk in stream corridors, determine whether early actions are needed, and make final IOU cleanup decisions after operations have ceased and as Operable Unit (OU) cleanup decisions are completed.

He then reviewed the LTR planned Early Action, referring to a photo of SRS. He said the Early Actions DOE, EPA, and SCDHEC have decided to take will address the part of LTR that is below the PAR Pond Dam. He spoke about LTR, stating it receives surface water discharge from PAR Pond. He said PAR Pond received discharges from the P and R Reactors during operations. He then reviewed the characterization of LTR that was conducted through the IOU Program; he said it was initiated and completed through the 2009/2010 Recovery Act Stimulus Program, and results showed a benefit to conducting an Early Action below PAR Pond Dam although the Early Action benchmarks were not exceeded. He showed a photo of a worker using Lanthanum bromide (LaBr) Radiation

Detector to take a direct measurement on the soil. He said that doing this repeatedly created an enormous catalogue of data that has been very helpful.

Mr. Hennessey then reviewed the proposed Early Action Timeline at the LTR. He said the scope of Removal Actions was divided into two areas: LTR Tail Section, which is about 15 miles, and UTR. Within the LTR Tail Section scope, he said the Removal Action included installing signs along the entire stream boundary, fencing in strategic locations, and limited soil removal, with appropriate disposal. CAB member Golden asked how deep the water is. Mr. Hennessey said it varies with the time of year, and that there are places where public roads cross where the creek is about 25 to 30 feet wide, and probably doesn't exceed 6 feet in depth. Within the UTR scope of Removal Actions, Mr. Hennessey explained there was limited soil removal, with appropriate disposal. He listed benefits of the Removal Actions such as a reduction in public exposure, and that it will be the first SRS IOU Final Closure Activity.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if the LTR "pig tail" was part of the original Site acquisition. Mr. Hennessey said he believes it was not part of the original acquisition. CAB Chair Bridges then asked having acquired the additional 15 miles, was that an adequate amount. Mr. Hennessey said the government's property encompasses all of the contamination and provides a bit of a buffer.

CAB member Travis Johnson asked if the private property around LTR is contaminated and if there had been any issues from private owners because their land is so close to SRS. Mr. Hennessey said the private property around LTR is not contaminated, and no problems have occurred.

CAB member Clinton Nangle asked if there was any contamination on the private land to the left of the LTR tail. Mr. Hennessey referred to a photo of SRS to show where the contamination is. CAB member Nangle asked how private owners get onto their property now that DOE is going to post signs and put up fencing. Mr. Hennessey said the fencing and signage will not go across anyone's road or entrance to their land.. He said the fencing will only go across preferred trespassing locations. Susan Blas, SRNS, said the contamination Mr. Hennessey spoke about with CAB member Nangle is from Steel Creek rather than LTR.

CAB member Hayes asked Mr. Hennessey to describe the characteristics of Cesium137 and what the ramifications for the public are at the current levels of contamination. Mr. Hennessey said the levels of Cesium-137 in the LTR tail do not exceed a health-based benchmark for taking Early Action. He said there was no regulatory requirement for DOE to do anything right now. He said in order for a person to be exposed enough to Cesium-137 to have a risk of cancer he or she wouldn't have gotten anyway (1 in 10,000 probability), the exposure assumption used is 90 days per year, 18 hours per day, for 10 years; he called this type of trespasser an "adolescent trespasser." He added that Risk Assessment is done with deliberatively conservative assumptions so to not underestimate. Mr. Rob Pope, EPA, commented that is how they generated the number that EPA will use to clean up the actually excavations that will happen. He said this number is the number they will most likely look at, at the end of the day when the work is done at SRS. He said if they walk away and leave everything behind, they want it to be safe enough that someone like an adolescent trespasser will still be safe. He said this more conservative number will be used in the Final Action for the LTR tail. CAB Chair Bridges commented that the half-life of Cesium is 30 years, so in 30 years it's going to reduce by half. He said time is working on their favor when working on these issues. He then asked which creek in the IOU is the most contaminated. Mr. Hennessey said that in terms of Cesium contamination, which came from reactor operations, LTR is the most contaminated. He continued that Fourmile Branch, which drains the F, H, and E Areas, contains more tritium and other radionuclides that are at the seep line. He added that very robust corrective actions are going on at the F and H Seepage Basins and the Mixed Waste Management Facility.

Mr. Hennessey continued to list benefits of an Early Action such as it will remediate contaminated SRS property adjacent to the public, reduces the opportunity for inadvertent trespassing, it is endorsed by the regulators, accelerates remediation by about nine years, and there is no additional characterization required. He listed considerations such as regulatory documentation is required, and property owners.

He went through the Early Action Strategy, which had three parts: Part 1: Strategic placement of fencing, Part 2: Placement of additional signs along boundary, and Part 3: Limited excavation of contaminated soil. He then spoke about additional signage that will be implemented in the LTR tail section. Mr. Hennessey stated that soil excavation will be focused in three areas. He said they will remove up to one acre of contaminated soil, with minimal impact to vegetation, and they will perform a post excavation sampling. He then reviewed the Path Forward for LTR, stating

they will excavate three acres of contaminated soil, install approximately 6.6 miles of fencing along the LTR tail, install and/or place approximately 1,000 additional signs along the LTR tail, and will provide an early response action which will be incorporated into the final remediation strategy for the LTR IOU. He then reviewed graphs, based on 2009-2010 data, highlighting Cesium-137 activities before and after the early action.

CAB member Bill Rhoten commented that Mr. Hennessey gave acreage estimates in terms of what they will be removing. He asked if that was in square units or does Mr. Hennessey have a cubic estimate of how much soil will be removed. Mr. Hennessey said he cannot convert the measurements to volume, but the Cesium that exceeds the levels that DOE wants, and will remove, is only in the uppermost foot. He said they won't be going any deeper than a foot and the acre will not be a perfectly shaped acre, but will conform to the topography.

CAB member Louie Chavis asked if DOE saw an increase in deaths of animals that are drinking the water with Cesium contamination, or any issues with the surrounding flora. Mr. Hennessey said they haven't seen an adverse effect on the flora or animals.

CAB Chair Bridges asked Mr. Hennessey if he could brief the CAB on the impact of the "catastrophic" failure of PAR Pond in terms of water surge and contamination dispersal. Mr. Hennessey said he cannot comment on it, or speculate.

Karen Guevara, DOE-SR, commented that DOE occasionally conducts "table top drills" where DOE looks at the issue CAB Chair Bridges brought up; she said they can include this scenario in the brief Mr. McGuire, DOE-SR, agreed to give to the CAB on emergency response and preparedness at the Site.

Rob Pope, EPA, said that when they talk about final actions, they are talking about the tail section. He said the LTR IOU includes PAR Ponds, canals from R Reactor, settling ponds. He said they have not looked at those areas for a final action.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation (FD&SR) Committee Overview-Continued

Recommendation Voting

"Reallocation of Funds for Regulatory Support in FY2012 Appropriations and Request for Increase in FY2013"

CAB member Parson turned the discussion over to the Recommendation Manager, CAB member Barnes. CAB member Barnes briefly reviewed the recommendation, and asked if anyone had comments or questions. CAB Chair Bridges asked if there was a motion to open the recommendation for voting; CAB member Simon made a motion and another CAB member gave a second.

The CAB voted on the recommendation; the recommendation was approved unanimously by all present CAB members.

Discussion of DOE Response to Recommendation 283

CAB member Parson said Dr. Moody "made her day" that morning with his comments about the website. She said she is very passionate about this topic. She stated that in 2009, the U.S. Census reported that 73 percent of people had computer access in their household; she remarked the number is probably higher now in 2012. She said that South Carolina and Georgia are below the national average, but people do rely on the internet for information. She explained why they put Recommendation 283 forward, and said she found that many documents referenced on the Environmental Bulletin were available online. She noted that the public access to documents was limited to reading rooms, which is not a bad thing, but is limiting overall. She said she also has a concern that documents are not readable by the public; she said they have come a long way in the past year, but still need to improve. She then addressed the issue with accessing portions of the www.srs.gov website with a MAC computer; she said MAC users cannot see all portions of the website.

She briefly reviewed the DOE Response, stating it does not seem to address all of the specific recommendation items. She said the spirit of the DOE Response is positive, but not specific to Recommendation 283. She said the

CAB can review DOE Responses and determine if the response is satisfactory. She said at the next FD&SR Committee meeting, the committee will discuss the response and decide if it is acceptable or not. She said if it is acceptable, Recommendation 283 will be given a "closed-complete" status. She then said if it is not deemed acceptable, the CAB Chair, with assistance from the CAB Support Team, will go back to DOE through the DDFOs in an attempt to resolve the issues. She asked if anyone had any comments they would like to make.

CAB member Johnson asked which bullet points within the recommendation were not answered satisfactorily. CAB member Parson said the response has not directly responded to each recommendation. She read aloud what she felt was the most relevant portion of the response: "Recognizing the need to revamp SRS external websites to better respond to the growing digital communication demands, the Site is taking prudent steps to modernize the SRS and DOE-SR external website, as well as ensure that releasable information and documents posted are readily accessible, searchable and understood by stakeholders." She said this is currently not taking place. CAB member Johnson said the CAB may just need to tell them that when the user is using a MAC operating system, the website isn't functioning correctly.

Dr. Moody, Site Manager, said that within a few minutes of the website getting modified, he tried to access it from his iPad; he said SRNS is aware of that issue. He said the response came to the CAB the way it did because it is going to be a work-in-progress. He aid DOE will win on a few issues, but others will take a bit longer. He encouraged the CAB to engage DOE anytime. He said they recognize that they aren't there yet, but they are committed to make it better. He said the website will get better, but it will take them a little while to get there.

CAB Chair Bridges asked CAB member Parson if she wanted to consider reviewing the response at her next committee meeting, and perhaps come up with a formal response that asks DOE to cover certain things the response does not address specifically, or did she want to consider what she has done thus far as appropriate and will stand-by for further upgrades. CAB member Parson said she would do that at her next committee meeting.

She then invited everyone to attend the next FD&SR Committee meeting, held April 17, at the DOE Meeting Center in Aiken. She encouraged those who could not attend in person to attend online.

Strategic & Legacy Management (S&LM) Committee Overview-Harold Simon, Chair

CAB member Simon announced the next S&LM Committee meeting, and encouraged everyone to attend the meeting. He briefly reviewed the committee's focus and areas of interest, which are based on the 2012 S&LM Work Plan. He reviewed the last S&LM Committee meeting, stating two recommendations were discussed at this meeting. He said one recommendation was approved during the Full Board meeting, but the other was tabled until it could be better-defined. He said they would address the tabled recommendation at the next S&LM Committee meeting.

PRESENTATION: Environmental Management Cleanup Program Performance Measures Update-Rich Olsen, DOE-SR

Mr. Olsen began his presentation by stating the purpose of his presentation, which was to review the major areas of the Environmental Management (EM) Cleanup Program, provide an update on EM Performance Measures through February, including the following enhancements: inclusion of System Plan Rev. 17 for Liquid Waste, Pathway for Pu Disposition, Used Nuclear Fuel inventory, and SRS work force. He added that this presentation was also being given to fulfill the Strategic & Legacy Management (S&LM) Work Plan requirements.

He reviewed the EM Program Lifecycle Plan, stating the EM Program Lifecycle Plan for the SRS cleanup program started in the 1990s. He said the current Lifecycle Plan estimates EM cleanup completion by 2034 at a cost of approximately $54 Billion. He explained that Performance Measures have "evolved" to track progress towards current Lifecycle "End State" targets. He said related to the Lifecycle Plan, they have identified "metrics," which are a type of report card.

Mr. Olsen identified the four major areas within the SRS cleanup program as: Liquid Waste, Solid Waste, Nuclear Materials, and Soil, Groundwater, & Facilities. He said there are several contractors who have been charged to do

that work. He said that on the Liquid Waste side, SRR is the key contractor; associated with SRR is Parsons. He then explained that the major contractor tasked with the remaining three areas is SRNS.

He continued to review the major areas within the SRS cleanup program, listing sub-categories under the four major areas. He listed the three major areas under Liquid Waste as insoluble sludge, salt waste, and tank closures. He listed the two major areas under Solid Waste as transuranic (TRU) waste and mixed & low level waste. He listed the three major areas under Nuclear Materials as highly enriched uranium (HEU), plutonium (Pu), and Used Nuclear Fuel (UNF). He listed the two major areas under Soil, Groundwater, & Facilities as waste site remediation and facilities deactivation & decommission.

Mr. Olsen then reviewed how the work is going, and where they are currently. He reviewed the percentage complete under all four major areas of SRS cleanup, including the sub-categories. He said they are 45 percent complete with insoluble sludge, 5 percent complete with salt waste, 8 percent complete with tank closures, 76 percent with TRU waste, 100 percent complete with mixed level waste, 21 percent complete with low level waste, 100 percent complete with HEU, 2 percent complete with Pu, 0 percent complete with UNF, 77 percent complete with waste site remediation, and 26 percent complete with facilities deactivation and decommission. He said all the activities are interrelated.

CAB member Parson asked how they come up with the percentage amounts, specifically in the Soil, Groundwater, & Facilities category. Mr. Olsen used waste site remediation as an example. He said it doesn't get declared as 100 percent remediated until the entire site is complete; he said there are 515 of those sites. He continued that when they finish one site, and they've handled both the soil and groundwater and can now declare the site as "remediated," it gets counted as part of the completion.

Ms. Wilson, SCDHEC, commented that she believed on the waste site remediation, the 77 unit percentage completed is calculated from everything that is "logged in" under the FFA and that whenever there is a decision on how that unit should be cleaned up, that would count towards the percentage. She said the decision may be that the groundwater will be remediated for the next 30 years, but as long as there is a decision, it will count towards the completed percentage.

Mr. Olsen then began reviewing several charts, the first titled "Progress Toward EM Site Cleanup-through Feb. FY2012." He said it is like an overall report card, and gives a four-year history of site cleanup. This chart named the major categories of EM Site Cleanup, and listed the percentage completed in FY 09, FY 10, FY 11, and FY 12. It also listed the End State quantity, unit of measure, and FY year completed.

Mr. Olsen reviewed the Liquid Waste Performance Measures graphs, highlighting Produce Canisters, Close Old Style Tanks-Single Wall, Salt Solution Processed, and Close Newer Style Tanks-Double Wall. Each metric listed the End State quantity, and the actuals versus the targets. He noted that these metrics listed targets that were based on Liquid Waste System Plan Rev. 17.

CAB member Nina Hazen asked for the age difference between Legacy Waste and Newly Generated Waste. Mr. Olsen said Legacy Waste is primarily waste that was created prior to 1990, and Newly Generated Waste is waste created as a result to operations on Site after 1990.

He reviewed Solid Waste Performance Measures graphs, highlighting TRU disposed: Legacy, TRU disposed: Newly Generated, MLL & LLW disposed: Legacy, and MLL& LLW disposed: Newly Generated. Each metric had an End State quantity listed, and the actuals versus the targets. He noted that the metrics excluded LLW associated with Facility D&D.

Mr. Olsen went over the Performance Measures for Nuclear Materials, stating that a new measure was added for UNF Inventory. He said Pu disposition paths have been determined, and the total scope includes 5,600 containers

(3013 type) of Pu. He then noted that dissolve for vitrification processing at SRS is 100 percent completed, package for shipment to WIPP is 3,000 and disposition to MOX at SRS is 2,500.

Mr. McGuire, DOE-SR, noted that in regards to the shipment going to WIPP, DOE has a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for 500 containers, and a decision on disposition of the remaining 2,500 containers will be made following the completion of the Surplus Pu Disposition Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS).

CAB member Burke commented that he thought there was an issue with sending Pu to WIPP. Mr. McGuire said they are packaging the Pu that does not currently meet the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication fuel specifications, blending it, and shipping it as TRU waste to WIPP. He said once that container enters WIPP, the salt mine doesn't know where the container came from. He said there are no prohibitions with shipping the Pu to WIPP. Dr. Moody, Site Manager, commented that there is no Pu limit on WIPP; it is a Pu repository. He said the purpose of WIPP is to isolate the long-lived actinides like Pu for the hundreds of thousands of years needed for those materials to decay.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if that includes the Pu that is scheduled to come to SRS. Mr. McGuire said it does include that Pu. He stated the CAB may have heard them talk about metric tons of Pu or containers-this is a means to convey as much information on what DOE plans to receive, or has on-site, without getting into security issues. He commented that Mr. Dearolph from NNSA provided some disposition options in his presentation that was given the day prior.

Mr. Olsen then reviewed the Performance Measures graphs for Nuclear Materials, highlighting HEU disposition: Blend down & ship, UNF: L-Basin inventory, Pu Disposition: Dissolved for processing, and Pu Disposition: Package for shipment to WIPP. He listed all End State quantities and targets versus actuals.

He reviewed Area Completion Performance Measures graphs over waste sites remediated and facilities deactivated & decommissioned. He listed the End State quantities for each graph, as well as the actuals versus the targets. Mr. Olsen then showed a graph of the SRS Work Force.

He summarized his presentation by stating that DOE-SR will continue to update and validate the Lifecycle measures for the key operational areas of EM cleanup operations, and that suggestions from CAB members are welcomed.

Public Comments

Karen Patterson, public, commented that Mr. Rich Olsen's presentation was very good. She said she knows the CAB and DOE worked on it for a while in order to get it right, and it is really good. She said she needed a refresher on terminology. She asked Mr. McGuire to add "Liquid Waste," "Solid Waste," "Liquid Solid Waste," "Mixed Low Level Waste," and "High Level Waste" to the terminology list.

Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee Overview-Rose Hayes, CAB

CAB member Hayes reviewed what the NM Committee addresses, and said the Committee has three open recommendations: 280, 281, and 282. She spoke briefly about the presentation Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR, would be giving later that day. She then reviewed topics of interest for the NM Committee, including Pu storage and risk, strategic initiatives, UNF, SMRs, and the Blue Ribbon Commission's Final Report. She encouraged everyone to review the BRC Report. She then spoke briefly about transmutation, saying technology is now looking at it as a way to burn and not have much waste left over. She said the 2012 NM Work Plan will cover that topic, among others. CAB member Hayes said not much progress has been made concerning Pu disposition and UNF disposition; she encouraged new CAB members, especially new NM Committee members, to ask questions about these topics and to request reading material. She announced when and where the next NM Committee Meeting will take place.

She welcomed all the new CAB members, and said anyone who signs-up for the NM Committee will find it to be interesting and "eye-opening."

PRESENTATION: L-Basin Augmented Monitoring and Condition Assessment Program- Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR

Ms. Maxted first stated the purpose of her presentation, which was to fulfill the NM Committee work plan requirement, and to give the CAB an understanding of what DOE does in L-Basin. She reviewed the L-Basin mission, which is to receive and store aluminum-based UNF from Foreign and Domestic Research Reactors, as well as support the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Global Threat Reduction Initiative for removal of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) from research reactors worldwide. She said the mission also supports ongoing domestic research reactor programs, says the L-Basin will store legacy special nuclear materials, and will maintain capability to package and ship fuel for disposition.

She spoke about the L-Basin Facility, stating it is the former L-Reactor Facility, converted for offsite fuel receipts. She said it has wet storage in a 3.4 million gallon basin, but limited dry storage. She said they are working on an initiative concerning dry storage. She continued that the facility has the capability to handle a wide variety of fuel sizes, shapes, enrichments, and conditions. She showed a chart of its current inventory, listing fuel type and assemblies. She said the current inventory is about 15,000 assemblies. She showed an example of a model fuel assembly.

Ms. Maxted reviewed the L-Basin Storage configurations, first reviewing the Expanded Basin Storage (EBS) Racks. She said the EBS Racks fixed geometry for criticality control, as four to five Material Test Reactor (MTR) Assemblies per tube (bundle). She said there is one tube per storage rack position, and 3,650 positions are currently installed, with 3,174 positions currently filled. She said the racks are seismically qualified and no active cooling is required, which differentiates from Fukishima. She said most of the fuel in L-Basin is old and cooled down, and they just have to maintain the water quality.

She then spoke about storage capacity, stating that, and maintaining their receipt capability, is their biggest concern. CAB member Hayes asked Ms. Maxted to inform the CAB on how many feet of water are in the L-Basin and how deep it is. Ms. Maxted said the water ranges from 17 feet to 30 feet. She said when the operators are maneuvering they can do it by hand or can use a manual pulley system. She said all of the tools have locking mechanisms so there is no way they can fail open and fall to the bottom of the Basin. She said the transfer bay is its deepest at 30 feet, but has a shelf at 17 feet.

CAB member Golden said there are people who argue that the glow in the L-Basin water is from radioactivity and not lights. Ms. Maxted says she has heard those rumors, but has not seen it. She said they do have lights in the basin and it gives the water a blue effect.

Ms. Maxted reviewed key variables concerning storage capacity, stating they look at what they will be receiving and when, the H-Canyon processing decision, and a funding profile. She listed current activities such as adding additional EBS Racks, stating they have room for 15 additional racks and the design and procurement has been initiated. She continued listing activities, stating they were looking to add additional High Flux Isotope Reactor (HFIR) Racks; new higher-capacity HFIR-C Rack design will replace the existing racks and the design review and project planning activities are ongoing. She spoke about processing fuels in H-Canyon, explaining there were preparations in progress for processing Sodium Reactor Experimental (SRE) Fuel, and they are supporting studies and opportunity evaluations, including storage alternatives. She then reviewed a graph titled, "EBS Positions Filed by Base FRR/DRR plus Receipt Scenarios."

She spoke about ensuring safe storage, commenting that SRNL completed a study on fuel and basin life extension in April 2011. She said this study concludes that fuel can be safely stored for an additional 50 years contingent upon the continuation of management activities and the implementation of several augmented program activities. She listed the three program plans as 1.) Conduct a periodic examination of bundled fuel, 2.) Perform an assessment of fuel in isolation containers, and 3.) Conduct a basin concrete assessment. She listed the existing programs to be continued as basin water chemistry, corrosion evaluation, structural integrity, aging facility management assessments, and infrastructure maintenance.

She reviewed potentially vulnerable fuels, listing subsets of stored fuels that are vulnerable to oxidation as declad/damaged, and intentionally cut. She said they have 500 sealed and vented cans stored in 20 oversize cans and 200 bundles. She said they have stainless steel and zirconium clad items. She continued by stating they have experience in handling and repackaging degraded fuels and failed containers. She said challenges include: structural integrity of fuel and container, risk of basin contamination and cleanup, and an undefined disposition path.

CAB member Hayes asked if the arrangement to exchange the zirconium and aluminum clad items went through, how much rack space would be freed up in the L-Basin. Ms. Maxted she didn't know the answer to that offhand, but she would email the answer to CAB member Hayes. CAB member Hayes then asked if they don't have to cool the material with the water in the pool, why are the containers open on the bottom and top. Ms. Maxted said it's to allow the water to go through because if they're open, and they get a leak of Cesium that is above the level where Cesium is, they can identify it.

Ms. Maxted addressed the issue of basin "cobwebs," stating the First Line Manager identified them during an inspection round. She said the facility attempted sampling, but the webs broke apart. She stated that SRNL is assisting in the sampling and analysis of these "cobwebs," and they are currently believed to be a form of bacteria. She said samples have been taken to SRNL and are under review. She showed photos of these "cobwebs" in different forms and/or stages.

CAB member Hayes asked if there was any indication that the "cobwebs" have affected the containers. Ms. Maxted there is no indication of that, and testing has not identified any specifics. She said level three growth or higher covers 7 percent of the basin, but 40 percent is covered by these "cobwebs" at a different growth level.

Ms. Maxted summarized her presentation by stating they will safely receive and store SNF to reduce the global threat, the Foreign Fuel Receipt Mission will continue through 2019, the Domestic Fuel Receipts will continue indefinitely, and additional racks and/or fuel disposition is required to support anticipated receipts. She continued that there would be an implementation of augmented monitoring and condition assessments for extended basin storage, and they are positioning the facility and resources to support the DOE programmatic direction.

CAB member Parson asked if L-Basin is considered a state-of-the-art facility, and what would they want to be different or the same if building a separate state-of-the-art facility. Ms. Maxted said the L-Basin is not a state-of-the-art facility, as it is 50 years old, and that they would still have a pool basin, but the mechanisms that move the fuel around would probably be more electronic rather than human-maneuvered. She said they just got a new crane, and then reviewed upgrades/changes they are considering to improve the facility.

CAB member Burke asked that once they discover the nature of the "cobwebs," what kind of treatment plans could be used in the Basin as the water chemistry is very sensitive. Ms. Maxted said they have heard of some methods that have been used in reactors; she explained this process briefly.

CAB member Hayes asked Ms. Maxted to talk about the cost for re-racking the Basin. She asked if the decision to re-rack is based on budget issues, or if there are other reasons for doing so. Ms. Maxted said the cost for re-racking is around $5 to $8 million for the EBS Racks, and more than $10 million for the HFIR Racks. She said in terms of what decisions go into the re-racking, she said they look at if they are going to process, when they are going to process, and if they have the storage space. She said they are lucky that they have the storage space and have the room to re-rack.

Waste Management (WM) Committee Overview-Ed Burke, Chair

CAB member Burke encouraged CAB members to sign-up for the WM Committee. He reviewed the WM Charter, and listed its principle goals. He briefly went over the 2012 WM Work Plan topics. He said the WM Committee has asked for the history, legislative requirements, and federal government commitments for bringing waste onsite and getting it offsite; he said they are hoping for a presentation over this topic. He said in December South Carolina was looking for comments on what should happen with Tanks 18 and 19. He said the WM Committee put together a letter asking for South Carolina to go forward with closure. He said South Carolina has taken that position.

PRESENTATION: Cost Savings Initiatives (CSI) Process and System Plan Revision 17 Results-Pete Hill, SRR

Mr. Hill stated the purpose of his presentation, and what he would be addressing. He reviewed a schematic diagram of the Liquid Waste System, stating there are two Tank Farms at SRS. He listed regulatory drivers such as the FFA, which requires the 22 remaining old-style tanks to be operationally closed by the end of FY2022, and the Site Treatment Plan (STP), which requires "removal of the backlogged and currently generated waste inventory by 2028."

He reviewed graphs of the Projected Life Cycle and the SRR Funding Profile. He stated that all Liquid Waste activities are placed on an Integrated Priority List (IPL), and in the past, the funding line would be moved up or down the list to match the funding allocation; everything below the line was cut. He said this would impact the waste removal to provide feed to the DWPF, tank closures, and preparations for SWPF startup. He added that a new approach was needed that could be executed with "high confidence," and without reliance on new technologies or regulatory relief.

He went over the reinvention process, stating they had a 4 step plan. The first step: 1.) Scope and price the Just in Time (JIT) compliant case; this step calls to eliminate everything that is not needed to support regulatory commitments, employee developments, and safety, and they schedule what remains on a JIT basis. The second step: 2.) Add new scope and pricing that's not in the current contract. The third step: 3.) Compare JIT Compliant Cases cost to expected funding. The fourth step: 4.) Priority Add Backs (PABs). He said the JIT Compliant Case, plus the PABs is the recommended case. He added that new technologies will be pursued, but treated as opportunities.

Mr. Hill said they defined Just in Time (JIT) Compliance with the following criteria: 1.) Surveillance and maintenance, 2.) Immobilize sludge to meet the STP & FFA JIT, 3.) Immobilize salt to meet the STP& FFA JTI, 4.) Close tanks to meet the FFA JIT, and 4.) Receive waste from other site missions. He said they defined PABs list as: mega Salt Disposal Units (SDU) and Control Room Consolidation (which are investment items), mature Tank 48 alternative treatment technology, accelerate closure of old style sludge tanks, deploy Small Column Ion Exchange to reduce the SWPF risk, accelerate DWPF to finish by Dec. 2026, additional acceleration of tank closures as increased salt processing allows, start Tank 48 chemical destruction field modifications, and Life Cycle acceleration per LWSP rev. 16.

He reviewed Mega SDUs, stating that right now when they build an SDU, it consists of two cylindrical cells that hold around 3 million gallons of grout. He said they are investigating a single, much larger tank that can hold around 30 million gallons. He said it is projected that in the next few years they can save around $100 million in SDU construction costs and half a billion dollars over the Liquid Waste Life Cycle. He said the only downside is that it cost an additional $10 million in FY12 to get the single tank started.

He stated that in the Tank Farms, they have several 1950s era control rooms that are spread out. He said these control rooms are old and difficult to maintain. He stated that by spending around $7 million this year, they were able to take four of the older control rooms, and computerize and consolidate them into one control room; this saved $21 million for FY12-17 and $54 million within the Life Cycle. Mr. Hill then reviewed a graph of the Projected Life Cycle Savings at Expected Funding.

He stated the recommended strategy supports FFA compliance, STP compliance, preserves a major portion of the Life Cycle Cost savings, and maintains the option for further Life Cycle acceleration with additional investment. He noted that the recommended strategy identified the inputs and assumptions for Rev. 17 of the system Plan. He said the System Plan Rev. 17 has been approved by DOE and SRR.

Mr. Hill reviewed the targeted results for the System Plan. He said the System Plan Rev. 17 assumptions are aligned with the Federal Facility Agreements for waste removal and tank closure commitments and the STP commitment for completion of waste processing. He listed the System Plan targeted results as process salt waste, reduce lifecycle cost and schedule for sludge processing, close tanks, and support H-Canyon nuclear materials disposition operations. He stated changes are driven by advances in technology, change in sequencing, acceleration opportunities, cost savings opportunities, and funding adjustments. He listed System Plan Rev. 17 inputs and assumptions concerning areas such as the Actinide Removal Process (ARP) and the Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit (MCU), Small Column Ion Exchange, and SWPF. He said the Saltstone Processing Facility supports ARP/MCU operations and is increased with SWPF startup. He continued that DWPF will implement productivity enhancements during the SWPF tie-in outage, and DWPF melter replacement will occur during the SWPF tie-in outage and after that will be

replaced every six years. He reviewed a results chart concerning key milestones, System Plan Rev. 16 and 17, and the FFA/STP commitments. He then reviewed a Closure Summary graph.

He summarized his presentation by stating the System Plan documents current operating strategy of the SRS Liquid System Waste System, the System Plan Rev. 17 assumptions are aligned to meet FFA requirements, and System Plan Rev. 17 forecasts compliance with FFA and STP commitments.

CAB member Stan Howard asked Mr. Hill to talk a little more about SDUs. Mr. Hill said they are still finalizing the design so the exact dimensions are not final. He said he investigated commercial water tanks that hold around 32 million gallons; they used this existing tank and applied it to their need.

CAB Chair Bridges asked why they started out with smaller tanks. Mr. Hill said the original vaults one and two were rectangular. He said when they started processing into vault four, the idea came up to use commercially available circular water tanks.

CAB member Hayes asked if the mega tanks were double-walled. Mr. Hill said he didn't believe so, but described to her how the tanks are constructed.

CAB Chair Bridges asked what was the major vulnerability with System Plan Rev. 17. Mr. Hill said DWPF has already demonstrated its capability to produce at 275 cans per year, and ARP/MCU has demonstrated the necessary technology, so the technological risk with SWPF startup lies with "scale up issues". He said when one looks at the entire system, the one thing not operating today is SWPF but he said they have demonstrated that it will produce.

Administrative and Outreach (A&O) Committee Overview-Kathe Golden, Chair

CAB member Golden thanked everyone for attending and welcomed the new CAB members. She encouraged the CAB members to sign-up for the A&O Committee. She spoke about the Board Beat newsletter, encouraging CAB members to contribute to the newsletter. She reminded everyone that all CAB members needed to sign-up for at least one issues-based committee. She announced that the CAB has a website and a Facebook page. The web address is http://cab.srs.gov and the Facebook page is facebook.com/SavannahRiverSiteCAB.

She spoke about membership, showing the CAB the membership packets the CAB Support Team created. She reminded everyone to support the CAB online meetings.

Ms. Flemming announced that Ms. Becky Craft, DOE-SR and OEA Director, was retiring, and that Mr. Bill Taylor, DOE-SR, would be working in her stead at CAB meetings.

CAB Budget Input-CAB Chair Bridges

CAB Chair Bridges said DOE asked the CAB to provide input on its 2014 Budget. He said the right approach to take would be to go with the priorities the CAB approved with its Position Statement, passed in January 2012. He asked Erica Williams, Facilitator, to read the Position Statement aloud. CAB Chair Bridges said he was proposing the CAB offer up the Position Statement as its priorities.

CAB member John Snedeker said the CAB has been asking DOE to provide adequate funding to programs, but he feels like that is "preaching to the choir" since DOE doesn't have the full authority to provide the funds as it is up to Congress. He said he feels the CAB should receive a briefing on how the appropriations process works in regard to the functions of the DOE and SRS, and how it can be influenced by citizens rather than politicians. CAB Chair Bridges said the CAB gets that briefing about once a year and is about due for another. Mr. McGuire agreed to make that a future agenda item.

Public Comments

Dawn Gillas, public, said she was a recent retiree of DOE-SR. She said she was the old Spent Fuel Program Manager for Nuclear Materials. She said she has a lot of experience in used and spent fuel management. She said the receipt, storage and handling of fuel at SRS is done safely; she said the biggest part to focus on is disposition. She stated they have the capabilities. She urged the CAB to continually question the long-term monitoring and the

program Ms. Maxted presented on. She listed activities the CAB should focus on, and she told them to pay extra attention to emerging definitions and prioritizations. She then spoke briefly about the BRC Final Report, urging CAB members to read it and come up with their own interpretations.

~Meeting adjourned

Please see relevant attachments:

Recommendation # 285: "Reallocation of Funds for Regulatory Support in FY 2012 Appropriations and Request for Increase in FY 2013"

DOE Response to Recommendation # 283, "Revising the Department of Energy Websites & Using Plain Language to Communicate with the Public More Effectively"

Letter provided by Tom Clements, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (ANA)

Savannah River Site

Citizens Advisory Board

Recommendation # 285

Reallocation of Funds for Regulatory Support in FY 2012 Appropriations &
Request for Increase in FY 2013

Background—In the FY 2011appropriations, the Department of Energy's allocation for Community and Regulatory Support was $18 M. Out of these funds, positions are paid for US Environmental Protection Agency and South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control staff, whose key responsibilities include being oversight regulators as established by the Federal Facility Agreement. With the decrease of $8 M in the FY 2012 appropriations for Community and Regulatory Support, some of these key positions may be in jeopardy, which is a grave concern to the Citizens Advisory Board.

The Federal Facility Agreement guides the cleanup of the Savannah River Site and appears to be working well, due to the cooperative spirit of the Department of Energy (DOE), US Environmental Protection Agency, and the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control as well as adequate staff funding. The public understands the complexity of the cleanup process and takes confidence in the oversight provided by regulators who are onsite on a regular basis and ensure that environmental stewardship is on track.

If funding for Regulatory Support is not restored this FY as well as in future years, the Citizens Advisory Board is concerned that the important oversight role of the regulators will be jeopardized, and cleanup could be stalled or priorities misplaced. In addition, public confidence in the cleanup process to restore and protect the environment and the surrounding communities will erode.

Recommendation: The Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board recommends that DOE:

1) Take steps to restore funding in FY 2012 for regulatory support appropriate to the scope of work needed to meet FY 2012 clean up goals.
2) Provide information at the May 2012 Citizens Advisory Board Meeting that describes what steps are being taken to restore the budget for regulatory support.
3) Supply, if funding is not restored:
    a. Details on how the reduced budget would impact the ability of the regulators to be onsite on a regular basis and to maintain the current level of cleanup oversight, and
    b. Information on strategies that will be initiated to assure that oversight from the regulators is not weakened.
4) Make a commitment that the FY 2013 budget will be prepared to restore funding for regulatory support appropriate to the scope of work needed to meet FY 2013 clean up goals.

Department of Energy
Savannah River Operations Office
P.O. Box A
Aiken, South Carolina 29802

JAN 18 2012

Dr. Donald N. Bridges, Chairperson
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
P.O. Box A
Aiken, SC 29802

Dear Dr. Bridges:

SUBJECT: Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) Recommendation Number 283

Thank you for your recommendation on "Revising the Department of Energy (DOE) Websites and Using Plain Language to Communicate with the Public More Effectively." The Department appreciates and agrees with the CAB's position that releasable information should be written in reader-friendly, understandable language and also be made readily available to the public in a timely manner.

As a whole, the Department recognizes the opportunities for improving navigation and search capabilities of its external websites as well as content. I am pleased to share that the DOE-Savannah River Operations Office (SR) and its prime contractors are committed to implementing such improvements to the Savannah River Site's (SRS) overall web communications.

The CAB's recommendation will be shared with DOE-Headquarters (HQ) Office of Environmental Management (EM) Web Council, which was established to facilitate the sharing of ideas and web best practices and encourage cost efficient, collaboration and resource sharing among DOE program offices and field sites. Specifically, the enclosed DOE Web Improvement Strategy, issued October 11, 2011, outlines current initiatives that DOE is taking to streamline web operations and external communications across the Complex.

Recognizing the need to revamp SRS external websites to better respond to the growing digital communication demands, the Site is taking prudent steps to modernize the SRS and DOE-SR external websites as well as ensure that releasable information and documents posted are readily accessible, searchable, and understood by stakeholders.

The revamped SRS external website is expected to be launched this month with a redesigned DOE-SR website to follow in a timely manner.

As always, DOE welcomes the CAB's feedback on the effectiveness of the enhanced communication tools as we continue to work with DOE-EM to identify opportunities for additional improvements.

If you have any questions you can contact me or Rebecca Craft, of my staff, at (803) 952-7606.

Sincerely,

David C. Moody
FOR Manager

OEA-12-0028

Enclosure:
DOE Web Improvement Strategy

WEB IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY

U.S. Department of Energy
October 11, 2011

ENERGY.GOV

OBJECTIVE
Improve Digital Communications While Eliminating Wasteful Spending

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June 2011, the Obama Administration launched the Campaign to Cut Waste, an effort to root out wasteful spending at every agency and department in the Federal government, and highlighted Federal Web Reform as a key part of the initiative. Since the Energy Department owns hundreds of websites -- about 87 domains and hundreds of subdomains -- we're answering the Administration's call, seizing the opportunity to streamline web operations, reduce duplicative spending and improve overall web communications.

Here's how:

Step One: Identify our Website Footprint.

In order to determine what to reduce, we need to determine what we have and how much it costs. This past spring, we began an aggressive effort to identify all of the websites the Department owns and maintains in order to educate our website reform efforts.

Step Two: Eliminate Wasteful Spending by Consolidating and Reducing Websites.

For the past several months, we've been working on what we call the Energy.gov Renewal Project, the initiative to provide a one-platform solution (i.e. branding, content management system, hosting, etc.) for our public-facing websites. Where possible, we'll be consolidating our headquarter websites into one Energy.gov platform – eliminating duplicative costs on website infrastructure.

Step Three: Establish Clear Governance and Guidance.

In mid-2010, with the support of Secretary Chu and Deputy Secretary Poneman, the Office of Public Affairs launched the New Media Office, to retool the Energy Department's online presence. While New Media is leading the Department's website reform efforts in collaboration with the Office of the Chief Information Officer, web management and new media staff across the Department have established the Energy Web Council to facilitate the sharing of ideas and web best practices, encourage collaboration and resource sharing, and keep us ahead of the curve in this ever-evolving space.

Ultimately, the website reform effort we've launched at the Energy Department aims to save taxpayers more than $10 million per year. Within the past year alone, we've saved taxpayers over $1 million by not building some new websites and consolidating others.

However, as digital communications becomes even more central to delivering information and services to the public, the Energy Department will need to make new investments in this area. The process we are undertaking now will put those efforts on a much better footing -- rationalizing our approach, making it more strategic and avoiding costly redundancies and inefficiencies. This more strategic approach will get us more bang for the buck, ensuring the American public gets the information they need, while eliminating wasteful spending none of us can afford.

BACKGROUND

The changing media environment and rapid expansion of high-speed Internet access over the past several years have fundamentally changed the ways that members of the public consume information. This creates new opportunities for the Energy Department to more effectively communicate and increase transparency. As we modernize the Department's approach to new media and digital communications, we can also realize significant opportunities to save money for taxpayers.

Historically, the Energy Department's web presence and new media efforts have been almost entirely decentralized. Our program offices each have maintained their own distinct websites. Not only do these have a different "look and feel," but also in many cases have a different underlying infrastructure to support their individual websites – paying for software (a Content Management System, or CMS) as well as hardware (buying and maintaining servers to host the websites). They also employ a wide range of contractors to maintain and update their websites that modern technologies could eliminate and repurpose. The result is a fragmented and confusing user experience making it hard for the public and our stakeholder audiences to find the information and resources they are seeking – at an unnecessary cost for taxpayers.

In mid-2010, with the support of Secretary Chu and Deputy Secretary Poneman, the Office of Public Affairs launched a New Media Office to retool the Department's overall approach to digital communications to deliver a more effective product while eliminating wasteful spending.

Within its first year our New Media Office gave Energy.gov a facelift and implemented a sustained, strategic and aggressive online outreach strategy using social media tools (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, etc.) as well as blog content on Energy.gov. Their comprehensive digital strategies expanded the Department's reach from a couple thousand people online to millions.

However, the biggest changes to the Department's online presence are happening as part of the Energy.gov Renewal Project, which is retooling Energy.gov in order to better respond to the growing digital communications demands of the 21st century and reduce wasteful spending.

PROBLEM

The Energy Department's web presence can be described in one word: sprawling. Web surveys facilitated through both DOE and Federal reform efforts showed us that the Department operates several hundred websites on various duplicative, archaic and poor performing technology systems. These systems often

- Are not dynamic or interactive,
- Require manual processes when modern competitors offer automated solutions,
- Cannot communicate with one another (i.e. staff and contractors can spend unnecessary hours updating the same content multiple times in order to share it across multiple websites),
- Require IT professionals to publish content, rather than empowering the communicator/author themselves to publish their own content online and
- Needlessly increase operating costs, when relatively inexpensive, easy-to-use technology alternatives that could better serve our digital communications needs are available.

Simply put – there's a significant opportunity to do a lot more with less by pursuing modern technology solutions and streamlining website infrastructure processes across the Energy Department.

SOLUTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

In order to eliminate wasteful spending and better respond to the growing digital communications demands of the 21st century, the New Media Office within the Office of Public Affairs is spearheading an effort to create a centralized online platform, via Energy.gov, that provides our stakeholder audiences with clear, consistent and reliable information and services wherever and whenever they want it, while also empowering Department employees with simple tools and straightforward guidance to communicate and interact with those stakeholders and each other.

We're calling this effort the Energy.gov Renewal Project. It utilizes open source and cloud computing technologies in order to provide a platform that not only meets current demands, but can also best scale and adapt to future needs at a low cost.

The Energy.gov Renewal Project is making two integral kinds of improvements:

1. "Front End" cosmetic changes you can see:

In August 2011, a brighter, less cluttered, more strategic Energy.gov was launched making it much easier for public audiences to find the information and services they are seeking. Additional improvements to usability are ongoing as we continue to seek and respond to feedback from stakeholders.

2. "Back End" infrastructure changes you can't see:

a. Open Source Content Management System

In August 2011, Energy.gov was moved into an open source content management system called "Drupal," which has no monthly licensing fees and is vastly more sophisticated, flexible and user friendly than Energy.gov's previous outdated, proprietary CMS. Non-technical staff members can easily learn how to post press releases, photos or make other routine updates to their websites using the new Drupal CMS. Further, the new Drupal CMS with its sophisticated tagging system will automatically curate web content into relevant web pages exponentially increasing the exposure of web content.

b. Cloud Hosting

In support of the OMB 25-point plan, Energy.gov was identified as one of the Energy Department's Cloud First initiatives, and hosting of the Energy.gov infrastructure was moved to the Cloud in August 2011. The Cloud provides the high-availability, scalability and service required for a cabinet-level Department website, and does so at a cheaper cost than internal hosting options.

The Energy Department's New Media Office is approaching the initiative in three main phases:

- **Phase One:** Rebuild the front and back-end infrastructure of Energy.gov to make it a top-of-the-line, leading government website. Include the dozen or so program office websites that are wholly dependent upon the current, archaic infrastructure in this upgrade:
  - Recovery Act
  - Open Gov
  - Office of the Chief Information Officer
  - Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs
  - Office of Economic Impact and Diversity
  - Office of Electricity Deliverability and Energy Reliability
  - Office of the General Counsel
  - Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance
  - Office of the Inspector General
  - Office of Management
  - Office of Policy and Intergovernmental Affairs
  - EnergyEmpowers.gov, etc.

Completed August 2011.

- **Phase Two:** Migrate program office sites that use the 'old' Energy.gov 'look and feel' but have their own back-end infrastructure into the new, cutting-edge infrastructure. This includes offices like
  - Office of Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy, including sites like EnergySavers.gov
  - Office of Environmental Management
  - Office of Fossil Energy
  - Office of Nuclear Energy
  - Office of Health, Safety and Security
  - Office of the Chief Financial Officer, etc.

Expected completion Jan-Feb 2012.

- **Phase Three:** Work with remaining program offices that have their own various 'look and feels', technology systems, etc. to migrate their sites to the extent possible into the new, cutting-edge infrastructure. This includes offices like
  - Office of Science
  - ARPA-E
  - Loans Program Office
  - Office of Legacy Management, etc.

Expected completion Oct-Nov 2012.

ENERGY WEB COUNCIL

The Energy Department Web Managers Council (Energy Web Council) was created in December 2010 as a way for Department Web Managers and New Media Specialists to collaborate across programs, and share common challenges, ideas and best practices. Members work in various program offices and staff offices and include representatives from policy, communications, public affairs, and Chief Information Officer (CIO) staffs.

The purpose of the Energy Department Web Managers Council is to:

- Promote the use of Web best practices on Energy Department websites serving internal and external audiences;
- Address high-level web policy issues that affect all programs;
- Advise and make recommendations to policy-makers, partners and other stakeholders, to improve Energy Department web content and strengthen web content management policies;
- Educate the Energy Department community - give them tools to improve web content today, and prepare them to handle the challenges of tomorrow;
- Promote collaboration across programs;
- Provide a way for Energy Department Web Managers and New Media Specialists to share skills, knowledge, best practices, ideas, and solutions;
- Communicate our successes (and challenges) to stakeholders, to bring greater recognition and support for our work and the Energy Department web presence as a whole; and
- Leverage the size and influence of our community to get things done across the Energy Department that would be harder to do individually.

PRELIMINARY SUCCESS

In just a few short months, we've seen tremendous promise with website reform, as evidenced by the new and improved Energy.gov. But we're also seeing some immediate cost benefits. Specifically, by consolidating just one website into Energy.gov this past December, we've been able to nearly cover the initial upfront investment in the new platform. This only gives us further belief in the cost-reduction potential of the project.

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

A national network of organizations working to address issues of nuclear weapons production and waste cleanup

Fifteen Groups Submit Comments on Weapons Plutonium Disposition, MOX Plutonium Fuel - for DOE's Amended Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

On January 12, 2012, the U.S. Department of Energy published a notice in the Federal Register that it was seeking comments on the reopened environmental document being prepared on disposition of surplus weapons plutonium. That notice - **Second Amended Notice of Intent To Modify the Scope of the Surplus Plutonium Disposition Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Additional Public Scoping** – can be found at: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-01-12/pdf/2012-445.pdf

On March 12, the last day for comments to be received, fifteen environmental and arms control groups submitted an extensive and hard-hitting 20-page comment for the Supplemental EIS record: http://www.ananuclear.org/Portals/0/documents/SEIS_group_comments_3.12.2012.pdf

In the comments, the groups pointed out the serious challenges that face the DOE's plutonium fuel (MOX) program. As no reactors have been lined up to use MOX, no MOX in-reactor testing schedule has been outlined and no operational schedule of the MOX plant can be presented, the MOX program faces technical, scheduling and cost challenges which could prove to undo the entire program. The groups advocated for an urgent analysis by DOE of non-MOX options, which is necessary as the faltering MOX program could fail, leaving no options for disposal of surplus weapons plutonium. Additionally, costs are increasing dramatically and seriously impacting other more important DOE non-proliferation programs, which is raising concern by decision-makers in Washington.

The draft EIS is expected to be issued in the summer and, according to the National Nuclear Security Administration, hearings are expected to be held in the same cities in which earlier hearings on the same SEIS had been held: Athens, AL, Chattanooga, TN, Aiken, SC and Santa Fe, New Mexico.

The Supplemental EIS has been in development for five years, indicating DOE's chronic problems in managing the plutonium disposition program.

The MOX plant is under construction at the DOE's Savannah River Site in South Carolina. Cost estimate for construction alone are around $5 billion. In the DOE budget request released on February 13 - http://www.cfo.doe.gov/budget/13budget/Content/Volume1.pdf - DOE presents an estimate of $499 million per year for operating costs, a huge jump from last year's estimate of $356 million/year (see page 461). DOE presents an operating life of the plant of 13 years in one place in the budget, 20 years in another and also says that the "nominal design life of the facility is 40 years." It thus appears that operating costs of the MOX plant alone could be $10 billion or more, far more than earlier presented.

The draft EIS is expected to be issued in the summer and, according to the national Nuclear Security administration, hearings are expected to be held in the same cities in which earlier hearings on the same SEIS had been held: Athens, AL, Chattanooga, TN, Aiken, SC and Santa Fe, New Mexico.

The Alliance for Nuclear Accountability has placed on line a number of documents pertinent to plutonium disposition and which were obtained via Freedom of Information Act requests. Look on the right on the "Plutonium Fuel (MOX)" page under "Freedom of Information Act Documents." (http://www.ananuclear.org/Issues/PlutoniumFuelMOX/tabid/75/Default.aspx)

Tom Clements
Nonproliferation Policy Director
Columbia, SC
tel. 803-834-3084, tomlements329@cs.com

Comments posted at:

http://www.ananuclear.org/Portals/0/documents/SEIS_group_comments_3.12.2012.pdf

Sign-on groups:

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability - Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance
Nuclear Watch South - Georgia Women's Action for New Directions
Tri-Valley CAREs - Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center
Snake River Alliance - Friends of the Earth - Nuclear Information and Resource Service
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, U.S. Section
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy - Tennessee Environmental Council
South Carolina Chapter of the Sierra Club - Tennessee Chapter of the Sierra Club
Mothers Against Tennessee River Radiation/Bellefonte Efficiency and Sustainability Team

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability - Union of Concerned Scientists - Arms Control Association
Project on Government Oversight - International Panel on Fissile Materials
Friends Committee on National Legislation - Physicians for Social Responsibility
Women's Action for New Directions - Friends of the Earth
Nuclear Information and Resource Service - Nuclear Watch of New Mexico - Tri-Valley CAREs
Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance - Georgia Women's Action for New Direction
Nuclear Watch South - Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League - South Carolina Chapter of the Sierra Club
Fernald Residents for Environmental Safety & Health
HEAL Utah - Peace Action West - Campaign for a Nuclear Weapons Free World
Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety - Colorado Coalition for the Prevention of Nuclear War
Mothers Against Tennessee River Radiation/Bellefonte Efficiency and Sustainability Team

March 19, 2012

The Honorable Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Chairman
The Honorable Peter J. Visclosky, Ranking Member
Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development
U.S. House of Representatives
2362 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Cut MOX Plutonium Fuel Program – Spiraling Costs, Technical Hurdles, Impacts to Nonproliferation Programs

Chairman Frelinghuysen and Ranking Member Visclosky:

We request that the subcommittee substantially reduce funding for the Mixed Oxide Plutonium Fuel (MOX) program and direct funds to essential nuclear nonproliferation programs.

Costs for the Department of Energy's MOX program are increasing at an alarming rate. The estimated cost of MOX plant construction at the Savannah River Site has increased from $1.6 billion in FY2004 to the current $4.9 billion. The DOE's FY2013 overall request for MOX and associated plutonium disposition programs is $887 million and the budget indicates a funding request of $3.6 billion from FY2014 to FY2017.

The estimated annual operating cost for the MOX plant jumped to $499 million/year in the FY2013 budget request, up from $356 million in FY2012 and $156 million in FY2011 - more than a 200% increase in just two years. If DOE's current prediction that the MOX plant will operate for 20 years is accurate, operating costs alone could total over $10 billion, placing continuing pressure on non-proliferation and cleanup programs.

DOE attributes increased costs to such things as higher equipment costs, MOX plant design changes and "higher than expected professional/technical staff turnover due to demand for nuclear trained personnel at other projects" yet it is far from clear if costs are under control.

After years of effort, no reactors are contracted to test or use MOX fuel. Given the risks associated with MOX use, it is far from certain if the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) will test or use MOX in any of its reactors. MOX made from weapons-grade plutonium has *never* been tested or used in a boiling water reactor (BWR) such as TVA's Browns Ferry, a GE Mark I (Fukushima Daiichi) design, necessitating a lengthy testing period. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) recently made it clear that its regulations require testing before MOX can be commercially used, which would severely impact the schedule for the program and result in cost increases.

The plutonium disposition request for FY2013 represents over one-third of the NNSA's Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation budget. The result is that critical programs such as the Global Threat Reduction Initiative and Nonproliferation and International Security office are under extreme budgetary strain. Experts have made a strong case that projected funding for key non-proliferation budgets this year and in the coming years is inadequate. The relentless budget pressure caused by MOX, which does nothing to address loose fissile material, is a large part of the problem.

Given the cost, schedule and technical vulnerabilities of the MOX program and the possibility that the program will fail, it is essential DOE be directed to review viable options to manage surplus plutonium as waste. In the past, immobilization in high-level waste was shown to be less expensive than MOX.

Thank you for intensifying oversight of the MOX program and for significant cuts to the MOX plant construction and administrative budgets. Please do not allow important nonproliferation programs that have been proven effective to suffer because of the MOX program's out-of-control costs.

Sincerely,

Letter posted at: **http://ananuclear.org/Portals/0/Cut_MOX_E_&_W_letter_3.15.2012final.pdf**