

**Meeting Minutes
January 24-25, 2011
Hilton Head, SC, Full Board Meeting**

Monday, January 24 Attendance:

CAB

Tabitha Barrett
Dr. Emile Bernard
Manuel Bettencourt
Dr. Donald Bridges
Edward Burke
Art Domby
Kathe Golden
Judith Greene-McLeod
Lee Harley-Fitts
Dr. Rose Hayes
Stanley Howard
Dr. K. Jayaraman-**ABSENT**
Ranowul Jzar
Cleveland Latimore
Denise Long
Joe Ortaldo
Dr. Marolyn Parson
Skyye Vereen
John Snedeker-**ABSENT**
Dr. Gerald Wadley
Sarah Watson
Alex Williams

Agency Liaisons/Regulators

David Williams, EPA
Robert Pope, EPA
Cathy Amoroso, EPA
Kyle Bryant, EPA
Rhelyn Finch, EPA
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC
Kim Newell, SCDHEC
Van Keisler, SCDHEC
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC

DOE/Other

Dr. Dave Moody, DOE-SR
Rebecca Craft, DOE-SR
Patrick McGuire, DOE-SR
Terry Spears, DOE-SR
Doug Hintze, DOE-SR
Helen Belencan, DOE-SR
Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR
David Hoel, DOE-SR
John Lopez, DOE-SR
Wade Whitaker, DOE-SR
Zack Smith, DOE-SR

Contractors

Bethany Raines, PEC
Tiajuana Cochnauer, USFS-SR
Sonny Goldston, SRNS
Jeannette Hyatt, SRNS
Nancye Bethuren, SRR
Ginger Dickert, SRR
Steve Thomas, SRR
Erica Williams, V3
Ashley Whitaker, V3
James Tanner, V3
Jenny Freeman, V3
Bill Brizes, V3

Stakeholders

John Gadd
Tom Clements
Karen Patterson
Bobbi Paul
Dianne Valentin
Theresa Kerrigan
Emily Neagle

Jenny Freeman, V3, served as meeting facilitator and opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda, and announcing a CAB Work Plan Development meeting to be held on February 3.

SRS CAB 2010 Work Plan Review-Bill Brizes, V3

Mr. Brizes first explained the process followed to create the CAB Work Plan. He stated that in 2010 the Work Plan was created via email, but in 2011 the process will be slightly different as there will a meeting held to discuss the Work Plan on February 3. He encouraged CAB members to add to the work plan topics that Doug Hintze would be presenting if they wanted to.

CAB member Donald Bridges asked who should make the request to add more topics. Mr. Brizes answered that each committee Chair should talk it out with his or her committee members, and then get together with the Chair of the Board to draft a letter to be sent to DOE that asks for the additional topic.

He then stated the committees reviewed 50 presentations in committee meetings during 2010. He listed how many presentations each individual committee had during 2010. He said an additional 52 presentations

were made at the Full Board meetings in 2010. Mr. Brizes listed additional activities during 2010 that supported the Work Plan topics.

He reviewed a “scorecard” that listed how many work plan topics each committee addressed. He announced that the Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation (FD&SR) Committee achieved 100 percent, the Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee achieved 86 percent, the Strategic and Legacy Management (S&LM) Committee achieved 86 percent, and the Waste Management (WM) Committee achieved 100 percent. The total Board achievement concerning addressing work plan topics in 2009 was 87 percent; in 2010 93 percent was achieved. He then listed, by committee, what work plan topics were not addressed in 2010.

CAB member Bridges suggested to Mr. Brizes that next time he would include information on CAB recommendations in the work plan review.

Presentation of Topics for CAB Consideration- Doug Hintze, Department of Energy

Mr. Hintze said he would provide an overview of topics for CAB consideration by committee. He said some topics will crossover between committees, such as the Recovery Act.

He began his presentation by listing topics for the Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee (FD&SR). He listed potential work plan topics such as the C Area Project Progress, the D Area Project Progress, the R Area Complex Project, the P Area Complex Project, and the P Area Ash Basin Project, as well as the Heavy Water Components Test Reactor, Infrastructure Support and Oversight Division, and the Environmental Quality Management Division.

He then listed topics for the Waste Management (WM) Committee, which included Solid Waste, Liquid Waste, a Transuranic (TRU) Waste Program Update, and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Shipping Status. He also listed topics such as the Liquid Waste ARRA Project, Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF) Process Improvements, the Tank Closure Program, and the Supplemental Salt Processing Strategy.

Mr. Hintze listed potential work plan topics for the Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee, which included H-Area Projects/Operations, K-Area Projects/Operations, L-Area Projects/Operations, F-Area Projects/Operations, and Disposition of Depleted Uranium Oxide (DUO) drums.

For the Strategic and Legacy Management committee, he listed topics such as DOE-SR Planning, Budget Formulation, an Integrated Priority List, SRS Performance Measures, the Recovery Act (ARRA), and the U.S. Army Update. He also listed topics such as Reutilization of SRS Assets for Future Missions, Environmental Compliance, an Annual Update on the SRS Natural Resources Management, an Annual SREL Update, an Annual SRS Environmental Report, an Annual NEPA Update, and the SRS Energy Management (EM) Overview.

Tom Clements, public, asked if the issue of commercial fuel reprocessing was on the CAB’s Work Plan in 2010. Mr. Hintze said he didn’t believe it was. Mr. Clements said the CAB has apparently already made a decision on this issue while Mr. Hintze is discussing it in more futuristic terms. He asked how it ended up on the Work Plan and being acted upon already. CAB Chairperson Manuel Bettencourt said the decision is an initial decision because the CAB did not meet between the time it had to brief the Blue Ribbon Committee. He said the Executive Committee put the slides together and sent them out to all the CAB members, asking for a vote on the issue from the CAB members. He said he suspects the next step is that position be considered in a formal recommendation by the CAB. Mr. Clements asked how a decision is made if the issue is not placed on a Work Plan or added; he asked what the mechanism is for adding a topic if it’s not there and acting on it.

Mr. Hintze concluded his presentation by stating that it is DOE’s expectation that the CAB will follow only those topics selected for the Annual Work Plan; however, DOE acknowledges that from time to time,

topics and issues may emerge after the Work Plan has been approved. He said they won't have topics that are outside of the EM mission or scope. He then reviewed the process for adding a topic after the Work Plan is approved.

Administrative Committee-Sarah Watson, CAB

CAB member Watson confirmed that her committee had a meeting earlier that morning, and said many topics and issues were covered. She overviewed the meeting by stating they talked about the Speaker's Bureau and developing a DVD to give to tour participants. She said they are working on the script and advised any volunteers to consult with her. She then stated there would be a Committee Chair election later that day.

She announced there was a meeting planned for current and past committee Chairs on February 3, 2011, to finalize the Work Plan for 2011. She said the Administrative Committee would be present at the meeting. She then said the CAB will still have input in the editing of the CAB Internal Processes, and indicated the deadline for these edits would be February 7, 2011. She said the Board would get a chance to look at the edited product before it is finalized.

Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR, asked everyone to send their edits to Emile, who volunteered to coordinate the comments.

CAB member Watson said orientation for the 2011 new members is not scheduled yet, but is planned for April. She said the Administrative Committee will be involved and they want to include a presentation on the Speakers Bureau at orientation. She advised the CAB to keep supporting the online meetings; she reminded everyone to say their names prior to speaking. She asked everyone to remember their commitment to the CAB and encouraged members to communicate with the Support Team if they're unable to attend a meeting. She encouraged good attendance, and if a member cannot make a meeting, to inform the Support Team of this information. She said the attendance guidelines will be finalized in the Internal Processes. She then thanked the exiting members and announced there would be a reception that evening in honor of these members.

CAB member Bridges asked for the status of new members, and asked when they will be in attendance at the CAB meetings. Ms. Flemming answered she received a report from Headquarters the previous week that said the application package is in its last stage. She said this means the new members should be approved by the next meeting in March.

CAB member Stan Howard asked if everyone would receive a copy of the draft CAB Internal Processes. CAB member Watson said they are currently working from the draft document that the CAB members should already have, and if CAB member Howard is asking if they'll be able to look at it before it is finalized, they will be able to do so. CAB member Howard asked for another copy. Ms. Flemming said the changes that were made at the 2010 Retreat were made and incorporated, and it was sent to the CAB. She asked if anyone else needed another copy.

Committee 2011 Work Plan Topic Discussion and Committee Updates-CAB

Nuclear Material (NM) Committee-Judy Greene-McLeod, CAB

CAB member Greene-McLeod listed the objective of the NM committee, and what issues it addresses, and thanked her committee members for their hard work in 2010. She reviewed her committee's open recommendations, which include 271, 266, and 263.

CAB member Hayes stated that 263 was partially responded to, but it was a seven-part recommendation. She said three parts were not responded to, and she suggested withdrawing 263 and rewriting it into a new recommendation. CAB member Joe Ortaldo suggested the committee keep it open until it is rewritten.

CAB member Art Dombay asked, based on Allen Gunter's presentation concerning plutonium disposition, if there were specific aspects of a recommendation that the NM committee has identified. He said there are a number of decisions that need to be made and the committee has been waiting a long time. He suggested coming up with a specific recommendation to address the decisions that need to be made.

CAB member Greene-McLeod said this is very true, and said when the committee put Recommendation 271 forward, it was a strongly worded recommendation, and it asked for resolutions. She then invited Pat McGuire, DOE-SR, to speak to this topic.

Mr. McGuire said DOE is looking at many planning options, and when the president submits his FY12 budget, which should be early February, the Department will be able to convey what options, and alternatives, will need to be performed to meet the FY12 budget. He said that probably in mid to late February, DOE will be in the position to say of all the plans it is doing now, and based on the budget, what it is going to embark on. He said this includes plutonium disposition, what is going to be done with foreign and domestic research reactor fuel, and facility dispositioning. He said right now there are many options and alternatives, but DOE is planning for all the different options the budget may present. He said they're continuing to run H-Canyon safely, and reviewed all the actions that are currently taking place. CAB member Dombay asked Mr. McGuire if Secretary Chu is familiar with H-Canyon. Mr. McGuire said he is. He spoke of when the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) visited SRS.

CAB member Stan Howard asked if the BRC understands that H-Canyon has expensive operational costs and that the workers need to have something to do. Mr. McGuire said he can't make a final conclusion on what they recognize, but when the BRC visited the Site, it saw the facilities and infrastructure that is available at the Site today. He said they recognize that SRS has the ability to execute missions today, as well as new missions.

CAB member Greene-McLeod then led the committee into Work Plan discussions.

Discussed Potential NM Work Topics:

- Plutonium storage & consolidation update
- Addressing Recommendations 261 & 263 (Future Pu Plan)
- Depleted Uranium
- Facilities upgrades in K-Area
- Plutonium disposition program
 - feasibility studies relating to WIPP and plutonium disposition
 - Optimization of the amount of material loaded into each canister
- WIPP update
- Used Nuclear Fuel storage update and disposition update
- H-Canyon issues
- NNSA updates
 - Small Modular Reactors
- Additional nuclear materials to be received on-site
- New Nuclear Initiatives; possible recommendation
- Heavy Water
- Results of Foreign and Used Nuclear Fuel/negotiations

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation (FD&SR) Committee- K. Jayaraman, CAB

In CAB member Jayaraman's absence, CAB Chairperson Manuel Bettencourt, and CAB member Emile Bernard, led the FD&SR committee updates and discussion. CAB member Bernard summarized a previous FD&SR presentation. He then commented on the schedule of a project presented by Candice Freeman; he suggested writing a recommendation to address this.

Discussed Potential FD&SR Work Plan Topics:

- Area completions: C,D,R,P,P-Ash, HWCTR, A &M Areas contaminated water plumes, and reserving the right to add more
- C-Area historical issues
- Infrastructure support and oversight
- SRS Energy Management
- Environmental Quality Management-Regulatory Integration
- ARRA impact on FD&SR
- Integrated Operable Units
 - Lower three runs
 - Watershed
 - Recovery Act work
- E-Area briefing
- Ground water remediation and pump entry/treat system status

CAB member Bernard said he is interested in the EM area on the flow path chart and asked if the CAB has been briefed on it. CAB member Ortaldo said that once a year the CAB gets a solid waste update and that area is typically covered in that presentation.

CAB member Ed Burke stated the CAB received a presentation a couple years back about pumping water out of the ground to release tritium so it would not go into the ground water runoff. He asked if the CAB could get an update on that topic. This was added to the Work Plan topics under pump entry/system status.

Waste Management (WM) Committee-Joe Ortaldo, CAB

CAB member Ortaldo reviewed the WM committee's open recommendations, including 270, 269, 263, 258, and 246. He summarized the January 7 BRC and CAB WM Committee meetings; he reviewed the Rev. 16 presentation that was given by Doug Bumgardner, SRR, at the Jan. 7 WM Committee meeting. The committee then went over Draft Recommendation 274, Liquid Waste Programmatic Risk Reduction-Spare Equipment and Spare Parts, providing edits and finalizing the recommendation for the next day's vote.

Discussed Potential WM Work Plan Topics:

- WIPP-history and overview
- SRNL Processes
- SWPF
- Different ways to address budget and priorities for the next three to four years
- Updates on Federal Repository
- Energy Solutions facility at Clive Utah
- Other waste disposal sites
- Success on bubblers-updates

Strategic and Legacy Management (SL&M) Committee- Gerald Wadley, CAB

CAB member Wadley reviewed his committee's objective and mission. He then reviewed SL&M's contribution to the 2010 Work Plan, which included 22 topics; 19 of these topics were addressed. He said SL&M closed three recommendations in 2010, and currently have two open: 267 and 272. He then reviewed the last SL&M committee meeting.

Discussed Potential SL&M Work Plan Topics:

- Army training at SRS
- Reutilization for Future Missions
- Historic Preservation
- Environmental Justice-EPA
- Restructuring, adapting, and reusing buildings and other resources
- Workforce Restructuring
- Performance Measures

CAB member Alex Williams asked for a “sweeping overview” of safety at SRS to be presented to the Board. He also asked for an emphasis on the Old Waste Burial Grounds on Site, including photos, a historical background, and a futuristic overview of SRS.

~Public Comments~

Tom Clements, Friends of the Earth, said his impression from listening to the discussion is that the CAB seems interested in considering the issue of small modular reactors and reprocessing of commercial nuclear fuel. He said it’s not the CAB’s mission to get into these issues that may come from other departments within DOE, including the Office of Nuclear Energy. He said he is a little confused about why the CAB is addressing this topic. He encouraged everyone to go to BRC.gov to hear his presentation that he gave to the committee. He said many people at the meeting are concerned about the reprocessing issue, Yucca Mountain, and spent nuclear fuel storage at SRS. He said somebody spoke on behalf of the Conservation Society in Aiken, and they reaffirm the concern about the reprocessing of commercial spent fuel at SRS.

Karen Patterson, public, said she would be speaking as a part of the Governor’s Nuclear Advisory Council (GNAC). She said she was also at the BRC and she heard something different than what Mr. Clements heard. She said that the GNAC is trying to make two points: 1.) Recycling commercial fuel should be part of any energy policy that the country implements, and 2.) H-Canyon is a good place to do Research and Development (R&D) for reprocessing. She continued by stating GNAC was not advocating reprocessing commercial fuel at SRS. As for small modular reactors, she said they are prototypes. She said they will not be built at SRS to generate fuel.

Theresa Kerrigan, public, said she was at the meeting as a Masters student. She said she was attending as a representative of a group of students at George Washington University who are doing their Masters in Environmental and Resource Policy. She said she was there as a part of a project with DOE to learn more about SRS and ultimately make recommendations to DOE. She said they are still in the process of scoping out what their project will actually be, but welcomed comments.

Bobbi Paul, Georgia Women’s Action for New Directions (GAWAND), said she wanted to provide a status update of the environmental monitoring in Georgia. She said she spoke with SRS Site Manager Dr. Moody and other entities; she said she thinks the monitoring is in process and a report will be available soon. She encouraged the CAB to get involved and to become more informed of the monitoring in Georgia. She also put in a plea for the CAB to look into the Environmental Justice program.

~Adjourned

**Meeting Minutes
January 24-25, 2011
Hilton Head, SC, Full Board Meeting**

Tuesday, January 25 Attendance:

<p><u>CAB</u> Tabitha Barrett-Absent Dr. Emile Bernard Manuel Bettencourt Dr. Donald Bridges Edward Burke Art Domby Kathe Golden Judith Greene-McLeod Lee Harley-Fitts Dr. Rose Hayes Stanley Howard Dr. K. Jayaraman Ranowul Jzar-Absent Cleveland Latimore Denise Long Joe Ortaldo Dr. Marolyn Parson Skyee Vereen John Snedeker Dr. Gerald Wadley Sarah Watson Alex Williams</p>	<p><u>Agency Liaisons/Regulators</u> David Williams, EPA Robert Pope, EPA Cathy Amoroso, EPA Kyle Bryant, EPA Rhelyn Finch, EPA Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC Kim Newell, SCDHEC Van Keisler, SCDHEC Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC Gregory Suber, NRC Nishka Devaser, NRC George Alexander, NRC</p>	<p><u>DOE/Other</u> Dr. Dave Moody, DOE-SR Rebecca Craft, DOE-SR Patrick McGuire, DOE-SR Terry Spears, DOE-SR Doug Hintze, DOE-SR Helen Belencan, DOE-SR Gerri Flemming, DOE-SR David Hoel, DOE-SR Wade Whitaker, DOE-SR Zack Smith, DOE-SR de'Lisa Carrico, DOE-SR Allen Gunter, DOE-SR Jay Ray, DOE-SR Brenda Mills, DOE-SR Jim DeMass, DOE-SR Dave Hepner, DOE-SR</p>
	<p><u>Contractors</u> Bethany Raines, PEC Tiajuana Cochnauer, USFS-SR Fred Dohse, SRNS Sonny Goldston, SRNS Jeannette Hyatt, SRNS Nancye Bethuren, SRR Ginger Dickert, SRR Steve Thomas, SRR Ken McLeod, SREL Mindy Mets, SRSCRO Erica Williams, V3 Ashley Whitaker, V3 James Tanner, V3 Jenny Freeman, V3 Bill Brizes, V3</p>	<p><u>Stakeholders</u> John Gadd Tom Clements Karen Patterson Bobbi Paul Dianne Valentin Theresa Kerrigan Emily Neagle Jean Sulc Donna Antonucci Laura Walker</p>

Ms. Freeman began the meeting by reviewing the ground rules and agenda.

CAB Chairperson Bettencourt asked for a motion to approve the November 2010 Full Board meeting minutes. CAB member Emile Bernard moved to approve the minutes and CAB member Denise Long seconded that motion. The minutes were approved. CAB Chairperson Bettencourt asked the incoming CAB Chairperson, Mr. Bridges, to provide the Chair update.

CAB member Bridges stated that December 2010 and January 2011 were busy months for the CAB. He provided updates on what happened with the CAB in late 2010 and early 2011, including an article about the Board in the Metro Spirit, a visit by the Blue Ribbon Committee, and an informal visit with Dr. Moody, the SRS Site Manager. He also acknowledged all CAB members who were leaving the Board.

Dr. Dave Moody, SRS Site Manager, acknowledged all of the members who were leaving the Board, and presented them with letters of appreciation.

Dr. Moody gave a brief update of activities taking place at SRS. He stated 1,000 square miles on Site were declared “complete” and “ready for re-use” under ARRA work/funding in 2010. He said in terms of liquid waste, 190 canisters were produced in 2010, to give a total of more than 3,000. He said the bubblers are working and all activities are on schedule; there is a goal of 400 canisters per year. He continued that one year prior, DOE-SR was managing the closure of seven tanks, and now it is managing 15. He said SRS is the only DOE Site that is processing its legacy salt waste, and last year 1.2 million gallons were processed. He said DOE-SR made 81 TRU Waste shipments last year and said they are striving to do better than that this year. He said DOE-SR is still on schedule to disposition the TRU Waste by calendar year 2012. He then stated some activities he hopes to work on in the next year.

Agency Updates

Fred Dohse, Chief Operating Officer-Savannah River Nuclear Solutions (SRNS)

Mr. Dohse stated when SRNS arrived at SRS it believed that once it brought modern business practices from its parent organizations to SRS, the Site would be able to run more efficiently with less people. He said SRNS began last spring to work with DOE in order to construct a plan to reduce the current workforce. He said this plan will be implemented in three stages. The first stage, phase one, included voluntary retirement; he said 328 workers took this option and this phase is now completed.

CAB member Bridges asked Mr. Dohse how many workers was initially expected to leave the Site through phase one. Mr. Dohse answered 100 and said they were pleasantly surprised at the larger number.

He said the second phase will take place in February and will be an involuntary separation. He said several hundred workers will be involved. He said they are working to identify those workers and the process will include SRNS providing those names to DOE, DOE will validate that SRNS has been fair, and then DOE will approve the list of names. These individuals will be notified by the end of February. He said a third involuntary phase will occur in the summer. He said the individuals being let go will be provided with training for new job placements and a job assist center will be opened in Aiken, as well as job fairs with local businesses.

CAB members Bridges asked how many people SRNS is looking to let go. Mr. Dohse said up to 1,400, but it will depend on SRNS’ work scope.

CAB member Bernard asked Mr. Dohse what the difference is between phase two and phase three of the restructuring. Mr. Dohse said these phases are very similar, but it has to be done in phases so SRNS can evaluate safety and operational performance through the first two phases.

CAB member Ortaldo asked who looks at the long-term plan when it comes to manpower needs from present day to later years. Mr. Dohse said it is a Managing and Operating (M&O) responsibility, but working closely with DOE. He said together they look at a strategic plan for the Site. Mr. Hintze said that when they start strategic planning, they look at future missions for the entire Site and how they are integrated.

CAB member Hayes asked if there were any discussions focused on how to grow some of the functions at the Site immediately in order to keep a trained workforce on to be integrated into any new needs. Mr. Dohse stated SRNS responds to things it sees in the not-so-distance future and he thinks SRNS can operate the Site in the future with less people. He said SRNS should be a good steward with as little tax payer money as possible, so if SRNS can complete its mission with fewer people and dollars, it feels it must do so. Mr. Hintze said that the budget environment must be taken into consideration. He said if the funding level gets decreased, the number of workers at the Site may have to be decreased. He said that currently through the Strategic Planning process, DOE is looking into how to use some of the resources that may not

be funded through DOE to do other missions, in order to keep the facilities running and workers on board. He said the problem is that if the funding goes, the Site will be stuck with extra workers and the Site is still trying to grow these new missions, it will be stuck with extra workers with inadequate funding. He said they are working to transition and not let go people who could work on future missions.

Mr. Dohse then stated that he is very proud of where SRNS is in terms of safety statistics. He said SRNS has grown 30 percent since fiscal year 2008. In parallel with that, he said SRNS has performed well statistically from a safety standpoint, achieving safety statistics the previous year that were the best in 25 years at the Site. He said SRNS is also performing very well operationally. He said it would exceed 6 million safe hours that week with its M&O workers and subcontractors. He said its construction workers are on the verge of exceeding 25 million safe hours, which is a national record.

Doug Hintze, DDFO-Department of Energy (DOE)

Mr. Hintze summarized what happened with the BRC, including its tour at the Site, and said it was a very successful meeting. He said DOE has decided that depleted uranium oxide will be disposed of at the Nevada National Security Site, which is Nevada's test site. He is not sure of the exact date it will be shipped off. He said H-Canyon is kept in a state of readiness and Allen Gunter would present on "What If Scenarios" with H-Canyon later that day.

He said the budget is still in a continuing resolution until March 4, where it will enter a full year continuing resolution or DOE will receive appropriations. He said this significantly impacts the path forward on many activities. He said the fiscal 2012 budget will be rolled out in February.

He said liquid waste canisters production was at 88 of 311, which is on track. He said salt waste processing continues to make wall and deck placements in accordance with meeting the schedule. He continued that the F Canyon TRU remediation continues to repackage the standard large boxes in order to reduce the need for the TRU Pack 3 shipments and saltstone disposal has received 277,000 gallons this fiscal year. He said in terms of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a decision was made the previous week by DOE in the final Mercury Storage Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that the waste control specialist site near Andrews, Texas is the preferred alternative. In another NEPA action, DOE is about to issue the Draft Greater Than Class C Radioactive Waste EIS, where SRS is being evaluated as an alternative disposal site. He said there will be a public meeting in the CSRA on April 19th. He then encouraged interested parties to sign up for the SRS public tours.

CAB member Judy Greene-McLeod asked if the workforce restructuring is limited to SRNS, and not SRR, and what is the break-down of the total numbers that work for the major contractors. Mr. Hintze said the workforce restructuring is strictly aimed at SRNS, as the M&O contractor. He continued that of the total workforce, there is around 5,800 working for SRNS and 2,500 on the SRR side.

Robert Pope-Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Mr. Pope stated the Federal Facilities Agreement (FFA) has an enforceable appendix that is updated every year. He said DOE submitted its appendix E to the FFA last calendar year and both agencies have commented on it and are awaiting DOE's response on it. He said there are some significant milestones still being worked within that appendix, and it is an ongoing process. He said this enforceable schedule covers most of the area completion work and some tank milestones.

He said there are two documents that the CAB should be aware of, including the Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis for the C Reactor railroad tracks soil removal and the Record of Decision for Gun site 218, which is a "no action decision."

Mr. Pope stated SRNS has in the past had a very "robust" program with providing updates to the communities around the Site. He said EPA has started talking with DOE to reinvigorate the program, but he urged the CAB to take on this topic of the Environmental Justice (EJ) Program. He said it is a way for the CAB to represent the community. He added that the Community Involvement Plan is something SRS is

required to do per the FFA, and SRS recently sent an upgrade to that plan to the agencies. He said EPA and SCDHEC made significant comments, and SRS is revising the plan to include those comments. He said this Plan also includes EJ actions. He continued by addressing the issue of the next cycle of Superfund Job Training Program, which should occur in late 2011. Mr. Pope then announced that Cathy Amoroso, EPA, accepted a permanent position within EPA that will take her away from CAB activities and meetings, and thanked her for her work.

CAB member Greene-McLeod asked how the CAB would be informed if something goes wrong at SRS per cleanup. Mr. Pope said that if something occurs on the Site that EPA or SCDHEC is not happy with, the agencies first work with the Site. He said it is very rare when the three parties cannot work an issue out. He said in general the CAB doesn't hear about when things go wrong because it is worked out before it becomes a major issue. He said this isn't true at every site. CAB member Greene-McLeod stated that she would like for the CAB to be informed when things go wrong because it would be helpful to the Board, particularly new members. CAB member Kathe Golden agreed. Mr. Pope said EPA will try to keep the CAB updated on problems.

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

Ms. Wilson said the cleanup at the Site represents a very small, but important, part that goes on environmentally. She said SCDHEC covers many other environmental areas other than cleanup, and those areas are different than the cleanup scope. She asked CAB member Greene-McLeod if the CAB would like to be informed on these activities as well. She introduced Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC, for an update on the FFA Cleanup Program.

Ms. Cathcart stated that all documents were reviewed by three parties-DOE, SCDHEC, and EPA. With the additions to the ARRA scope, the document review has increased significantly. She continued that in 2010, SCDHEC reviewed a total of 107 documents; prior to ARRA, SCDHEC reviewed a total of 50 to 60 documents. She said 61 of these documents are part of the ARRA 75 percent reduction scope. She then listed the types of documents SCDHEC reviewed. She then described a new document, titled "Fact Sheets," that summarizes decisions made on the project, but not necessarily in technical terms. She said it was specifically designed to help the public understand the project and its process and is submitted with the regulatory-approved Statement Basis Proposed Plan. In addition to ongoing projects, she stated SCDHEC and EPA review between 10 and 15 annual reports on data concerning various sites throughout SRS. She continued that this year, the FFA reviewed seven tank documents; she explained that this is new work for the FFA and when the tanks are closed under the South Carolina Industrial Waste Water Permit, they will move into the FFA under the F-Tank Farm Operable Units (OU). She said SCDHEC intends to be busy with tanks for the next few years and added they have reviewed seven appendixes pertaining to the FFA. She said these appendixes are reviewed annually, and she listed what commitments/information each appendix contains. She stated that SCDHEC is responsible for issuing all of the Monitoring Well Requests at SRS. In addition to the document reviews, four RODs were signed this year; she listed these RODs. She stated that all of this work is recorded in three quarterly reports, and one annual report, that's submitted to DOE. She added that SCDHEC participated in 12 Site visits to SRS, 17 face-to-face meetings in Aiken, and 37 conference calls.

Ms. Wilson noted that Appendix E, which Mr. Pope mentioned earlier, is the work scope that's planned for the future cleanup at SRS. She said this work scope is submitted to EPA and SCDHEC every year, and is approved every year, if acceptable. She said in SCDHEC's opinion, Appendix E needs to be amended because it is a "little out of whack" due to the influx of work and accomplishments resulting from ARRA funding. She said in the near future there will be a lull and a good deal of "back-ended" work. She said SCDHEC's comments to the Appendix E is to revise it so it's more realistically achievable.

She continued that SCDHEC commented to the BRC that since the 1970s, SCDHEC has been involved in reducing environmental liabilities at SRS. She said SCDHEC needs Yucca Mountain to be able to take the vitrified High Level Waste that is in a glass form. She said the reason for that is the goal is a final cleanup of SRS and if those glass logs remain at the Site that represents a large risk to long-term stewardship liability. She continued that a main point SCDHEC made to the BRC was that if there is a change at Yucca

Mountain, or a potential for high risk material to stay at SRS longer than anticipated, that changes SCDHEC's cleanup decisions that were made in the past, and those need to be evaluated. She then stated that the day prior SCDHEC approved the General Closure Plan for the F-Area High Level Waste Tank Farm and this decision was made ahead of schedule.

CAB member K. Jayaraman said that based on the agency updates, the CAB needs to be clear on what exactly its mission is in 2011, and what it is supposed to be doing. He said the CAB should be concerned about EM missions and cleanup, not the budget or job creations.

~Public Comments~

Tom Clements stated his position on the small modular reactors, saying they don't exist, but are concepts. He then said the CAB's focus should be on Environmental Management (EM) and cleanup issues, primarily high-level waste and groundwater contamination at the Site. He said he is concerned by what happened with the BRC, that there was some straying from the mission of focusing on EM, and the CAB getting more into political issues that aren't really in its purview. He said he doesn't know what meeting took place to affirm the decision that was presented at the BRC. He said the CAB has recommended to the BRC that reprocessing of nuclear fuel is in the national interest and that the BRC identify H-Canyon is a resource to be maintained for R and D related to commercial reprocessing. He said he'd never been to a single meeting where those things were discussed and is curious how many of the CAB members actually voted on this to be presented to the BRC.

CAB member Art Dobby said that relative to public participation, Tom's comments, and some of the other comments, made him think a little bit about the laws behind what the CAB does. He stated during the 60s and 70s, the environmental laws, as well as the Federal Administrative Procedures Act, provided for public participation, but public participation was limited to two things: official notice and opportunity to comment. He continued that in the 60s, with NEPA and the regulations that were enacted, the federal government tried to broaden the opportunity for the public to be heard, but the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) really broadened that, and there were some executive orders as well. He stated that clearly, the CAB does not have in its charter that reprocessing is a purpose of the CAB, but what is in the charter of the CAB is to look at Environmental Management at SRS. He said that from his six years of working on the CAB, he's noticed that SRS has a work horse and it's called H-Canyon. He said the CAB is anxious to see the big picture after all these years of analysis, and the different options being analyzed. He continued by urging everyone to consider that when there is a logical link in nexus between H-Canyon and the ability to process orphan materials, that is in the CAB charter. He addressed Mr. Clements, stating there is not a goal to make SRS a reprocessing facility for the world.

Recommendation Updates-Bill Brizes, V3 Technical Services

Mr. Brizes referenced the recommendation status slide, stating that one recommendation is pending, nine that are open, and 263 have been closed since the beginning of the CAB; this equals a total of 273 Recommendations. He continued that since the last meeting, Recommendation 272 has been opened and Recommendation 242 was closed. He then said that during the previous day's meeting, the Recommendation 273 was changed from pending to open. Mr. Brizes referenced the Recommendation Status Report, stating that a new recommendation, 274, would be voted on that day. He stated there is a list of recommendations under consideration, or ideas created by committee chairs; he encouraged Board members to go to their committee chairs to share ideas for recommendations.

Waste Management (WM) Committee-Joe Ortaldo, CAB

Mr. Ortaldo reviewed the recommendation status within the WM Committee, stating it has five recommendations open. He said the WM Committee had a meeting on January 7 that corresponded with the BRC meeting; he summarized what occurred at the meeting.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Role at Saltstone: Monitoring Activities & the PA Review – George Alexander, NRC

Mr. Alexander first gave a background of NRC's role at SRS, current Saltstone activities, and the Saltstone Performance Assessment (PA) Review. He overviewed NRC's role at SRS, stating that based on the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) in 2005, DOE is required to consult with NRC regarding waste determinations, and NRC is required to monitor DOE's disposal actions. He continued that within the monitoring process, as dictated by Congress, NRC requires reasonable assurance that DOE can meet the performance objectives of 10 CFR, Part 61. Mr. Alexander then reviewed the history and timeline of NRC/DOE NDAA activities concerning the Saltstone Project.

He said that during the 2005 Saltstone review and 2007 Monitoring Plan, eight key factors were identified towards assessing compliance; these points were listed and reviewed. When conducting a risk-informed review, he said NRC relied on those key factors, and DOE conducted some research on those factors as well to reduce uncertainty. After this research was conducted, research topics such as hydraulic properties of Saltstone, physical integrity of Saltstone, fracturing of vault walls, reduction and retention of Technesium (Tc) in Saltstone, and inventory of Th-230/Ra-226 led to results; these topics and results were described by Mr. Alexander.

He said the current PA review that was submitted in December also had a Request for Additional Information (RAI), which is a set of comments that can be grouped into several different topics to relate to performance objectives or different technical concerns. He provided a brief overview of these comments and the technical concerns. The comment topics included PA Methods, Inventory, Infiltration and Erosion Control, Saltstone Performance, Vault Performance, Far-Field Transport, Inadvertent Intrusion, and Biosphere.

Mr. Alexander stated that one of NRC's PA methods questions was in relation to the Base Case. He said DOE provided several different cases for analysis, and its Base Case, or Expected Degradation Case, generated several concerns that NRC put into its RAI package. He said the Base Case should take into account all of the known conditions and account for a reasonable amount of uncertainty. He reviewed the concerns NRC has, including specific technical concerns. He then referenced a conceptual model that showed NRC's interpretation of DOE's Base Case.

After showing the conceptual model, Mr. Alexander reviewed the NRC revisions to the Base Case. He referred to a graph that showed the flow through Saltstone grout at 500 years. He then offered alternative analyses that DOE provided NRC. He said there were certain limitations to these cases that NRC will address with DOE. He reviewed the Synergistic Case and the Hybrid Approach, and then provided a summary of the presentation.

Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC, informed the CAB to be aware that SCDHEC regulates the Saltstone disposal activities. She said in the future if the CAB has a presentation from NRC, it would be a good idea to have a corresponding presentation from SCDHEC.

CAB member Marolyn Parson asked Ms. Wilson to provide an example of one contaminate that is being monitored and what a corrective action would be. Ms. Wilson answered that one contaminate that is monitored is Tritium and in that area, some wells have picked up some small traces of Tritium. She said the trigger-level that would require corrective action would be 25,000 picocuries per liter. She continued that SCDHEC has recently monitored the Tritium level at around 5,300, which is at the maximum picocuries per liter. She said they have not picked up near the trigger level, but if it got to that point, the corrective action would be an appropriate process selected specifically for the process being corrected.

Terry Spears, DOE-SR, said DOE is working on responding to the second rounds of RAIs, issues, concerns, and comments NRC has presented. He said DOE will work with NRC to work towards a consensus. He announced a public meeting that would be taking place later that week, and encouraged everyone to attend. He stated, in reference to the many research findings that were pointed out in NRC's

presentation, the PA is an iterative process. He said the first PA was developed in 1991, and was revised in 2008-2009, and then released for review to NRC in 2010. He said DOE will continue this process and will continue to improve the PA over time. He noted that DOE also has a PA Maintenance Program in place where DOE has spent millions of dollars in laboratories evaluating key questions and developing model support.

WM Discussion of Recommendation- “Programmatic Risk Reduction”

CAB member Ortaldo brought forward the proposed recommendation, 274, concerning “Programmatic Risk Reduction.” He said there were some changes that occurred since the previous day due to gained clarification on a few points. He reviewed the recommendation’s purpose to the CAB and asked for any questions or comments.

CAB member Ortaldo moved for approval and it was approved. The Board voted on the recommendation- all approved, no one opposed.

Nuclear Materials (NM) Committee- Judy Greene-McLeod, CAB

CAB member Greene-McLeod reviewed the objective of the NM Committee and listed three open recommendations.

She asked Mr. Hintze to speak about the possibility of SRS receiving Class C Radiation Absorption Dose (RAD) waste. Mr. Hintze said that DOE is about to release a draft EIS on the disposal of Greater than Class C Waste and SRS is an alternative disposal site.

H-Canyon “What If” Scenarios - Allen Gunter, DOE-SR

Mr. Gunter said that due to the uncertainty of the FY12 budget, DOE wants to provide some “What If” scenarios concerning the operation of H-Canyon. He then provided a status of where H-Canyon is currently and the activities that are occurring there. He then provided a background of the key NEPA decisions that have been made. He noted that the first decision was made in 1996.

He listed the prerequisites that are required prior to processing. He said SRS is awaiting approval of the amended ROD, and DOE is awaiting the recommendation out of the Blue Ribbon Committee (BRC) concerning the processing of fuel. He continued that it has been determined that the dissolution of Used Nuclear Fuel (UNF) is a “new start” which cannot begin under a continuing budget resolution. He said that due to uncertainty in the FY12 funding finalization, SR issued a letter to SRNS in mid-November 2010 resulting SRNS to evaluate three “what if” scenarios.

CAB member Bridges asked if a decision can’t be made until feedback is heard from the Blue Ribbon Committee. Mr. Gunter answered that DOE has made a determination that part of the BRC’s tasking was coming up with a recommendation concerning the processing of fuel, including both commercial and defense fuel. He noted that the material at H-Canyon is considered defense.

CAB member Domby asked why DOE doesn’t tell the BRC of its existing plans rather than waiting on the BRC to say “go ahead.” Mr. Gunter said that DOE has provided the BRC with its proposed plans, but is now waiting on a recommendation. He said the BRC has been provided with what the plans were/are.

CAB member Bridges asked at what point will a recommendation from the BRC become critical in terms of gainful employment at H-Canyon. Mr. Gunter answered that currently the facility is being utilized and those activities are not anticipated to slow down until the end of June. He said after June some decisions will have to be made.

Mr. Gunter then reviewed the H-Canyon “what if” scenarios, including scenario one which is, “assume the Continuing Budget Resolution is resolved by mid-January and approval to begin UNF processing in H-

Canyon is provided by January 31, 2011. He continued on to the second scenario, which is “assume approval to begin UNF processing in H-Canyon is not provided by January 31, 2011.” He stated the third scenario is, “approval to begin UNF processing in H-Canyon is not provided by January 31, 2011 and due to uncertainty associated with the approval of the Supplemental Analysis (SA) and the Amended Record of Decision (AROD).

CAB member Dombey asked, in reference to the statement “reduce risks associated with maintaining a high state of readiness,” what the risks are. Mr. Gunter said the risks come from dealing with nuclear materials. He said that flushing the system gets rid of nuclear materials and improves safety.

Mr. Gunter then concluded his presentation, stating the facility is ready to begin processing and has completed the readiness assessment. He said the SA and the AROD to support processing UNF in H-Canyon is currently under consideration, and DOE is awaiting the BRC’s recommendation prior to approving the NEPA. He said that due to numerous uncertainties, SR requested SRNS to evaluate several “what if” scenarios concerning H-Canyon/HB-Line operations.

CAB member Dombey asked if there is a safety argument to be made on a societal level to go ahead and reprocess the aluminum fuel. Mr. Gunter said that DOE does analyses on how long material can be stored. He said on a storage stand-point, the indications are that the material can be stored through the mid 2030s, as long as the water quality is maintained. He said he isn’t promoting that, but from a safety stand-point, the material can be stored safely for another 20 to 30 years based on the current data.

SRS Performance Measures Update: Nuclear Materials – Jay Ray, DOE-SR

Mr. Ray stated reference the CAB Gear Chart and stated what he was going to discuss, and stated the purpose of his presentation. He said the Matrix is not completed and is a work in progress. He then reviewed K-Area, L-Area, and H-Canyon, including what each area is responsible for.

He referenced the “Performance Measures-High Level Summary” within his presentation and stated the 29 percent listed is not the overall disposition of plutonium present but the authorized percentage out of the much larger amount of material. He said that taking the Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) blend-down program from when it started in 2003 until present day, it is about 63 percent completed. He stated that the UNF that would be dissolved is at zero percent.

Mr. Ray then referenced the Performance Measures format as of July 2010, and then showed how it looked as of January 2011. He said he is trying to keep it simple, but informative. He then reviewed this newer version of the Performance Measures. He then referenced a slide titled, “Graphical Analysis & Lifecycle Projections,” which had two graphs that showed LEU shipped by fiscal year and LEU shipped in Fiscal year 2011.

He stated that nuclear materials, including UNF, continue to be safely received and stored while awaiting disposition. He said SRS continues to make steady progress with disposition of nuclear materials in a safe manner.

~Public Comments~

CAB member Hayes said she wanted to speak as a member of the public on the issue of reprocessing. She said she read recently a letter from a Congressman in the 70s that was urging President Carter to start storing nuclear materials in the form of plutonium and uranium, at SRS and Barnwell. She said in 1982 the idea of a national repository came about and in 1987 Yucca Mountain was designated. She said the issue of Yucca Mountain may now be closed, but what isn’t closed is that science builds on science, and that there is new technologies dealing with reprocessing that are coming around. She said High Level Waste can’t be converted to “fairy dust,” but if you take the example of China, which is currently engaging in the building of a MOX plant that will process 800 tons of UNF a year, that’s the kind of process that is going to be

made in the future. She encouraged the CAB, and the public, to not think of reprocessing in a narrow fashion.

Strategic & Legacy Management (S&LM) Committee- Gerald Wadley, CAB

CAB member Wadley said S&LM has two open recommendations and that the public tours are being well advertised, and successful. He said his committee had a meeting in December 2010, with two presentations.

Update on Savannah River Recovery Act Program- Zack Smith, DOE-SR

Mr. Smith said he has discussed with the CAB several times what is going on with the Recovery Act, and that the day's discussion would be an update on what has been achieved, and what would be the immediate path forward under ARRA. He said he would first review foot print reduction, then transuranic waste disposition, and then to a website for further detail.

He stated that the scope of work for the Heavy Water Components Test Reactor (HWCTR) project involves deactivation, and removal of the steam generator and reactor vessel. He continued that the achievements and path forward consist of removing all the shielding blocks and grout to elevation -21 and all 25 nozzles on the reactor vessel have been cut. He said this allows worker to pull the reactor out of HWCTR. He then showed a picture of work being done on HWCTR.

Mr. Smith then reviewed the P Ash Basin project, stating the scope of work is 40 acres in size. He said this is currently being worked on. He continued that the work is expected to be completed on schedule and in budget; he said it should be completed by July 2011.

He then discussed R Ash Basin, stating it was declared "Mechanically Complete" in December 2010; he said it was completed six to seven months ahead of schedule, and about \$ 3 million below the Estimate at Completion (EAC) for that activity. He showed pictures of P and R Area Ash Basins.

He stated the work scope for P and R Reactors are very similar, and then reviewed the scope of work for both. He said that P Area is farther along progress-wise. He listed the achievements for P and R Reactors, as well as the estimated completed dates.

CAB member Hayes asking if the grout involved in encasing the P and R Reactors will undergo similar modeling that the grouting around the Saltwaste Processing Facility has undergone with NRC involvement. Mr. Smith said testing has taken place, but he doesn't know NRC's involvement in the process. Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC, added that that is all under the cleanup program, so there is the State authority under the Hazardous Waste Permit, and then SCDHEC conducts that through the FFA. She said the EPA is involved via the CERCLA perspective, but the NRC is not involved. CAB member Hayes asked what type of testing will be done in terms of long-term integrity of the grouting. Ms. Wilson said that she isn't sure of the details, but she is sure it is covered under the cleanup decision. CAB member Ortaldo said that there is a difference between the Saltstone grout and the grout Mr. Smith is discussing. He said the grout being used in the P and R Reactors is clean grout that is being put in to just fill up space. CAB member Hayes asked if they are encasing with grout because inside the structure there is still some contamination that needs to be enclosed. Rob Pope, EPA, said there is some stuff that is left behind, including curie contamination, and that is why it was decided to grout it up to the floor level; he said it is containing that curie content. He said it is not nearly as high as the curie content seen with Saltstone and the grout itself is clean, but being put in place to contain contamination. He said there was a modeling done, and the results showed that what was being used will be safe.

Mr. Smith then showed photos of the Disassembly Basin in R Reactor prior to grouting and after grouting.

He stated that the project remains committed to dispositioning 5,000 cubic meters legacy waste by December 2012. He said this activity is going very well and then reviewed the achievements and path forward concerning TRU. He reviewed a graph titled, "TRU Legacy Waste Program.," to show the TRU

volume and estimated Plutonium Equivalent Curies (PEC). He then reviewed a graph that showed the Total Legacy TRU Program Waste Disposition through January 13, 2011; the monthly volume dispositioned was calculated. He also showed charts depicting Foot Print Reduction work.

Mr. Smith summarized his presentation, stating the major progress that has been achieved, and showed an online SRS Foot Print Reduction Map.

CAB member Greene-McLeod asked what the term “Foot Print Reduction” means and how the mileage was assigned to each area on the map. Mr. Smith said it’s not an exact science, but there were facilities within a given area, if there was a facility there that needed D&D, that area could not be declared “clean.” He said they assign specific square miles to each building and region that is covered by the facility and make a work-off list. He said this approach was agreed upon within EM.

SRS CAB Full Board Briefing: Nuclear Workforce Initiative- Mindy Mets, SRS Community Reuse Organization (SRSCRO)

Ms. Mets said SRSCRO is a collaborative nuclear workforce effort that is ongoing in the region. She then gave a brief overview of SRSCRO, including when it was organized and why. She explained that SRSCRO has a very active board that recognizes that many new projects are ongoing. She listed some of these new projects and where they are happening.

She continued that the region has “tremendous” nuclear expertise and given that, a lot of activity was already going on. She said that Augusta Technical College is working with Southern Company and Aiken Technical College has established a well-thought of radiation protection program. She said that the leaders on the SRSCRO Board recognize that a unified, regional approach can maximize job development and economic opportunities. She said SRSCRO took a regional approach to looking at the issue of finding skilled nuclear workers for the next Nuclear Renaissance.

She said a Workforce Study that was conducted had four categories: professional, technician, engineer, and craft. Within those categories, there were 57 key job classifications. She said they only looked at jobs that were took a long time for training, required very specialized training, or jobs where employers saw a large gap between the need to fill that gap and possible availability. She added that within the study, only new positions were looked at, and positions that were expected to be available due to attrition. She said the results showed that nearly 10,000 new workers would be needed in the region over the next 10 years. She said the workforce need is real and it is a long-term, and varied, need.

Ms. Mets then stated the SRSCRO philosophy, and stated the above study was first presented at a Nuclear Workforce Summit. She said that it was a two-day event that on the second day involved nuclear employers, educational institutions, and economic developers, who all reviewed the study data in order to analyze it. She said the main recommendation that came out of this summit, was that SRSCRO should take a leading role in facilitating a regional nuclear workforce initiative. She said the SRSCRO committed funds in that direction and formed a Nuclear Workforce Initiative (NWI). She then reviewed how the NWI initiative is structured and listed four committees that came out of it. These committees included a Staffing Committee, K-12 Committee, Post Secondary Committee, and an Outreach Committee; she listed what types of people are on each committee and what each committee does. She added that there is also a task force and she listed its members; she also listed the 2010 NWI committee members.

Ms. Mets concluded her presentation by reviewing NWI impacts and summarizing the NWI mission.

CAB member Hayes asked where the program funding stems from. Ms. Mets said that they are looking at options, but right now some of the funding does come from the Government.

CAB member Wadley asked if the program has put together a timeline or a critical path. Ms. Mets said the program is working on the employers’ timeline, which typically falls around 2016. She said they are looking at middle schools and high schools, but also at retraining non-traditional students.

Biomass Cogeneration Facility- Jim DeMass, DOE-SR

Mr. DeMass stated the Biomass Cogeneration Facility (BCF) is a state-of-the-art, renewable energy steam plant that will also have the capability to produce electricity at about 20 megawatts. He said this project will allow DOE to close down the Coal Fire plant in D-Area. He said once the project is complete, SRS will have four Biomass Cogeneration Facilities onsite.

He reviewed the project drivers, which included the age of the D-Area Powerhouse. He continued that in K-Area, a project driver is the old boilers that are not cost effective. He said there are many critical missions ongoing at the Site that rely on steam. Another project driver is Federal mandates that required Federal agencies to conserve energy.

He then overviewed the contract, which was signed on May, 15, 2009, between Ameresco Federal Solutions and DOE-SR. He said many options were researched, but the BCF project was finally agreed upon, and executed, under the DOE Biomass and Alternate Methane Fuel (BAMF) Super Energy Savings Performance Contract (ESPC).

CAB member Bridges asked what renewable energy is. Mr. DeMass answered that renewable energy consists of things like burning wood chips, which are things that can be renewed or re-harvested. It's a fuel that can be used, but more of it can be grown.

Mr. DeMass said that Ameresco is responsible for the project and for operations throughout the performance period of the contract. He then overviewed the Biomass Project, including where the Plants will be located, the capacity for each, as well as other details. He stated there is turnkey access to the facilities. He reviewed the Biomass Heating Plants in K and L-Areas and the BCF, which is larger.

He then reviewed the project environmental benefits and safety.

CAB member Ed Burke asked if the listed reduction in air emissions is due to newer technologies or the switch to the biofuels. Mr. DeMass said the info he presented was a comparison to the Coal Fire Plant, but the BCF is the latest technology. CAB member Burke asked if the same reductions would occur if coal was still being burned. Mr. DeMass said he would get back to CAB member Burke with that answer.

CAB member Howard asked how the emissions would "rack up" as far as emitting naturally radioactive material compared to a coal-powered plant.

CAB member Hayes asked if the Government Mandate is a reduction of 7.5 percent by 2013, what percentage is represented within the air emission decreases. Mr. DeMass said the BDCF will represent around the 25 percent of the goal set by DOE.

Mr. DeMass reviewed Phase 1 of the project. He said the contract was awarded in May 2009 and mobilized in September 2009. He said the first six months was spent on typical Site work; he reviewed all the areas where there was emphasis. By March 2010, 38 acres of the Site were prepped and the ready for concrete placement. He then reviewed Phase 2 of the project, vertical construction, which began in March 2010; by June, the first piece of steel was erected. He referred to a photo of the Burma Road construction at 3,000 feet and listed the key milestones. He said the start-up time, commissioning, and DOE acceptance are all on track for December 2011.

CAB member Jayaraman asked what Mr. DeMass meant by the "turn-over" date being December 2011. Mr. DeMass said the contractor will operate and construct the facility for the next 19 years. He said DOE has to go through a start-up commission and a DOE readiness assessment to make sure the facility is ready to be operated safely.

Mr. DeMass then reviewed the progress in the K and L-Areas; he summarized the ongoing progress and the "look ahead."

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation (FD&SR) Committee- K. Jayaraman, CAB

CAB member Jayaraman stated the FD&SR Committee mission and introduced the committee members. He said the committee has one recommendation that should be closed shortly. He stepped down as committee chair and thanked everyone for their support. He thanked the outgoing members for their service.

Administrative Committee- Sarah Watson, CAB

CAB member Watson stated the Administrative Committee's mission and said it had a meeting the previous morning. She gave an overview of this meeting and stated the development of the Speakers Bureau would continue. She reviewed upcoming deadlines and objectives concerning the Speakers Bureau.

She said the Administrative Committee would participate in the February 3 Work Plan meeting. She then stated that CAB member Bernard would compile Internal Process Manual edits and send those into the Support Team by February 15. She outlined the types of edits that will take place in the Manual.

She then thanked the outgoing members for their service. She announced the next Full Board meeting. She said the election for the committee chairs would immediately follow her committee report.

Results of the 2011 Committee Chair Elections

Administrative Committee: Kathe Golden

FD&SR Committee: Marolyn Parson

NM Committee: Rose Hayes

S&LM Committee: Jerry Wadley

WM Committee: Emile Bernard

~Public Comments~

There were no public comments.

