

**Meeting Minutes**  
**SRS Citizens Advisory Board – Combined Committees Meeting**  
**Augusta, GA**  
**January 28, 2013**

**Monday, January 28, 2013 Attendance:**

**CAB**

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

**Agency Liaisons/Regulators**

Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC  
Kim Brinkley, SCDHEC  
Van Kiesler, SCDHEC  
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC  
Rob Pope, EPA  
Kyle Bryant, EPA

**Contractors**

Dave Olson, SRR  
Kim Hauer, SRR  
Nancy Bethurem, SRR  
Jeannette Hyatt, SRNL  
Keith Lawrence, U.S. Forrest Service  
Ashley Whitaker, NOVA  
James Tanner, NOVA  
Jesslyn Anderson, NOVA

**DOE**

Dr. David Moody, DOE-SR  
Terry Spears, DOE-SR  
Patrick McGuire, DOE-SR  
Angelia Adams, DOE-SR  
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR  
Rich Olsen, DOE-SR  
Soni Blanco, DOE-SR  
Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR  
Avery Hammett, DOE-SR  
Karen Guevara, DOE-SR  
Doug Hintze, DOE-SR

**Stakeholders**

Liz Goodson  
Tom Clements  
Bobbie Paul  
Courtney Hanson  
Nancy Bobbitt  
Jacob Stom  
Jill O'Donnell  
Robert Ingham  
Dawn Gillas  
Richard Selg  
Connie Young  
Jesse Young  
Bill Lawless

CAB Facilitator, Ashley Whitaker, NOVA, welcomed everyone to the meeting. She reviewed the Meeting Rules of Conduct and reminded everyone how to access electronic copies of meeting materials through the CABNET meeting feature. She reviewed the day's agenda before welcoming CAB Chair Donald Bridges to speak.

CAB Chair Donald Bridges welcomed everyone and thanked the CAB Support Team for the meeting arrangements. He explained the purpose of the meeting was to discuss topics the CAB may choose to pursue in 2013. He explained that in February, all the committee chairs would meet together to finalize the topics of their 2013 Work Plan.

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

CAB member Kathe Golden expressed her satisfaction with the amount of people in attendance before she reminded everyone that the CAB Committee Chair elections were scheduled for the next day. She addressed the recent membership campaign before listing the A&O Committee members. CAB member Golden welcomed Ashley Whitaker, NOVA, to begin the A&O Topics for Consideration presentation.

**PRESENTATION: Topics for Consideration, Ashley Whitaker, NOVA**

Ms. Ashley Whitaker, NOVA, began her presentation by listing the 2012 Work Plan topics and the proposed Work Plan topics for 2013. There were no additional Work Plan topics suggested for the A&O Committee; however, CAB

member Golden asked the board to inform her if they had additional suggestions for the internal processes. She expressed her appreciation to everyone who helped with the A&O Committee, before CAB Chair Bridges thanked CAB member Golden for her hard work in serving as the Chair of the A&O Committee.

**PRESENTATION: CAB Recommendation & Work Plan Status Report, Jesslyn Anderson, NOVA**

Ms. Jesslyn Anderson, NOVA, provided an update on the recommendation status report and Work Plan progress. She said currently there were 15 open and 7 pending recommendations. She provided an update of the CAB Work Plan and highlighted each committee's progress throughout the year.

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

CAB member Marolyn Parson listed the FD&SR Committee members and reviewed the committee's focus. She gave a recommendation status update, stating that recommendation 279 was open while recommendations 283, 293, and 294 were pending. Regarding recommendation 283, she mentioned the CAB received a response from the Department of Energy (DOE); however, she said her committee decided at the April 17, 2012 FD&SR Committee meeting, to write a letter to Dr. David Moody, Site Manager, before closing the recommendation. She stated that Dr. Moody's response was received on November 30, 2012, which she hoped to discuss later in the meeting. She explained the various pending recommendations and the corresponding responses from DOE. She continued her update by reviewing the FD&SR 2012 Work Plan topics, commenting that the "FD&SR Committee completed all its topics, while continuing to work on recommendations 279 and 283, and developing three new recommendations." She mentioned that the next FD&SR Committee meeting would be determined at the February 13, 2013 Work Plan Meeting. She reviewed the presentations that were scheduled for the meeting before mentioning that she hoped her committee could discuss the status of current open and pending recommendations if there was additional time throughout the meeting.

**PRESENTATION: SRS Natural Resources Management, Keith Lawrence, USDA Forest Service**

Mr. Keith Lawrence, USDA Forest Service, stated the purpose of his presentation and briefly summarized the DOE Natural Resources Management Plan (NRMP) for the Savannah River Site (SRS). He explained that SRS had approximately 200,000 acres of land that was divided into three categories known as industrial, research, and forest management areas. He explained that the Forest Service managed approximately 168,415 acres but conducted work throughout all three management areas. He provided a map of SRS to show how the NRMP divided the land into six areas, which were Primary Red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW), Supplemental RCW, industrial core, crackerneck, swamp, and the Lower Three Runs corridor. He explained each of the six land management areas before discussing six additional research categories Forest Service personnel study at SRS. Those research areas included threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, wetland restoration, bioenergy, biodiversity and ecological restoration, fire management, and other research areas.

He discussed the Forest Service's responsibility to manage threatened, endangered, and sensitive species at SRS. He provided pictures of the Red-cockaded woodpecker and the smooth coneflower before explaining how each species survived at SRS. He used a chart to explain the drastic increase of the RCW population at SRS since 1985. Mr. Lawrence discussed forest management and the areas the Forest Service monitors. He explained that the Savannah River Ecology Lab (SREL) manages the 14,000 acres of research set-aside areas; however, the Forest Service actually performed the necessary groundwork that the SREL felt would help advance forest health. He said the Forest Service was responsible for maintaining the site's 1,200 miles of secondary roads, 120 miles of boundary fence and signage, along with 60 miles of bike and fitness trails. He provided an example by explaining a major road project that was completed in 2012 that enabled the Forest Service to access an additional 2,000 acres at SRS.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if the expense of completing the road project would eventually pay for itself. Mr. Lawrence replied that it should not be long before the project resulted in a positive return.

Mr. Lawrence used another image to discuss watershed management. He explained that the Forest Service met the regulatory requirement to stabilize stream channels and reduce the amount of sediment leaving SRS with the development of "outfall structures." Mr. Lawrence mentioned that forest management was performed to promote

forest health, generate revenue, and enhance the habitat. He said the Forest Service always attempted to use any harvested materials to support continuing forest management operations at SRS. He explained that selling timber to AMERESCO promoted future forest management. He provided a graph that showed the amount of timber harvested at SRS and sold from 2000 until 2012. Mr. Lawrence explained that approximately 75 percent of ground lumber, that had no additional commercial value, was sent to AMERESCO to support the electric and steam production at SRS.

CAB Chair Bridges asked what happened to the remaining 25 percent of forest materials that did not support SRS. Mr. Lawrence replied that the remaining 25 percent of timber that did not support SRS was sent to another source because AMERESCO was only able to support 75 percent.

CAB member Parson asked if the current best management practices (BMP) for bioenergy research were established by the Forest Service as part of land management, or were they established to prevent contamination from site activities. Mr. Lawrence replied that the Forest Service's BMPs were established by the state, but are followed through forest management practices.

CAB Chair Bridges asked what types of wood the Forest Service sold. Mr. Lawrence explained that the Forest Service sold "stumpage" which included pulpwood, but approximately 60 percent of the wood sold was used to make lumber or utility poles.

CAB member Golden asked what happened to the money the Forest Service received from selling the timber. Mr. Lawrence stated the money went back to the Treasury while SRS received the timber receipts to fund additional forest management projects.

Mr. Lawrence showed another graph to represent the value of timber and "stumpage" sold from 2000 to 2012. He explained that the recent recession affected timber earnings; however, from 2011 to 2012 the revenue gained from the amount of timber sold had slowly increased. He said since there were not many trees at SRS when it began operating in the 1950's, the Forest Service "began planting slash pine because it was easy to establish and it grew fast." He mentioned that slash pine was not a native tree to SRS; therefore, the Forest Service began eliminating slash pine and reestablishing the native species of longleaf pine. He provided a graph that represented the elimination of 7,130 acres of slash pine and the planting of 7,036 acres of longleaf pine.

Mr. Lawrence described watershed and the wetland restoration processes. He used an image of a water flume, from a study done in coordination with the University of Georgia, to show how water and wetland restoration processes were monitored at SRS.

CAB member Rose Hayes asked about the cost to study the water flumes. Mr. Lawrence replied that the costs were shared with the University of Georgia since this particular study was a cooperative agreement.

He discussed the research category of fire management, which included wildfire responsibilities and prescribed fire accomplishments. He stated that the Forest Service's wildfire suppression objective was "to control 90 percent of all wildfires to 10 acres or less and 99 percent to less than 100 acres." He mentioned one way to accomplish this objective was through prescribed fire accomplishments. Mr. Lawrence stated that the NRMP at SRS continued to be successful and there were no anticipated changes.

CAB Chair Bridges asked Mr. Lawrence to identify areas where the Forest Service needed assistance. Mr. Lawrence replied that the Forest Service was fortunate to have the funding to complete the work needing to be done. Mr. Lawrence stated, "Our work is going very well and I do not see a real shortfall at this time." He mentioned that he hoped to continue looking to the future and find ways the Forest Service could continue supporting SRS's mission.

### **PRESENTATION: Topics of Consideration, Angelia Adams, DOE-SR**

Ms. Angelia Adams, DOE-SR, stated the purpose of her presentation was to provide potential topics for the FD&SR Committee for use in developing its 2013 Work Plan. She provided the list of 2012 Work Plan topics to show that the FD&SR Committee completed its entire Work Plan. She listed the 2013 topics, which included:

- I. Annual Integrator Operable Units Program Update
- II. Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) Appendix E Projected Changes
- III. Federal Facility Agreement (FFA) Appendix E Major Proposed Changes
- IV. SRS Energy Management Overview
- V. Five-Year Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Remedy Review
- VI. Revisit of the Area Completion Strategy
- VII. Monitoring Along the Savannah River
- VIII. Advanced Simulation Capability for Environmental Monitoring (ASCEM)
- IX. Frequency of onsite stream monitoring

After listing the new topics, she provided a brief summary of each topic stating that the items in red were what DOE considered the most important topics for the CAB to consider.

CAB member Parson expressed her concern regarding when the topics “FFA Appendix E Projected Changes” and “FFA Appendix E Major Proposed Changes” would be presented to the CAB. She stated that recommendation 279 asked for presentations to be given in August and November, not January and August as DOE proposed for 2013. CAB member Parson requested August and November so the CAB would have enough time to provide meaningful feedback to DOE. CAB member Parson addressed the topic “Revisit of the Area Completion Strategy” and asked whether the CAB would receive presentations about individual areas of SRS. Ms. Adams explained that the CAB received presentations in the past; however, certain areas might not undergo additional operations for several years.

CAB member Golden wished to add “Georgia” to the topic “Monitoring along the Savannah River.” CAB member Parson suggested adding a presentation about the overview of state and regulatory agencies to the list of FD&SR 2013 Work Plan topics. Ms. Adams mentioned that the path forward was for the Work Plan to be approved by both the CAB and DOE, then DOE would develop a schedule of presentations.

Ms. Ashley Whitaker, CAB Facilitator, allowed CAB member Parson to discuss open recommendations with the FD&SR Committee since the meeting was ahead of schedule. CAB member Parson mentioned they would discuss recommendation 279 the next day before she discussed recommendation 283. She said a response was received on November 30, 2012 from Dr. Moody; however, she asked about the different functions of the Environmental Management (EM), DOE-SR, and SRS external websites. Mr. Terry Spears, DOE-SR, explained how to access each website before mentioning it would be a “huge undertaking” to link all information for any DOE site across the country. After discussing recommendation 283, CAB member Parson suggested that FD&SR Committee members look over the recommendation since the committee would discuss changing its status the next day.

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

CAB member Rose Hayes listed the NM Committee members, and reviewed what the committee addresses. She provided a recommendation status update, stating that the NM Committee currently has 11 open recommendations. She mentioned the CAB Work Plan Process Session was scheduled for February 13-14, 2013 to establish the 2013 Committee meeting schedule and update current CAB processes. CAB member Hayes summarized the presentations that would be presented before welcoming Ms. Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR, to begin her presentation on 2013 Work Plan Topics for Consideration for the NM Committee.

### **PRESENTATION: Topics of Consideration, Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR**

Ms. Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR, stated the purpose of her presentation was to provide potential topics the NM Committee could use to develop its 2013 Work Plan. She provided an image of the CAB Waste and Material Flow Path chart, to illustrate that building 235-F, K-area, L-Basin, and H-Canyon were the NM Committee’s areas of interest. She provided the list of 2012 Work Plan topics to show what topics were completed. She listed the 2013 topics, which included:

- I. Nuclear Material Receipt and Storage

- a. Principles of Understanding with South Carolina- Annual Shipment Report (Annual Report of all transfers into and out of SRS)
- b. H-Canyon Used Fuel Processing Decision Update
- c. **Used Fuel Update (AMCAP, Dry Storage Initiative, FRR/DRR receipts)**
- II. Nuclear Material Reuse and Disposition
  - a. **Update on H-Canyon Missions (Roadmap)**
  - b. Update on H-Canyon Processing Credit
  - c. 235-F Implementation Plan cost and schedule for deactivation (joint with Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee)
- III. Strategic Initiatives and Policy Discussions
  - a. Department's Response to the Blue Ribbon Commission's Report on America's Nuclear Future
  - b. **Status of Enterprise SRS – Nuclear Materials Initiatives**

Ms. Maxted mentioned that the items in red represented DOE's most important topics requiring CAB input. CAB member Hayes mentioned there was not a topic that incorporated the Committee's request for a finalized plan for plutonium disposition. Ms. Maxted replied that plutonium disposition was categorized under the "Update on H-Canyon Missions (Roadmap)" when the 2013 topics were composed.

CAB Chair Bridges asked for a presentation about plutonium disposition to be added to the list of topics for the 2013 NM Work Plan. CAB member Hayes requested a presentation on the cost differences of dispositioning and storing spent nuclear fuel. Ms. Maxted replied that DOE would try to provide the CAB with better estimates; however, it would be difficult since there currently was not a disposition path or federal repository.

CAB member Hayes asked if the recommendation regarding the "exchange program with Idaho" was included within the list of proposed topics. Ms. Maxted explained it was included and would be discussed within the "Used Fuel Update." Ms. Maxted explained that once both the CAB and DOE approved the 2013 Work Plan, DOE would develop a schedule to present certain topics.

### **Strategic & Legacy Management (S&LM) Committee Overview- Clint Nangle, Chair**

CAB member Clint Nangle listed the S&LM Committee members and reviewed the committee's purpose. He began a recommendation status update stating that recommendation 288 was open, while joint recommendation 302 was pending. He explained that the next S&LM Committee meeting would be scheduled after the February 13, 2013 Work Plan meeting before he introduced Mr. Rich Olsen, DOE-SR, to begin his presentation on the Topics for Consideration for the 2013 S&LM Work Plan.

### **PRESENTATION: Topics of Consideration, Rich Olsen, DOE-SR**

Mr. Rich Olsen, DOE-SR, stated his presentation would provide potential topics for the S&LM Committee to use in developing its 2013 Work Plan. He listed the 2012 Work Plan and mentioned that the S&LM Committee completed its entire Work Plan before he listed the 2013 topics, which included:

- I. **Planning and Execution Updates**
  - a. Integrated Lifecycle Plan for Cleanup Program
  - b. Performance Metrics for Cleanup Program
  - c. Enterprise SRS
- II. **Budget Request and Congressional Funding**
  - a. Appropriations Status
  - b. CAB participation with Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Integrated Priority List
- III. Update on SRS Natural Resources Management
- IV. **Annual SRS Environmental Report**
- V. Military Training Exercises at SRS
- VI. Repurpose and Reuse of SRS Assets
- VII. EM Website Improvement Status

## VIII. Historic Preservation

Mr. Olsen stated that the items highlighted in red were topics DOE felt required the most attention from the CAB. CAB member Nangle asked to include small modular reactors (SMR) within the list of 2013 Work Plan topics. Mr. Olsen agreed that it was a topic last year and could be included within 2013; however, if any new information about SMRs developed, it would be included within the “Enterprise SRS” update.

CAB member Parson asked why “Update on SRS Natural Resources Management” and “Annual SRS Environmental Report” were included in the S&LM Committee when they were normally included within the FD&SR Work Plan. Mr. Olsen explained that the CAB could decide where to place certain topics at the Work Plan meeting. CAB Vice Chair Harold Simon reminded CAB member Nangle that he could include SMRs within the S&LM Committee’s Work Plan by adding it at the Work Plan meeting.

CAB member Hayes asked what committee should have the topic of SMRs. Mr. Olsen stated that for 2012, SMR discussions were included within the S&LM Committee’s Work Plan. CAB member Hayes asked if SMRs were still a part of the Enterprise SRS program or were they a separate topic. Mr. Olsen replied that the original intent of Enterprise SRS was to have twelve initiatives; however, it was possible for other initiatives to be prioritized before others. He stated that Enterprise SRS was an ongoing plan that DOE-SR used to keep track of everything that was currently underway while also focusing on the future.

Dr. Moody, Site Manager, said that Mr. Olsen was correct. He explained that Enterprise SRS was not a set of specific projects, but a mindset that DOE-SR was moving toward the future, while using its current expertise and assets. Dr. Moody mentioned that depending on the ability to receive funding, SMRs would remain a part of Enterprise SRS; however, more emphasis was being placed on other successful projects, such as processing Nuclear Materials in H-Canyon. CAB member Hayes asked Dr. Moody to describe Enterprise SRS since she did not fully understand everything when it was first explained to the CAB. Dr. Moody explained that the site was being cleaned up under the mindset of Enterprise SRS; however, DOE-SR was trying to expand its environmental stewardship efforts by sharing the Enterprise SRS mindset internationally. CAB member Hayes requested a presentation that would explain how current operations and success stories at SRS were incorporated into Enterprise SRS. CAB Chair Bridges asked if SMRs were going to be a specific topic on the S&LM Work Plan which CAB member Nangle agreed.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if both the S&LM and NM Committees would receive presentations on Enterprise SRS since each committee had it listed as a Work Plan topic. Mr. Olsen explained that there are certain strategic initiatives within Enterprise SRS that pertain only to NM processes; however, when the S&LM Committee received its presentation regarding Enterprise SRS, the presentation would focus on the whole aspect of Enterprise SRS instead of certain initiatives. Mr. Olsen summarized his presentation by saying the DOE looked forward to participating with the S&LM Committee to approve the 2013 Work Plan.

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

CAB member Ed Burke reviewed the WM Committee’s purpose before he listed the members. He provided a recommendation status update, stating that recommendations 269, 290, 297, 298, and 300 were open and recommendations 299 and 301 were pending. He briefly reviewed the responses for each open and pending recommendation.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if DOE’s response to recommendation 300 was an EM cleanup issue. Mr. Terry Spears stated the issue was “indeterminate” since the circumstances were unknown. He said DOE was very forthcoming with inputs from other programs; however, regarding commercial nuclear fuel, if SRS were proposed as an interim storage site, DOE-SR would welcome participants to brief the CAB on those activities. CAB member Burke reviewed recommendation 301. CAB member Burke took a moment to read two newspaper articles he included within his committee overview before introducing Ms. Soni Blanco, DOE-SR to begin her presentation of Topics for Consideration for the 2013 WM Work Plan.

## **PRESENTATION: Topics of Consideration, Soni Blanco, DOE-SR**

Ms. Soni Blanco, DOE-SR, stated her presentation consisted of topics the WM Committee could potentially use to develop its 2013 Work Plan. She listed the 2012 Work Plan and mentioned that the WM Committee managed to complete their entire Work Plan. She continued by listing the potential 2013 Work Plan topics, which included:

- I. Solid Waste
  - a. SRS Legacy Transuranic (TRU) Waste Program
    - i. **Status and schedule for project completion**
    - ii. Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) shipping
  
- II. Liquid Waste
  - a. **System Plan Rev. 18** (2012 CAB Recommendation 297)
  - b. Glass Waste Storage Status (2012 CAB Recommendations 290, 298, 299, and 301)
    - i. Storage plan to complete the mission
      1. **Canister Interim Storage Project**
    - ii. Issues dealing with the long-term storage of canisters at SRS and alternatives to extend storage on Site.
  - c. Tank Closure Status (2012 CAB Recommendation 284)
    - i. Closure progress on HLW tanks 5, 6, 12, and 16
    - ii. H-Tank Farm Performance Assessment
  - d. Salt Waste Processing Overview
    - i. Actinide Removal Project/ Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit (ARP/MCU)- Next generation solvent outage and operating performance
    - ii. Saltstone Disposal Units progress
    - iii. **Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF) start-up plans and transition to long term management structure**
    - iv. Technology development and implementation of supplemental salt initiatives

Ms. Blanco stated that the items in red represented topics that DOE felt the CAB should pay most attention to. She commented that DOE expected to have great results in 2013 before asking the WM Committee if they had suggestions for additional topics. CAB member Burke asked if the CAB could receive information regarding DOE's response to the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) since the CAB would appreciate a presentation regarding the overview of SWPF construction delays, along with an update of how the SWPF and potential budget constraints may affect the site plan. He also asked to receive a presentation on the term "consent based process."

CAB Chair Bridges asked for "WIPP interaction" or "WIPP options" to be considered for a WM Work Plan topic. Mr. Terry Spears stated that he did not see any problem listing that topic; however, it belonged within the NM Work Plan since it was part of the DOE's strategy to handle used nuclear fuel (UNF) or High-Level Waste.

Mr. Bill Lawless, public, suggested for a representative from the Carlsbad, New Mexico Department of Energy to come and brief the CAB about the possibilities of sending vitrified High-Level Waste. He continued stating it would be interesting to hear their perspective of how the TRU waste, and remote handled waste, SRS sent is doing. CAB member Burke agreed to the suggestion. Ms. Blanco felt the topics CAB member Burke suggested definitely dealt with issues going on at SRS, and she hoped the CAB and DOE could finalize a productive Work Plan for this year.

### **Letter Discussion**

#### **"CAB Charter Expansion"**

CAB member Burke discussed a letter that was addressed to Dr. Moody, regarding the scope and responsibilities of the CAB. Before reading the letter, CAB member Burke mentioned he would like the CAB to review the letter that day and vote on whether to send the letter to Dr. Moody the next day. CAB Chair Bridges asked other CAB members their opinion of the proposed letter. CAB member Robert Doerr stated, "The letter is quite appropriate to keep us focused on the future of the CAB." CAB member Barnes expressed his approval of the letter stating he "agrees with it 100 percent." CAB member Artisha Bolding also stated she "agrees with the spirit of the letter."

CAB member Stanley Howard felt like the letter demonstrated that the CAB was the best resource to relay information about SRS to the public. CAB member James Streeter stated he thought it was a good time to start providing this type of information to the public. CAB member Ed Sturcken stated he felt like the letter was well-written and expressed his desire to discuss more areas of SRS that were being impacted.

Once the CAB finished sharing their input, CAB Chair Bridges asked Dr. Moody how he felt about the letter. Dr. Moody commented that DOE-SR seek public input in various forums; however, DOE-SR could not ignore the constraints that were implemented when the Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Boards (EMSSAB) were established. CAB Chair Bridges stated that the CAB understood that DOE had restrictions; however, he thanked DOE for providing the CAB with as much information as legally possible. CAB Chair Bridges stated that sending the letter to Headquarters (HQ) would be a positive step forward for the CAB. Mr. Terry Spears, DOE-SR, agreed with statements Dr. Moody made and explained to the CAB that the probability of successfully expanding the CAB's charter would be difficult.

Mr. Rob Pope, EPA, encouraged the CAB to reach out to other EMSSAB's around the country. He also reminded the CAB of other sites that had finished their EM missions. He explained that those site were transferred to legacy management, which meant that those EM chartered EMSSABs were now closed.

CAB member Earl Sheppard asked how many times in the past the CAB developed something "new and approachable" before hitting a dead end. CAB member Burke stated that when he initially composed the letter, he knew the CAB was "reaching for the sky." He explained that he wanted to send the letter, but he realized "what the CAB is asking for is a real stretch;" however, the CAB was open to see if the government could provide any suggestions about what the CAB was requesting.

CAB member Hayes asked if the EMSSAB's were established under a congressional act. Mr. Terry Spears, DOE-SR replied that EMSSAB was an advisory board, established under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). CAB member Hayes asked if the particular act was a DOE regulation or a congressional act. Mr. Spears stated that it was a federal law. CAB member Burke stressed the fact that the CAB was an EM board, not a DOE advisory board, which meant the scope was limited to what was under the purview of EM. CAB member Hayes asked how the CAB could change the congressional act if the CAB felt like the limits of its mission and authority became too confined. Mr. Spears answered, "I don't think the law is the issue. I think it is just the way the law enables the Department of Energy to establish advisory boards." He continued by stating that under FACA, EM chartered a national board, which meant a single EMSSAB charter covered several sites. Therefore, several sites would be affected by the change this letter would initiate. Mr. Spears reiterated that the decision to send the letter to HQ was a complex undertaking, with no single individual who could make it happen. CAB member Hayes asked if FACA could be redefined, which Mr. Spears stated he did not think the law was the problem.

Mr. Rob Pope, EPA, addressed the charter expansion letter by explaining that FACA was the same congressional act that the BRC was categorized within and since it was a congressional act, it could not be changed. He stated when the government created advisory boards, the mission was always clearly defined. Mr. Pope mentioned that being an EMSSAB allowed CAB members to be treated like federal employees since the government covers expenses. He informed the CAB that the Department of Defense (DOD) formed Restoration Advisory Boards, which did not fall under FACA. He explained those advisory boards were based on the amount of funding each military base received for public involvement. He said even though the boards discussed wider ranges of topics, they were not allowed to travel and the government did not cover expenses. He stated, "It is a one or the other situation," stating if the CAB wanted to stay covered by the government, it had to operate under FACA, and have a clearly defined EM mission.

A copy of this letter has been attached to this document.

### **Public Comments**

Mr. Tom Clements, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability (ANA), commented that the CAB's letter might run into some "head winds" with the FACA law and EMSSAB process; however, he said if the CAB found the underlying cause of issues with the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility (MFFF) project, he totally supported the letter. He continued by expressing his appreciation for CAB member Burke addressing two newspaper articles from The State newspaper. The first article entitled, "SRS factory years behind schedule, millions over budget" was

posted on January 2, 2013 while the second article entitled, “Critics fear \$7 billion SRS boondoggle, building costs soar at nuclear fuel conversion plant near Aiken” was posted on January 27, 2013. Mr. Clements briefly commented on each article before discussing commercial spent fuel.

Mr. Clements explained that two South Carolina newspapers, the Spartanburg Herald Journal and the Rock Hill Herald, recently addressed the topic. He stated on January 8, 2013, The Hilton Head Island Packet addressed the SWPF within an editorial. He quoted the document saying, “It is worse to hear the Savannah River Site mentioned as a possible place to store highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel from the nation’s nuclear reactors.” Mr. Clements explained that there would definitely be more editorials surfacing as the issue of consent or non-consent progressed.

He mentioned a few public issues that “really underscore what is going on with this idea to store spent fuel in South Carolina.” Mr. Clements stated that reprocessing SNF to remove the plutonium was the reason behind storing SNF in South Carolina. In referencing an email he received, Mr. Clements mentioned AREVA’s hope that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) would finalize regulations about a reprocessing plant in 2017. He quoted the article stating that, “AREVA’s plan is to submit a license application for a recycling facility in 2019.” Mr. Clements stated that AREVA was “totally dreaming.” He stated, “This company is in bad shape financially in Europe, and they have a nose for sniffing out U.S. Government money so they have hit on the idea of pushing reprocessing here, which even electric utility does not support or want in France.”

Mr. Clements discussed a document EnergySolutions released on Friday, January 25, 2013, entitled “EnergySolutions’ Statement to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on Reprocessing and the Disposition of Used Nuclear Fuel.” Mr. Clements said within the one page memo, that the idea of co-locating SNF storage with a reprocessing plant was a good idea. He quoted the memo stating, “We believe there are significant synergies between a Consolidated Storage Facility (CSF) and a reprocessing facility. Each requires a receipt facility and temporary storage for the UNF.” Mr. Clements stated this memo tried to “make the case that interim storage should be linked to reprocessing.” Mr. Clements expressed his appreciation for EnergySolutions providing the memo to the NRC, and the CAB for paying close attention to the issue of SNF.

A copy of each of these newspaper articles, emails, and memos have been attached to this document.

Mr. Bill Lawless, a member of the public, addressed the newspaper articles CAB member Burke and Mr. Clements discussed. Mr. Lawless said that regarding the delays and over budgeting from construction of the SWPF, the NRC and National Academy of Sciences were to blame; not DOE. He stated his opinion was that current funding issues would prevent the SWPF from ever being completed; however, with further operational adjustments, the Actinide Removal Process/Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit (ARP/MCU) could possibly “save the day.” Mr. Lawless mentioned that on November 13, 2013, he wrote Dr. Moody and CAB Chair Bridges a letter; however, had not received a response. CAB Chair Bridges said he appreciated Mr. Lawless’ input and his letter was under consideration. Mr. Lawless took a moment to remind everyone of the types of vitrified High-Level Waste and stated he would like to hear a comparison of the two types to determine which one was considered more dangerous.

CAB Facilitator, Ashley Whitaker, took a few moments to remind CAB members to complete and return their surveys to the CAB Support Team. She also addressed a minor change to the agenda for the next day stating that Mr. Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR, and Mr. Tony Polk, DOE-SR would both present their scheduled presentations; however, they would be switching the times of their presentations.

**~Meeting Adjourned**

**Meeting Minutes**  
**SRS Citizens Advisory Board – Full Board Meeting**  
**Augusta, GA**  
**January 29, 2013**

**Tuesday, January 29, 2013 Attendance:**

**CAB**

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

**Agency Liaisons/ Regulators**

Van Keisler, SCDHEC  
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC  
Rob Pope, EPA  
Kyle Bryant, EPA

**Contractors**

Amy Meyer, SRNS  
Teresa Eddy, SRNS  
Karen Vangela, SRNS  
Mary Flora, SRNS  
Susie Ferrara, SRNS  
Shelia McFalls, SRNS  
Dave Olson, SRR  
Nancye Bethurem, SRR  
Jeannette Hyatt, SRNL  
Ashley Whitaker, NOVA  
James Tanner, NOVA  
Jesslyn Anderson, NOVA

**DOE**

Dr. David Moody, DOE-SR  
Terry Spears, DOE-SR  
Pat McGuire, DOE-SR  
Doug Hintze, DOE-SR  
Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR  
Karen Guevara, DOE-SR  
Angelia Adams, DOE-SR  
Rich Olsen, DOE-SR  
Avery Hammett, DOE-SR  
Ben Gould, DOE-SR  
John Bellavich, DOE-SR  
Alescia Almond-Parson, DOE-SR  
Jolene Seitz, DOE-SR  
Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR  
Tony Polk, DOE-SR  
Gail Whitney, DOE-SR

**Stakeholders**

Courtney Hanson  
Jill O'Donnell  
Tom Clements  
Connie Young  
Jesse Young  
Dawn Gillas  
Susan Corbett  
Lisa Darden  
Liz Goodson  
Nancy Bobbitt  
Suzanne Rhodes  
Bobbie Paul

CAB Chair Bridges opened the meeting. CAB Facilitator, Ashley Whitaker, NOVA, led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance, and informed meeting attendees of the public comment periods planned throughout the day. She reviewed the Meeting Rules of Conduct and the agenda before inviting CAB Chair Bridges to begin his update.

**CAB Chair Opening and Update-Donald N. Bridges, CAB**

CAB Chair Bridges called for discussion of the September and October 2012 Full Board meeting minutes. There were no suggestions or comments regarding the minutes. He opened the floor for a vote; the CAB, with no opposition and no abstentions, approved both sets of minutes with 18 votes.

CAB Chair Bridges welcomed everyone to the meeting before recognizing CAB member Stanley Howard and CAB member Sarah Watson for serving six years on the CAB. He briefly discussed CAB membership, stating there would be six new members, coming in March. He stated this year, the CAB would begin having combined committee meetings, which meant that one committee would meet from 4:00-5:50 p.m. and another from 6:00-7:50

p.m. He mentioned that a complete schedule would be determined at the upcoming Work Plan Meeting on February 13, 2013.

He continued by speaking about the Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs), stating that in December 2012, CAB Vice Chair Simon participated in a conference call to discuss general board issues and budget updates. CAB Chair Bridges reminded everyone that the March Full Board Meeting was planned to be held in Savannah, Georgia; however, all remaining meetings for 2013 would be held locally. He announced the Work Plan and Process Session would be held February 13-14, 2013 at the DOE Meeting Center in Aiken, South Carolina before he explained what was scheduled for those meetings. He briefly mentioned that the CAB was featured in Bella Magazine and encouraged CAB members to think of ways the CAB could be publicized. CAB Chair Bridges announced he was recently elected to the Board of Directors for the Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness (CNTA) before discussing the position statements for 2013.

He stated the CAB had one position statement regarding SRS Cleanup, which did not receive any additional adjustments besides changing the date. CAB member Burke asked if the bullet labeled “The Radioactive Liquid Waste Program should be given top priority, adequate funding, and management attention,” meant that the Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF) should receive top priority. CAB Chair Bridges stated, “That is exactly what it says.”

CAB member Hayes asked if the third bullet included the prospect of incorporating MOX assistance. Mr. Pat McGuire, DOE-SR, answered that both the third and fifth bullets within the position statement conveyed the CAB’s desire use H-Canyon to disposition SNF. CAB member Hayes asked if it incorporated some of the MOX processing, or would H-Canyon actions increase greatly. Mr. McGuire answered that “yes they will.” CAB member Hayes asked if there would be additional funding and would it impact activities the CAB was interested in. Mr. McGuire replied that the funding to provide fuel to the MOX facility was incrementally funded by NNSA, which was above the funding provided by EM. He stated that the funding NNSA provided was adequate for this year. CAB member Hayes stated that the CAB hoped to understand that funding for ongoing cleanup programs would not be eliminated or reduced due to MOX activities. Mr. McGuire replied that the EM budget would not be decreased due to NNSA activities for MOX.

CAB Chair Bridges called for a motion, and the position statement for 2013 was approved with 21 votes of approval, no oppositions, and no abstentions. A copy of this position statement has been attached to this document. CAB Chair Bridges continued his update by discussing topics that may challenge the CAB in 2013. He stated he hoped the CAB continued to send recommendations to DOE, while receiving more input from CAB members and the community.

## **Agency Updates**

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

Dr. Dave Moody, DOE-SR, began his update by expressing his appreciation of six members who were leaving the CAB. He presented the three members in attendance with a certificate and letter of appreciation for their dedication to the CAB. He discussed the budget for FY 2013 saying that the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act helped remove some of DOE-SR’s funding constraints. Dr. Moody explained that the act enabled funds to be moved between “buckets.” He mentioned if sequestration did not occur, there would not be additional downsizing at SRS for FY 2013; however, due to the FY 2012 funding situation, DOE-SR reduced the workforce at SRS by 900 people.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if employees were being replaced. Dr. Moody replied that there probably would not be a one to one replacement rate for the 900 employees, but employees were participating in mentoring efforts, as well as being moved around to gain expertise. He said when the FY 2013 budget was released he hoped to evaluate the likelihood of funding the CAB to have downstream meetings again.

Dr. Moody discussed the SWPF, saying that in tight budget times, DOE-SR would possibly increase the budget for SWPF, but not at the detriment of the Liquid Waste program. Dr. Moody stated, “It does not do us any good to have the SWPF operating and not be able to tie it in to process the material.” He stated that in 2013, the Liquid Waste

program anticipated closing tanks five and six, which would mark DOE-SRs continuing commitment to dispositioning High-Level Waste from SRS. He continued his update by discussing the growth of H-Canyon missions, which could potentially result in a growth of funds. Dr. Moody explained that the necessary agreements were in place to begin the blending down of highly enriched uranium (HEU) from Canada for SRS to send to the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).

CAB Chair Bridges asked how long the blend down process would occur. Dr. Moody answered that it would last for a few years. Mr. Pat McGuire commented that the process involved approximately two to three years of shipping the material from Canada to SRS, and then minor modifications would be made to the H-Canyon facility in order to receive and unload the materials. Mr. McGuire stated that once the blend down process began, it would be approximately a six-month campaign.

CAB member Hayes asked if the material that would be blended down was reactor grade and whether TVA had experience in burning this type of fuel. Dr. Moody answered “yes,” the fuel was just like the material SRS previously provided TVA. He stated, “We will take the enriched material, blend it down to the five percent range and it will be fabricated into fuel. So it is just like the material we have done in our previous campaigns.” CAB member Hayes asked if the source of the material was research reactor material. Dr. Moody replied that the source of it was from the “targets” or attempts to reduce proliferation attractive material. He explained that DOE-SR would charge Canada to receive, monitor, blend down, and ship the material to TVA. Dr. Moody stated, “Not a single shipment will leave Canada and arrive at the site until we have the check for the whole project.” CAB member Golden asked whether DOE would be allowed to keep the funds for doing the project. Dr. Moody replied, “Absolutely because this is a work for others, so they are funding the actual work.”

CAB Chair Bridges asked Dr. Moody if DOE-SR had forgotten about “heavy water.” Dr. Moody replied that DOE-SR had not forgotten about heavy water, stating that he was unable to discuss the company that was interested; however, other countries besides Canada were showing interest. Dr. Moody continued his update by discussing the five-year remedy review and the 52 operable units that would be reviewed with EPA and SCDHEC. He stated that in working with state regulators and developing innovative solutions to difficult problems, DOE gained expertise that had international value. He stated that the expertise was used to help locally cleanup SRS, but DOE-SR started doing a better job of communicating internationally. He explained that DOE-SR signed a contract with Fukushima to assist in their cleanup efforts. Dr. Moody noted that this was an example of how SRS’s current cleanup mission tied directly to the fundamental underpinning of Enterprise SRS. Dr. Moody stated the biomass facility, which produces steam for SRS, had successfully operated for a year.

Dr. Moody addressed the CAB’s desire for the High-Level Waste glass canisters to be included within the Department’s response to the BRC; however, he stated, “Right now, the High-Level Waste glass logs are not specifically designated as part of the pilot.” He shared with the CAB that he did not plan to construct a third glass waste storage building, but would like to position the glass logs closer to a “transportation ready configuration.”

CAB member Hayes asked Dr. Moody if he agreed or disagreed with the results of a study conducted at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, that concluded there was no need for retrievability for High-Level Waste and post closure recovery was not needed since the materials had no economic value in terms of national security. She mentioned it seemed to be a great time to expand the vitrification approach and allow more materials go to places like the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).

Dr. Moody stated, “I agree that there are a number of materials that can be disposed in the salt beds without any impact on the overall performance of the repository. I disagree that continued vitrification of all of those materials is going to be necessary.” He also stated, “While I agree with the first part, that a salt repository would be compatible with those materials, it is not clear to me that behind our current program with the liquid High-Level Waste, we need to look at vitrification of used fuel that we choose not to reserve for any future energy value. I think we could dispose of it as it sits.”

CAB member Hayes stated, “So L-Basin, if you are correct, could be packed up and sent out to WIPP.” Dr. Moody explained, “I believe that would be a mistake. Yes, we could from a performance standpoint, but there is tremendous value in the material that is in L-Basin from the standpoint of blend down and providing that material to TVA.” He clarified if DOE-SR was successful in having those endeavors pay for themselves, by recovering those funds, then it

may be a faster disposition path. Dr. Moody mentioned that one of the responses to the BRC was to have a repository available by 2046. He said, "I believe we could be through the materials in L-Basin long before 2046" by blending down and dispositioning the materials to TVA."

CAB member Hayes stated, "I am confused because the language in the strategy plan says a recently completed technical review by Oak Ridge National Lab found that approximately 98 percent of the total current inventory of commercial UNF can proceed to permanent disposal without the need to ensure post closure recovery for reuse."

Dr. Moody replied that the report dealt with economics. He explained that the report CAB member Hayes referred to implied that at least for the next one hundred years, studies conducted by electric power research institutes suggest it would be more economical to mine the uranium and enrich it to five percent than to process the used fuel. He stated, "I believe that is what the study is saying and it has no bearing at all on the 90 percent of enriched material that is sitting in L-Basin, because the value of that is much higher."

He discussed how Enterprise SRS continued to move towards the future and welcomed the opportunity to continue updating the CAB on specific projects of interest. He explained even though SRS did not receive an SMR yet, he believed SMRs were an important part of EMs mission and key to an alternate disposition path for consolidated materials at SRS. He stated, "If it is going to be 2046 before we have a repository for materials, I want another way for some of the materials at SRS to be disposed which is why he believes the SMR's offer that option." Dr. Moody mentioned 2013 would be a challenging year; however, he said he looked forward to the CAB's input as DOE-SR focused on addressing future changes. He then opened the floor for questions.

CAB member Parson asked how DOE-SR interacted with community groups. Dr. Moody stated that DOE-SR attempted to work with all the community groups; however, those groups were independent of DOE-SR, but we do try to educate the public just as the CAB does. He explained that educational outreach was vital in moving forward. CAB member Parson asked if the Department had a list of community groups it routinely reached out to or if DOE-SR typically responds only to requests. Dr. Moody answered that DOE always supports and reaches out to the CAB; however, it goes to each of the individual sites. He explained that any group that wants to understand what is going on at SRS is welcome; however, the easiest thing to do was encourage groups to contact the site since it is hard to know which groups are truly interested. He explained that CAB member Golden asked him to provide a presentation on SRS to her boating club, where he informed "down-streamers" of operations going on at SRS. He also stated that DOE-SR normally interacts with the Community Reuse Organization (CRO) and Chambers of Commerce in South Carolina and Georgia. He explained that he attempted to be in the community as much as his job allowed.

### **Mr. Robe Pope, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

Mr. Pope began his agency update stating that his agency did not have a budget established for the upcoming year. He explained that DOE had agreements with both South Carolina and EPA to provide some funding to continue oversight and involvement of both agencies. He said this year DOE notified the EPA and SCDHEC and explained that they had to cut what DOE-SR was going to provide both agencies. At this time, DOE notified EPA that it would be a seven percent cut. Mr. Pope explained that unless he was in Aiken for a project meeting or site inspection, he would only attend committee meetings online. He explained in the near future, CAB members should look for decision documents on F-Tank farm, TNX area groundwater, and the beginning of decision documents in A-area on a coal ash issue and "steel creek, Dumbarton bay." He said these documents would be available for public review and EPA could discuss these issues at either a committee or full board meeting.

CAB member Burke asked if there were going to be any surprises. Mr. Pope stated there were discussions occurring regarding what to do with coal ash; however, there should not be any surprises. He mentioned that the five-year remedy review, which provides an update of areas at SRS that were cleaned up, was moving closer to a finalization point. He commented that he hoped both the CAB and public would review the five-year review and provide feedback to EPA. He stated the five-year review was mainly used to ensure that the remedies that were established have remained protected. He updated the CAB that EPA also noticed the jump from 2032 to 2042 as an end date for the projects. He explained that DOE put forth that there was a change in mission status and they expect missions at certain places, such as the tank farms and H-Canyon, to extend. He explained that when missions extend, it meant that other areas of the site scheduled to cleanup, could not be done until other missions are completed. He said that

EPA asked DOE to look at subunits the EPA could address such as areas around reactors that are not being utilize; however, the EPA was waiting for DOE to discuss those possibilities.

Mr. Pope mentioned that at the end of February, the Waste Management Symposia would take place, which was the premier meeting to discuss issues of cleanup within the DOE complex. He stated he would attend and discuss interactions with the public. He asked Mr. Kyle Bryant, EPA, to provide an update on the status of Environmental Justice meetings. Mr. Bryant stated the next EJ meeting in the community was scheduled for March 7, 2013 in Beaufort, South Carolina. He stated that this meeting coincided with an Environmental workshop that would be held in Coastal South Carolina, beginning March 8-9, 2013.

### **Mr. Van Keisler, South Carolina Department of Health & Environmental Control (SCDHEC)**

Mr. Keisler explained that on March 1, 2013, SCDHEC would be restructuring from eight regions to four; however, a majority of the impact would be to the health side of the agency. He said the workforce restructuring would produce a cost savings of two million dollars for the agency. CAB Chair Bridges asked if the Aiken office would be impacted. Mr. Keisler replied there would not be any changes in personnel. He explained that the closure modules for tanks five and six were reviewed, and SCDHEC and EPA provided comments back to DOE on January 10, 2013. He explained that the 30-day public comment period would begin February 20, 2013 and there would be a public meeting on the second full week of March. Mr. Keisler mentioned that SCDHEC and EPA have attended seven meetings, one site tour, reviewed 24 documents, and four appendices to the FFA. He then mentioned that the Environmental Surveillance Oversight Program (ESOP) was responsible for providing independent environmental monitoring around SRS, and should release its data report before the next Full Board Meeting in March.

### **Public Comments**

Mr. Tom Clements, ANA, discussed the accountability and credibility of the CAB, noting that he appreciated CAB Chair Bridges for announcing his decision to join the CNTA board. He stated that the credibility of the CAB should be somewhat independent of DOE and public interest groups, which means CAB members involved in other groups, “with a very specific agenda, like the CNTA” hurt the credibility of the CAB. He commented that most of the meetings discussion focused on future missions at SRS, but he encouraged the CAB to focus on cleanup work. Mr. Clements addressed his opinion of outreach activities DOE and contractors provide to the public. He said that CAB members should make sure their opinions are unbiased and well-informed. He mentioned the MOX presentation scheduled for the afternoon might answer questions regarding the massive cost overruns and schedule problems.

Ms. Bobbie Paul, Women’s Action for New Directions (WAND), stated that she looked forward to the presentation on Environmental Monitoring in Georgia. She encouraged the CAB to choose a “science-based decision” primarily before a “consensus based decision” when composing recommendations on waste and a repository. Ms. Paul commented that if MOX reached completion, then the CAB, as the cleanup vehicle for the environment and safety of the public, should take a hard look at solutions to deal with the waste problem.

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

CAB member Parson mentioned the presentations for the today’s meeting, but briefly explained that there have been several questions and concerns from the public regarding monitoring in Georgia. She explained that Ms. Gail Whitney’s presentation should address those concerns. Since time permitted after both presentations, CAB member Parson addressed the status of four recommendations with her committee. She briefly explained that recommendation 279 was open but wanted to discuss Dr. Moody’s response letter. She stated the only reason the FD&SR Committee decided to leave the recommendation open was to ensure the CAB had enough time to provide input once Mr. Hennessey provided the presentation on the proposed changes made to the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA). She stated she felt the timeline moving forward was fine since DOE agreed to provide a presentation in August of the tentative proposed changes to the FFA, the major proposed changes to the FFA in November, and the CAB should be given to DOE by the end of the year. She stated her only concern was that it would be helpful if the FD&SR Committee could have the information before the meetings in order to understand the material. She proposed to close this recommendation as “closed complete.”

She moved on to discuss Dr. Moody's letter in response to recommendation 283 stating that she felt items number two through number five were adequately addressed; however, item one was not. She proposed to close this recommendation as "closed-incomplete" since the requirements of this recommendation are long in nature. CAB member Artisha Bolding agreed with the decision to change the status of the recommendation since item number one will be an ongoing process. CAB member Nangle also agreed with CAB member Parson's decision.

CAB member Thomas Barnes discussed recommendation 293, stating that a response was received on November 30, 2012. He commented that the response lacked specific details, before he mentioned that the CAB would like to receive a presentation of the cost, timeline, and additional impacts of implementing the Safety Board's Recommendation. He proposed to move this recommendation from "pending" to "open," and CAB member Parson agreed. She stated the FD&SR Committee was extremely interested in this topic and would most likely make a decision about recommendation 293 once a presentation was given. She asked if the presentation could be presented at a Full Board Meeting, instead of the NM Committee meeting, in order for all the committees to receive the information.

CAB member Golden addressed recommendation 294, stating that a response was received on November 30, 2012. She read and explained DOE's response to each recommendation item before CAB member Parson provided a suggestion to DOE's response to item number five. She suggested adding the phrase "comment period is closed" and "final document" beside each environmental report as the comment and finalization periods occur. She explained this suggestion would allow the public to follow the actions of various environmental reports. CAB member Golden suggested leaving recommendation 294 "open" until the next board meeting so DOE can have time to make the new changes.

**PRESENTATION: Federal Facility Agreement Appendix E Major Proposed Changes,**  
**Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR**

Mr. Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR, began by stating the purpose of his presentation was to provide information in response to recommendation 279. He explained he would provide an update of revision zero, submitted in November, and revision one that was due for submittal in a few days. He briefly discussed the background of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA), before providing an overview of Appendix E. He provided a diagram, which showed the milestones for the three appendices, E.1, E.2, and E.3, which make up Appendix E. He stated, "DOE updates Appendix E annually and submits for review to SCDHEC and EPA in November." He provided the "generic timeline" or schedule to prepare, submit, revise, and issue Appendix E. He provided a flow diagram to explain the documents that are necessary to reach the milestones within Appendix E. He continued by explaining FY 2013 FFA Appendix E and a few milestones that would be reached in E.1 for FY 2014 and E. 2 for FY 2015.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if anything troublesome was discovered in the five-year review. Mr. Hennessey explained that at that time, nothing had been discovered. CAB Chair Bridges asked if the flow diagram was being fine-tuned. Mr. Hennessey answered that over the years, several of these documents have been combined, which makes the process easier.

Mr. Hennessey stated, "This year was the first year where the Appendix E reflected the lengthening of the EM program baseline at the Savannah River Site, extending operations out to 2042." He then listed the activities for program extension in H-Area, K-Area, L-Area, N-Area, and A-Area. He explained since missions in these five major areas were extended, the Integrator Operable Units (IOU) for each of these areas were also extended. He provided the SRS Area Completion Plan chart to the CAB to explain the different milestone extensions.

CAB member Hazen asked what a watershed was. Mr. Hennessey explained that a watershed was a large land area that drained by a stream or its tributaries.

CAB member Burke asked if the area completion chart represented that F-Tank farm would be cleaned up six years from the original plan, and if the delay dealt with emptying the tank farm. Mr. Hennessey stated that the chart did not represent any new system plan for emptying tanks. Mr. Terry Spears stated that DOE would research a specific answer and provide it to the CAB as soon as possible. CAB Chair Bridges asked where S-Area was located on the area completion chart. Mr. Hennessey replied that there is no S-Area within the FFA.

Mr. Hennessey explained that when missions were extended, EPA and SCDHEC asked DOE to find smaller projects within the areas that will not be complete until later. He stated there is work that will have to be done in these areas so work will continuously be occurring.

CAB member Parson asked where the schedule for smaller projects was located on the area completion chart. Mr. Hennessey replied that DOE did not have it yet, but would be working to develop it in the next three to six months. He also mentioned that next year's Appendix E would have the results of DOE identifying those projects. CAB member Parson asked if the Lower Three Runs watershed was not a new unit, why was it starting this year. Mr. Hennessey stated that the chart reflected that DOE issued a decision document in 2013, to reflect the cleanup work that was done last summer. CAB member Parson asked how could the CAB better understand the budget implications of milestone changes. Mr. Doug Hintze, DOE-SR, stated DOE could provide a presentation of the Integrated Lifecycle Cost Estimate.

CAB member Burke asked about the different reasons the time horizon extended. Mr. Pat McGuire explained that since the FFA was composed, certain projects for L-Area, K-Area, and H-Area have evolved due to programmatic decisions.

### **DISCUSSION: Environmental Monitoring in Georgia, Gail Whitney, DOE-SR**

Ms. Gail Whitney, DOE-SR, explained the purpose of her presentation was to provide the CAB and public with an overview of the environmental monitoring activities conducted in the Central Savannah River Area (CSRA), identify monitoring activities SRS performs in Georgia, and present changes that were being considered to improve the communication of environmental monitoring with the public. She provided a list of agencies, departments, and companies who monitor in the CSRA and Savannah River before discussing a chart that displayed the total amount of samples collected in 2011. She explained that the chart was composed of data collected by SCDHEC, Plant Vogtle, and SRS to categorize the sampling locations within different states. She explained that the basic monitoring performed by these organizations was based on "pathways" of how contaminants reach the public through the air, water, animals, and sediment. She discussed two charts that represented samples that were collected at SRS and offsite. Ms. Whitney commented that if the sampling conducted on SRS was not included within the chart, with the exception of the river swamp because it is located on the South Carolina side, the amount of sampling in Georgia would be equal to or more than South Carolina.

CAB member Nina Hazen asked if there was a Georgia counterpart of DHEC, aside from the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, that monitors in the CSRA and Savannah River. Mr. Rob Pope, EPA, answered that the Georgia agency was part of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and they were called the Environmental Protection Division.

Ms. Whitney provided several maps to indicate where actual samples are collected in Georgia. Each map showed the specific location where air, water, fish, sediment, and Thermoluminescent Dosimeter (TLD) monitoring samples were collected. She shifted the discussion to explain various changes SRS was considering to improve communication with the public about environmental monitoring. She explained that the proposed revisions would be included in the Annual Site Environmental Report and Summary that is released in October. She mentioned that SRS conducts a comprehensive environmental monitoring program in Georgia and South Carolina while the SRS environmental monitoring program is reviewed annually to ensure adequate monitoring is conducted to quantify the impacts that SRS operations have on the public and environment.

CAB member Earl Sheppard asked how many samples are "24 hour composites or grab samples." He also asked if monitoring results were collected to remain at SRS or were results reported to SCDHEC as enforceable numbers. Ms. Whitney explained that she could provide him with a list of composite and grab samples. She explained that the environmental monitoring program was comprised of two components: "effluent monitoring" and "environmental surveillance." The effluent part monitors potential contaminants on site, which are enforceable by SCDHEC; however, surveillance samples are not enforceable by SCDHEC, but were used to ensure the control mechanisms, in the effluent part of the program, are operating correctly.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if Ms. Whitney's presentation would convince the average citizen in Georgia and Georgia's Department of Natural Resources. Ms. Whitney commented that she could not speak for DNR; however, she felt that the average citizen would be pleased with this presentation.

CAB member Parson thanked Ms. Whitney for the presentation and for her desire to communicate more about environmental monitoring with the public. She suggested that in the future, Ms. Whitney could explain why certain areas of the maps are not monitored in order to prevent confusion of why there were blank areas on the maps.

CAB member Louie Chavis asked if mercury contamination was monitored further down the Savannah River. Ms. Whitney responded that SRS does monitor that through fish and water samples. Ms. Teresa Eddy, SRNS, commented that mercury levels had been steady for the past five years; however, she would have to find the exact figures.

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

CAB member Hayes reviewed her presentation from the day before. She said the committee currently had 11 open recommendations, two pending recommendations, and three draft recommendations. She welcomed Mr. Jeffrey Allison, NNSA, to begin his presentation.

### **PRESENTATION: Fissile Material Disposition, Jeffrey Allison, NNSA**

Mr. Jeff Allison, NNSA, stated he would provide an overview of NNSA and the Fissile Materials Disposition (FMD) Program. He stated that defense programs, naval reactors, defense nuclear nonproliferation, and emergency operations were the major mission programs for NNSA. He explained each mission area before focusing specifically on the defense nuclear nonproliferation. He stated, "This program is designed to provide the systems and capabilities to detect nuclear materials." He listed the five goals of the defense nuclear nonproliferation program; however, he stated he would only be focusing on the goal to "Reduce inventories of surplus weapon-usable fissile materials in a safe, secure, and irreversible manner." He provided a chart that represented how NNSA and DOE work together at SRS. He explained that work performed at SRS falls under several national and international agreements such as the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and other presidential commitments. He explained the strategies of the FMD Nonproliferation program before addressing plutonium disposition within the United States.

CAB member Hayes said she understood there was a collaboration between NNSA and the Russians to eliminate fissile materials; however, she asked if the Russians were planning to process their material through a MOX system. Mr. Allison replied the Russians planned to produce MOX fuel and burn it in their reactors. CAB member Hayes asked if there were other options for processing the fuel besides MOX. Mr. Allison explained that several studies determined that MOX fuel was the best method. CAB member Hayes asked about the type of reactor that the Russians would be using to burn the MOX fuel. Mr. Allison explained that it was a "fast reactor and would be operated under non breeding conditions." CAB member Hayes asked if weapons grade plutonium MOX fuel had ever been burned in any reactor in the United States. Mr. Allison replied, "Yes, we did a test in the Duke reactor back in the last decade," which was weapons-grade plutonium.

Mr. Allison provided a flow chart of the FMD program to explain the process of what is occurring at SRS, before discussing construction of the MOX facility. He explained that like the SWPF, the MOX facility has also experienced construction delays and NNSA is currently reviewing a baseline change proposal for the project.

CAB Bridges asked how much funding was needed for MOX to become operational. Mr. Allison answered that the current baseline was "\$4.8 billion and to start making fuel in 2018;" however, he said that when an estimate became available, he could brief the CAB. CAB Chair Bridges asked if NNSA would be able to "get their money back" after selling MOX fuel. Mr. Allison stated, "We are probably not going to make money on this, but the idea is to deal with the proliferation issue and to eliminate 34 metric tons of plutonium."

Mr. Allison provided two images, one from July 2007 and December 2012. He reviewed the images and showed different elements of the facility before discussing construction of the Waste Solidification Building (WSB). He also provided two images of the WSB, one from January 2010 and another from December 2012. He explained the

plutonium feedstock for the MOX facility and the MOX fuel experience. He stated, “MOX fuel is currently being used in 31 reactors worldwide, and has been used for decades.” He discussed customers for MOX fuel stating, “NNSA continues to have utilities interested in MOX fuel, and is confident that we will have utilities under contract when the MOX facility is complete and prepared to provide fuel.” He stated that one strategy NNSA was using to find customers was consulting with various fuel fabricators and allowing them to market the fuel to their utility customers. He explained the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement (PMDA), which was signed by the United States and Russia, requires at least 34 metric tons of U.S. and Russian weapons-grade plutonium be dispositioned in order to eliminate material for at least 17,000 nuclear weapons. He then discussed the Russian Plutonium Disposition program, which is similar to the United States’ plan except it will irradiate MOX fuel in Russian “fast reactors.” He stated that the United States and Russia were working with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to develop a monitoring and inspection regime to ensure PMDA requirements are met.

CAB member Hayes asked what the storage plan would be for MOX fuel if a customer did not become available. Mr. Allison explained his beliefs that once MOX fuel became available, a vendor would purchase it.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if there were any requirements that the fuel must be irradiated within the United States. Mr. Allison stated that he would have to find an answer to that; however, NNSA believes there will be customers in the United States for MOX fuel.

### **Public Comments**

Ms. Courtney Hanson, WAND, thanked the CAB for putting Environmental Monitoring in Georgia on the agenda. She stated that the issue of monitoring in Georgia has been an issue for several years, and she hoped the CAB would improve public outreach efforts.

Ms. Bobbie Paul, WAND, also expressed her appreciation of Ms. Gail Whitney’s presentation; however, she felt the material within the presentation was not enough to satisfy the monitoring that should be conducted in Georgia. She stated that the Georgia Environmental Protection Division experienced a 40 percent cut over the last five years. She explained that the lack of funding for monitoring in Georgia was an environmental justice issue and asked the CAB to consider having a new committee to handle these types of concerns. She informed the CAB that WAND created their own “citizen’s guide” to try to understand what the citizens want to know about environmental issues.

Mr. Tom Clements, ANA, commented on the MOX program. He thanked CAB member Hayes for her concern with the MOX facility. He stated for the last two years, he was told that the cost of the MOX project was being “re-baselined.” Mr. Clements stated that if it was still being re-baselined, then concerns should be raised regarding DOE’s ability to manage the project. He encouraged the CAB to keep asking questions about the MOX program.

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

CAB member Burke introduced Mr. Brent Gifford, SRR, to begin his presentation on the ARP/MCU Lifecycle Enhancements and Operating Performance.

#### **PRESENTATION: Actinide Removal Project/ Modular Caustic Side Solvent Extraction Unit (ARP/MCU) Lifecycle Enhancements & Operating Performance, Brent Gifford, SRR**

Mr. Brent Gifford, SRR, stated the purpose of his presentation was to provide an update of the operating performance and lifecycle enhancements of the ARP/MCU. He provided a copy of the CAB “Waste and Material Flow Path” in order to show where the ARP/MCU is located at SRS. He presented the diagram of the salt disposition process of the ARP/MCU and explained the process of how the salt solution flows through several interconnected facilities. He discussed the mission of the ARP/MCU, which was to pretreat salt solution for disposal, extend the operational life while mitigating the impact of the delay in starting the SWPF, and to provide operational experience for the salt processing program. He stated that the first phase of life extension modifications were completed in the spring during a six month outage.

CAB Chair Bridges asked what the nominal lifetime was for the ARP/MCU when the facilities were initially designed. Mr. Gifford replied that originally, the ARP/MCU had an operational life of three years and a design life

of five years. CAB Chair Bridges asked Mr. Gifford if in retrospect, the ARP/MCU had all the right design criteria. Mr. Gifford replied that he was proud of the project overall since he had been a part of the project since conception and now had the responsibility to oversee the operations of the facility.

CAB member Hayes asked whether the actinides and cesium that go to the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) were ever mixed together. Mr. Gifford replied that it all comes together at the intersection of DWPF. CAB member Hayes asked where the mixing occurs. Mr. Terry Spears stated the materials are mixed well within DWPF resulting in a uniformed mixture of both salt and sludge.

Mr. Gifford described the initial timeline for construction, which began in January 2004 and ended in April 2008. He displayed several pictures of key integrated processing facilities used in the ARP/MCU process. Mr. Gifford provided a chart, which displayed the operational performance, which showed the cumulative amounts of salt that had been processed from Tank 49, since the ARP/MCU began operating in 2008. Mr. Gifford stated, "In January 2013, the facility reached three million gallons since startup. He discussed some of the operational performance issues with the five different salt batches. He explained that with the fifth salt batch, the ARP/MCU continued to optimize the process and increase process attainment. Mr. Gifford discussed the lifecycle enhancements that were made by replacing high-risk equipment to extend salt processing capabilities until the SWPF began operating. He provided pictures of the replaced equipment stating that each enhancement resulted in better processing through the facility. He stated plans are underway to implement next generation solvent at the MCU beginning with an outage in July 2013. He mentioned that modifications must be made to the facility before supporting the next generation solvent; however, the ARP/MCU has continued to provide successful interim salt processing while the lifecycle enhancements set the stage for extended ARP/MCU operations.

CAB member Burke asked if the next generation solvent could cause a capacity increase or only an efficiency increase. Mr. Gifford replied "just an efficiency increase." He said an increase in capacity could come, but the facility would require additional investments so the filtration system could be modified to handle higher throughputs.

CAB Chair Bridges asked how the cesium was removed from the solvent. Mr. Gifford explained how the cesium passes through several contactors, to eventually be sent to DWPF in an acid stream.

**PRESENTATION: Salt Waste Processing Facility Start-up Plans and Transition to Long-term Management Structure, Tony Polk, DOE-SR**

Mr. Tony Polk, DOE-SR, stated the purpose of his presentation was to provide an update of the SWPF. He provided two images that compared the construction progress of the SWPF from May 2011 to November 2011. He provided a labeled image of the SWPF to illustrate the various parts, support facilities, and construction elements that were recently completed. He continued by showing images of the large American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) vessels, tanks in the Actinide Finishing Facility, the operating deck, and high roof construction.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if continuing with construction when the ASME vessels were delayed allowed for any mitigation of time. Mr. Polk explained that construction resequencing enabled DOE to mitigate any additional delays associated with the facility. Mr. Polk said that the high roof was recently completed, making the facility ready for the final "membrane placement" once the concrete dried. He said this was a major milestone since the facility would be completely dried in.

Mr. Polk listed significant construction accomplishments. Regarding the accomplishment of testing being completed for the "Modified Monosodium Titanate," CAB Chair Bridges asked about the function of the Modified Monosodium Titanate. Mr. Polk replied that the material is used to repel actinides in the waste feed, which allowed for the clarified salt solution to move through the process.

Mr. Polk provided an explanation of specific cost and construction increases stating, "The large ASME vessels dominated the delays and cost increases." He added that in June 2012, the ASME vessels were delivered two years behind schedule, which introduced an even larger delay since the vessels were intended to be placed in the facility at the ground floor and the rest of the facility be built over the top. Mr. Polk explained that the delay caused DOE to "resequence how construction had been planned."

CAB member Hayes asked where the large ASME vessels were constructed. Mr. Polk replied that the vessels were built in the United States by American vendors. He continued discussing additional delays such as other Nuclear Quality Assurance (NQA-1) vendor performance, piping, welding, and design requirements. He explained that the delivery of the large ASME vessels, and other parts that played a safety role in the facility, were DOE's major focus; however, due to the lack of nuclear commercial business within the United States, both DOE and the contractor, Parsons, realized the extent of the NQA-1 problems. DOE took action and brought in individuals who were experienced in NQA-1 construction, piping, and welding, even though it resulted in cost increases and delays. He mentioned that DOE was able to mitigate issues from the delivery of other NQA-1 deliverables by gaining this individuals with additional expertise. He mentioned the design changes that occurred were associated with the construction re-sequencing and delays with the vendors.

He continued his presentation by discussing impacts and challenges for completing construction of the SWPF. He explained that the Liquid Waste Program is working closely with the SWPF; however, he said "It makes no real sense for SWPF to start up and for Waste Disposition not to be prepared to provide feed and vice versa." He explained that approaches for construction and budget are being developed to synchronize SWPF start-up with the Waste Disposition system. He explained in order for the Deputy Secretary to establish a new baseline for completing the project, the government must complete an Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE), Independent Cost Estimate (ICE), and an External Independent Review (EIR). He also mentioned that DOE is awaiting a proposal from Parsons to determine the appropriate cost for the remaining work.

Mr. Polk explained the next steps for SWPF construction were to maintain construction progress and address funding issues. He explained that the IGCE was completed to inform DOE's position on cost and schedule, while a contract modification will be necessary; however, ESAAB approval was targeted for the middle of November. Mr. Polk mentioned that funds were reprogrammed in 2012. CAB Chair Bridges asked how much was money was reprogrammed in 2012. Mr. Polk replied that in 2012, \$34 million of "operating dollars" were reprogrammed to "construction dollars." He stated that with approval from the Deputy Secretary through the ESAAB process, the necessary funding would be aligned to complete the project.

CAB Chair Bridges asked if at one time the SWPF was supposed to be operational in 2009. Mr. Polk replied that the original startup was anticipated for 2009; however, the original design was modified and startup moved to 2011. Mr. Polk stated, "Additional changes occurred, as a result from input from DNFSB, and the facility changed from a performance category 2 to a performance category three facility." CAB Chair Bridges clarified that the projection of starting operations in 2011, changed to 2015. Mr. Polk answered "yes," but stated the year 2015 was no longer achievable based on recent delays. CAB Chair Bridges asked Mr. Polk what would be a "guestimate" for completion of the facility. Mr. Polk replied, "Sometime in 2018 we should be able to start the facility."

CAB member Burke asked what changed in the last six months to increase the startup date to 2018. He also asked Mr. Polk if any technical issues could delay operations beyond 2018. Mr. Polk explained the delay in the NQA-1 large ASME vessels, cost factors, and NQA-1 piping and welding issues. He continued stating that further delays were possible, but DOE planned to mitigate and eliminate potential risks that could cause further delays of constructing the facility. CAB member Burke asked if possible future delays would affect the current enforceable agreement DOE-SR has with SCDHEC. Mr. Van Keisler commented that the enforceable agreement in place, recognizes October 2015 as the date SCDHEC expects the SWPF to become operational; however, SCDHEC had not received a formal request from DOE to change the date on the permit. Mr. Keisler mentioned that if SCDHEC received a formal request to change the date on the agreement, SCDHEC would evaluate the request, but DOE must do everything it can to complete the facility on that date or as close as possible.

CAB Chair Bridges stated that he understood the two-year delay due to the ASME vessels; however, he asked how the remaining seven years influenced the operational startup date that changed from 2009 to 2018. Mr. Polk stated that the additional seven years dealt with the facility switching from a performance category 2 facility to a performance category 3 facility. CAB Chair Bridges asked if achieving the 2018 startup goal was a funding question or a technical question. Mr. Polk replied, "It is not a technical question because there are no technical issues with this facility." CAB Chair Bridges asked when the DWPF would be shut down with the 2018 SWPF startup date. Terry Spears stated that there is no plan to shut down a critical facility, like the DWPF.

## Letter Voting

### “CAB Charter Expansion”

CAB Chair Bridges called for a motion to accept the letter. The CAB had 21 votes for approval, no oppositions, and no abstentions.

A copy of this letter has been attached to this document.

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

CAB member Golden reminded the CAB that the Board Beat newsletter was released for the quarter. She reminded everyone that the website address was [cab.srs.gov](http://cab.srs.gov). She said that everyone could begin voting for CAB Chair and Vice Chair and the results would be announced by the end of the day.

### **Committee Chair Elections**

CAB member Golden revealed the results of the Committee Chair election. CAB members elected Mr. Ed Burke to Chair the WM Committee Chair, Mr. Clint Nangle as the S&LM Committee Chair, Ms. Marolyn Parson as the FD&SR Committee Chair, Ms. Rose Hayes as the NM Committee Chair, and Ms. Nina Hazen as A&O Committee Chair.

### **Strategic & Legacy Management (S&LM) Committee Overview- Clint Nangle, Chair**

CAB member Nangle expressed his appreciation of CAB member Watson. He also stated that the new Co-Vice Chairs of the S&LM Committee were Bob Doerr and James Streeter. He introduced Karen Adams and asked her to begin her presentation.

### **PRESENTATION: Asset Revitalization Initiative Update, Karen Adams, DOE-SR**

Ms. Karen Adams, DOE-SR, said the purpose of her presentation was to provide a report on efforts of the DOE-HQ Asset Revitalization Initiative (ARI) task force and describe accomplishments and paths forward for the SRS Community Reuse Team. She provided a brief background of how the ARI was a department-wide effort to advance the beneficial reuse of assets such as land, facilities, infrastructure, equipment, technologies, natural resources, and highly skilled workforce. Ms. Adams stated, “The vision is to have a more efficient business environment, with public and private collaboration, to maximize the benefits to achieve energy and cleanup goals.” She explained that individual task forces were cross-functional and included various combinations of DOE, NNSA program offices, and field site offices. The task forces were responsible to “identify problems” and implement ARI projects and programs when challenges arose at individual sites around the DOE complex. She explained that the task force was set up with four different delivery teams, which were energy, modernization, diversification, and real property and assets.

She discussed the current focus for ARI efforts with the Community Reuse Project team was to maximize asset use, availability, and potential reuse to promote a more efficient infrastructure at SRS. She explained the community reuse team was developing a preliminary 10-year strategic road map, identifying excess assets for reuse in the community through the SRS Community Reuse Organization (CRO), continuing efforts with the Department of Defense (DOD) to use land for training, and participating with the HQ ARI task force.

Ms. Adams provided images of completed, current, and future projects the CRO planned to perform for DOE-SR. She explained the CRO completed the project to reuse the C-Area fuel tanks before discussing the current project to remove abandoned steam lines, railroad tracks, and wooden MOX shipping containers from SRS. She mentioned in October 2012, the CRO provided the wooden shipping boxes to construction programs at two schools in Bamberg and Barnwell counties. She said since January 2013, the CRO has provided wood to seven schools. She explained that by providing local schools with approximately “71 tons of wood” approximately \$70,000 per year was saved in disposal costs. She said in the future that the CRO would remove A-Area trailers, the 681-1G pump house, D-Area

coal, and L-Area machine shop equipment. She stated the SRS ARI task force would continue supporting the DOE-HQ ARI task force while working with SRS CRO to create a “leaner and meaner SRS.”

CAB Chair Bridges asked if the SRS ARI task worked only with the CRO. Ms. Adams answered that there were various aspects of the ARI program; however, the current focus was to assist the CRO since there was not additional funding to focus on other initiatives within the ARI program. CAB Chair Bridges asked if the CRO would be able to reuse any equipment from the D-Area power plant. Ms. Adams answered that only deactivation had been done; however, individuals have inspected the equipment to determine its value.

### **DISCUSSION: Budget Update, Doug Hintze, DOE-SR, Patrick McGuire, DOE-SR, and Paul Hunt, SRNS**

Mr. Doug Hintze, DOE-SR, explained that Mr. Pat McGuire, DOE-SR, and Mr. Paul Hunt, SRNS, would assist in answering additional questions throughout the discussion. He stated that the sequestration was delayed from January 2, until March 1. He explained that the Continuing Resolution (CR) runs out on March 27, 2013, and DOE-SR still did not have final appropriations. Mr. Hintze said beginning in 2012 under a CR meant that Congress expected DOE-SR to operate under the budget received in FY 2012. He explained at first, it was not too bad, because FY 2012 and FY 2013 budgets were almost identical; however, due to the President’s FY 2013 budget request, Senate and House markups, and the sequestration, DOE-SR was unable at the beginning of the year to operate as if the site was still under the FY 2012 funding level. He mentioned in lieu of the sequestration, the Department held back an additional five percent of the budget. He explained with all the cuts, the net outcome significantly impacted Savannah River Nuclear Solution (SRNS) since it handled the management and operating (M&O) aspects of SRS. He stated due to the Pension Relief Act, DOE was able to save approximately “\$65 million on the EM side” by making the necessary pension contributions.

He stated the most difficult aspect was dealing with the CR since DOE-SR did not know the amount SRS would receive for the entire year. He explained that DOE-SR had funds to operate through March 27, 2013; however, if sequestration occurred, the government must save approximately “\$109 billion for the year,” which would result in budget reductions for defense and non-defense programs by approximately 8 to 9 percent. He stated with the new Congress, any previous submittals to the old Congress no longer existed, which meant there was no longer a President’s budget request, Senate or House markups. He said DOE-SR was currently operating under the CR, which was 48 percent, because March 27, 2013 was 48 percent of the year.

He explained that problems would arise if sequestration went into effect on March 1, because DOE-SR would only have half a year to absorb the impacts of what would have dealt with for the rest of the year. He said, “In other words, it is doubling the impact DOE-SR would have.” He mentioned that DOE-SR was unable to reduce its execution level significantly in anticipation of the 10 percent sequestration. He explained the actions that were done to handle the budget issues and said he planned to present them at the March Full Board Meeting.

CAB member Doerr asked what baseline DOE-SR would use if sequestration triggered a budget reduction for non-defense programs. Mr. Hintze said the baseline was based off FY 2012 and if sequestration occurred, the only way to save funding would be to furlough employees. He stated that several of SRNS’s activities would move toward a “minimum safe” type of operation, while the Liquid Waste program would continue operating through the year.

CAB Chair Bridges asked how difficult it was to shift money from different accounts for different programs. Mr. Hintze explained that DOE-SR had to go back to 48 percent of the year and if sequestration occurred, an additional 10 percent off, the site would “fall over the cliff.” Mr. Hintze explained that all the way from October to when the new Congress came in, DOE-SR was operating at a significantly reduced level. He said SRS would see a little bit of light at the end of the tunnel from January through March; however, when March arrived, SRS could be impacted again if sequestration occurs for the second half of the year, especially since it was unknown what the CR would be. Mr. Hintze stated that at the March Full Board Meeting, he would provide a presentation to show the differences in FY 2012 and FY 2013, and hopefully the FY 2013 budget would be available.

CAB member Nangle asked what the total workforce population at SRS was, which Mr. Hintze stated “approximately 7,000 to 7,500 people.” CAB member Nangle requested from time to time throughout the year for DOE to provide the CAB with a workforce population status in order for the CAB to remain focused about talking

about jobs and doing anything the board can to keep jobs going. CAB Chair Bridges addressed CAB member Nangle stating that site population employment is one of the indicators Mr. Rich Olsen, DOE-SR, provides within his quarterly report. CAB member Nangle asked if SRS would take an approximate 20 percent impact if sequestration went into effect for the second half of the year. Mr. Hintze replied, "That is correct."

CAB member Burke asked "assuming sequestration goes into effect, will there be enough money to fund SWPF and MOX at the anticipated level, based upon what we are seeing right now." Mr. Hintze stated that he could not speak for MOX, but with the EM program, the SWPF received approximately \$180 million to sustain the current rate of construction for the rest of the year. Mr. Hintze stated, "SWPF is okay for the year."

CAB member Doerr asked if DOE-SR was lowering expenses as the Recovery Act money began depleting. Mr. Hintze replied that DOE-SR completed several projects with the Recovery Act funding and as the Recovery Act began, DOE-SR hired approximately 3,000 employees; however, it was understood that those employees would leave once the Recovery Act ended.

### **Public Comments**

CAB member Howard thanked everyone he worked with while serving six years on the CAB. He stated the six years he served on the CAB was an enriching experience. He was thankful that he learned more information about specific activities and areas of the site than he had while working 25 years at SRS. He was appreciative of the opportunity to provide input, and receive feedback from DOE, about the activities occurring at SRS. He looked forward to participating in CAB meetings as a member of the public to see how things progress.

Ms. Susan Corbett, Sierra Club, read a letter written by Ms. Debbie Parker, the Legislative Director of the Conservation of Voters of South Carolina. The letter addressed her opposition to import waste "under any condition, including under the pretexts of interim or consolidated spent fuel storage or reprocessing." She asked the CAB to consider including citizens who have different opinions about some of the topics the CAB discusses. She asked if individuals with "differing opinions" could provide a presentation at the March Full Board Meeting.

A copy of this letter has been attached to this document.

Mr. Jessie Young, a member of the public, stated that he hoped the funding for cleanup efforts remained persistent. He commented that his opinion of SRS was "to protect the people of South Carolina from any accidental poisoning by the various and dangerous wastes that are stored here." He stated the recently formed citizens group "Don't Waste Aiken" are completely against interim storage and do not agree with SRS expanding its mission to bring the United States' supply of SNF to Aiken. He thanked members of the CAB for their input in protecting the surrounding community.

CAB member Watson stated that her time on the CAB was gratifying. She expressed her appreciation of the CAB members and thanked the CAB Support Team for "holding everything together." She asked each CAB member to reflect on the CAB's mission statement while striving to provide advice and recommendations to DOE regarding EM issues. She planned to attend future meetings and continue building relationships she made on the CAB.

Ms. Connie Young, a member of the public, stated she recently began attending CAB meetings. She expressed her concerns and frustrations with the lack of a budget for the upcoming year. She stated her disapproval of creating projects that require additional funding from the federal government. She thanked the CAB for all their hard work they do and encouraged them to keep informing the public.

**~Meeting Adjourned**