

Meeting Minutes
Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) – Full Board Meeting
Beach House Hotel – Hilton Head Island, SC
January 22-23, 2018

Attendance – Monday, January 22nd, 2018

CAB

Gil Allensworth
Susan Corbett
Bob Doerr
Thomas French
Dawn Gillas
Eleanor Hopson
Douglas Howard
Daniel Kaminski
Jim Lyon
Narinder Malik
John McMichael
Cathy Patterson
Larry Powell
Bill Rhoten
Earl Sheppard
Bob Smith
Nina Spinelli
Ed Sturcken
Joyce Underwood
David Vovakes
Mary Weber
Bobbie Williams

DOE/Contractors

Avery Hammett, DOE-SR
Jim Folk, DOE-SR
Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Terry Spears, DOE-SR
James Tanner, S&K
Chelsea Gitzen, S&K
Federica Staton, S&K

Agency Liaisons

Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Susan Fulmer, SCDHEC
Gregg O'Quinn, SCDHEC
Sandra Snyder, SCDHEC

Stakeholders

Charles Rives, Jacobs
Michael Graham, Bechtel
Kriste Webb, IIA
Shannon Farrell, WGS
Jim Marra, CNTA
Jean Sulc
Dara Glass, BWXT
Mel Galin

Opening: Nina Spinelli, CAB Chair

Ms. Spinelli welcomed everyone to the meeting.

CAB Chair Update: Nina Spinelli, CAB Chair

Ms. Spinelli provided a PowerPoint presentation recounting any recent events that may be of interest to the CAB.

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

Mr. Tanner reviewed the meeting rules and agenda.

Agency Updates

Jack Craig, Site Manager, Department of Energy – Savannah River (DOE-SR)

Mr. Craig took the time to thank the outgoing SRS CAB members for their service and contributions. He continued with his update by summarizing the status of various ongoing projects on the site.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if the D Ash project would be done in 2018 FY or calendar year. Mr. Craig noted he would find the answer and get back to Ms. Gillas. Ms. Gillas then asked if that was the completion estimate for the entire project or just construction. Mr. Craig answered it was the construction completion he had mentioned in his update.

Ms. Corbett asked if Mr. Craig could speak about a DNFSB report sent to Secretary Perry. Mr. Craig replied that over the past year or so DOE had identified a number of safety-related issues with SRNS and SRR with respect to their technical safety requirements which are technical safety requirements and documentation which must be followed for safe operation – some issues were related to training, procedures not being defined as clearly as they should be, and other issues. He noted these were all notified to both contractors who developed action plans to address them, which were then accepted by DOE-SR. He continued by pointing out that this was prior to the letter from DNFSB being sent out. He went on to say DOE-SR believes they

have action plans in place to address those issues as mentioned and the contractors are on their way to carrying out the actions necessary to resolve them. Ms. Corbett asked what the review process is for these actions to ensure they're carried out, which Mr. Craig replied that the specific actions mentioned in their plans will be reviewed by DOE-SR and DNFSB which has representatives stationed at SRS.

Ms. Hammett noted in response to an earlier question from Ms. Gillas that the completion date is FY 18.

Mr. Malik asked regarding the 3-H Evaporator if there is a leak is it still operating and how much additional cost would there be to operate as is and to fix it. Mr. Craig responded that he did not have an answer to all of those questions yet, but the robotic repairs done last fall were believed to have fixed the leak and it was estimated they would be back in operation today. These were new leaks identified after the repairs and startup, he further noted. He continued by saying they're still evaluating whether or not we can use it with these small leaks or at a reduced rate but an answer hasn't arrived yet. He also noted a new procurement is being done to replace that evaporator, and another evaporator is on site that is operational.

Mr. Vovakes noted there was recently legislation enacted with regards to drones, and asked if that will change the way SRS monitors them. Mr. Craig answered there have been prohibitions proposed which may have already passed related to drones flying over SRS, and DOE is trying to implement it across all sites but this would not really change the response from SRS with respect to drones which they have been unable to identify who is flying them.

Susan Fulmer, South Carolina Department of Health & Environmental Control (SCDHEC) Ms. Fulmer provided an update of various documents nearing circulation for public review provided by DHEC pending approval which are related to SRS. She went on to summarize various meetings attended by DHEC and DOE and what they were regarding. Ms. Fulmer then stated there had been 2 recent NOV's to SRS for asbestos and waste water and storm water discharges with a fecal coliform issue – both were actions with no final follow up.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if EPA is not present because of the shut down. Mr. Tanner noted that is not a question he could answer.

Mr. Sheppard asked what the fecal count of the NOV was and what it was contributed to. Ms. Fulmer answered that she did not have that information but would provide it in the future. Ms. Hammett replied that the count at outfall LO7A was 1,600 colonies per 100 mL and the maximum allowed is 400.

After this Q&A session ended, outgoing CAB members were then recognized by Mr. Craig.

Administrative & Outreach Committee Update: Eleanor Hopson, Chair

Ms. Hopson summarized the current activities of the AO committee.

Facilities Disposition and Site Remediation Committee Update: Dawn Gillas, Chair

Ms. Gillas noted there are no open, pending or draft recommendations currently for her committee.

Nuclear Materials Committee Update: Larry Powell, Chair

Mr. Powell noted there are three open recommendations which he believed should be closed. Mr. Tanner asked if that had been discussed at the previous committee meeting, which Mr. Powell noted they had not. Mr. Tanner then asked the DDFO, Mr. Mikolanis, if the committee could vote on the open recommendations regardless at the following day when voting will commence on recommendations. Mr. Powell then agreed to provide a synopsis on the recommendations and why the committee would like to vote to close them the next day. He then opened discussion on recommendation 350.

Strategic and Legacy Management Committee Update: David Hoel, Vice Chair

Mr. Doerr summarized the previous SLM committee meeting and noted one open recommendation received a DOE response since that meeting which would be discussed at the next committee meeting. He then noted there are no new recommendations and one pending recommendations.

Mr. Tanner then noted that the DOE response to recommendation 350 was posted online previously which is where anyone who had not read it could do so.

Waste Management Committee Update: Gil Allensworth, Chair

Mr. Allensworth noted which were open and pending recommendations.

Balancing the Demands of EM Scope with the Pension Funding Committee Update: Tom French, Chair

Mr. French summarized the previous BPS committee meeting and what the next meeting would entail. Mr. Allensworth asked what would be done regarding membership with multiple outgoing members. He then noted he would step down as vice chair of this committee.

Discussion of Draft Recommendation:

"Investigate Feasibility of Reclassifying Certain High-Level Waste to Enable Acceleration of Disposal and Reduction of Costs"

Mr. Allensworth noted his support for this recommendation and then read it in its entirety. He then summarized the draft recommendation and its history.

Ms. Corbett noted her disagreement with this recommendation due to a lot of speculation and not enough information creating a lot of vagueness.

Mr. Malik noted the Senate had created a resolution to reclassify nuclear waste in the past, and he supported this recommendation.

Ms. Gillas also noted her agreement with this recommendation, and further noted the recommendation asks for a feasibility study.

Ms. Underwood asked if there's any way to ballpark the cost of the investigation and if the CAB would make the recommendation geared solely to the melter if the majority would be in support of it.

Mr. French suggested putting infrastructure into the recommendation, including creating a cask for shipping the melter and modifications for accepting said cask at WIPP.

Mr. Doerr noted the WM committee to forward this recommendation the full board, and DOE has reviewed this recommendation and has not pulled it. He then noted the studies and informational points in the references, and asked if the WM committee had reviewed these reference materials. Mr. Allensworth answered that Mr. Hoel, the previous recommendation manager, presented the recommendation and information to the committee which is what they based their support on. Mr. Doerr then noted the recommendation does not ask for a commitment but a feasibility study, therefore he is in favor of it.

Mr. Kaminski agreed that potential cost savings are important and would help the overall EM mission. He noted infrastructure would be part of this study, and the melter would probably not fit into WIPP but another low-level waste site if not destruction.

Mr. Smith voiced his support for this recommendation, and asked how the HLW was given. Mr. Folk answered that the HLW designation is given because the material was processed from SNF. He then noted that the recommendation is asking for a new designation to be given based on risk and quantity of material.

Mr. Malik noted there had already been some assessment for a cask design for melter transportation to Yucca Mountain.

Ms. Gillas noted that WIPP has the capability to remote handle packages already, and they've been able to be more flexible in recent years. She then noted that she is comfortable they would be able to figure that out. Larry Ling, SRR, noted NDAA authorizes the Secretary of Energy in consultation with the NRC to reclassify HLW and manage HLW as LLW. He further noted that in order to reclassify it the process would not be any different than closing tanks or producing saltstone since specific regulations would need to be followed – which he went into detail about.

Mr. Allensworth noted the CAB scope is solely SRS and not Yucca Mountain or WIPP. He further noted this recommendation is not asking about those topics, but solely to see if reclassification is possible.

Mr. Craig added this subject has been in discussion for the last three years and longer, and the Energy Communities Alliance sent DOE a letter within the last year on the topic supporting the reclassification. He further noted there are actions underway to respond to that letter. He then explained the ECA is representative of communities of all of the major sites within DOE including SRSCRO.

Public Comment

Jim Marra of CNTA added his thoughts on the draft recommendation based on his experience, and noted the US is the only country in the world who classifies their waste as source-based instead of risk-based.

END OF DAY 1, January 22nd, 2018

Attendance – Tuesday, January 23rd. 2018

CAB

Gil Allensworth
Susan Corbett
Bob Doerr
Thomas French
Dawn Gillas
Eleanor Hopson
Douglas Howard
Daniel Kaminski
Jim Lyon
Narinder Malik
John McMichael
Cathy Patterson
Larry Powell
Bill Rhoten
Earl Sheppard
Bob Smith
Nina Spinelli
Ed Sturcken
Joyce Underwood
David Vovakes
Mary Weber
Bobbie Williams

DOE/Contractors

Terry Spears, DOE-SR
Avery Hammett, DOE-SR
Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Soni Blanco, DOE-S
James Tanner, S&K
Chelsea Gitzen, S&K
Federica Staton, S&K
Kristen Huber, SRNS
Eloy Saldivar, SRNS
L Ling, SRR

Agency Liaisons

Gregory O'Quinn, SCDHEC
Sandra Snyder, SCDHEC
Heather Cathc, SCDHEC
Susan Fulmer, SCDHEC
Gregg O'Quinn, SCDHEC

Stakeholders

Dara Glass, BWXT
James Marra, CNTA
Michael Graham, Bechtel
Jeff Bess, BJWSA
Charles Rives, Jacobs
J Guille

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

Mr. Tanner reviewed the meeting rules and the agenda for the day.

Presentation: Savannah River Ecology Laboratory – Gene Rhodes, SREL

Mr. Rhodes provided an update and future plans for SREL projects. He also included an explanation of their mission, staff, funding, scope, significant events and advances.

Q&A Session

Ms. Underwood asked if SREL is creating opportunities to create relationships with other universities. Mr. Rhodes answered that they have a lot of other universities that they currently already have relationships with including USC Aiken, USC up-state, Augusta University and others throughout the region including Clemson and Benedict College in Columbia. Ms. Underwood then asked if the rice fish are native. Mr. Rhodes replied that they're not native, they're a model – a species which are easy to raise, reproduce and much is known about their genome which would be best used for studies and are used in multiple labs for collaborative purposes. Ms. Underwood then asked if carrion birds were tracked. Mr. Rhodes responded that they have a great knowledge of their current paths and they're not consumed by people. He further noted they also track ducks and have been for a long time.

Ms. Gillas noted she has had rabid racoons on her property which she had to dispose of and had called multiple local agencies and authorities to find out how to do that properly to no avail. Mr. Rhodes noted he would provide her with his email address to put her in touch with the right people who would apologize for how that situation was handled improperly. Ms. Gillas then asked if climate change is involved in their research. Mr. Rhodes answered yes, especially when studying amphibians.

Mr. Howard asked what the difference has been to cause an increase in the grad student population. Mr. Rhodes replied that low funding levels were to blame for the low level of grad students. Mr. Howard then asked how SREL conveys information to the public so they're able to understand it. Mr. Rhodes responded that it depends on the audience and trial and error is conducted to find the best way to communicate.

Mr. Vovakes asked if effects studied on genome discussed is in relation to human genomes or animal and plant genomes. Mr. Rhodes answered that all effects on all genomes are studied.

Ms. Weber asked if the tritium research could be explained. Mr. Rhodes replied and summarized all projects SREL is involved in with regards to tritium.

Mr. Kaminski noted what he described as a glaring error in a recent local news article which was discussed at the previous FDSR committee meeting. Mr. Rhodes also noted there had been accurate articles related to REMOP, and errors tend to occur if the source writing them does not ask for input from SREL.

Ms. Corbett asked how the survey will be disseminated and who will take part in it. Mr. Rhodes responded it would be disseminated by mail and advertised through the news and radio locally. He went on to explain that this would only be disseminated in Burke County. Ms. Corbett then asked who is writing the curriculum for radiation risk for schools, to which Mr. Rhodes answered SREL would be, and corrected her to note that they were conducting activities working with teachers such as showing teachers how to take samples from the school grounds which SREL analyzes to show them the data on metals and other things which occur in soils in order to help them understand monitoring programs.

Mr. Malik asked if SREL had observed any mutations at SRS in the animals or plants, to which Mr. Rhodes replied no. Mr. Malik then asked about a change in the ecosystem of the site. Mr. Rhodes responded no.

Mr. Doerr asked what are some of the primary sources for external funding for SREL. Mr. Rhodes answered US Department of Agriculture, Department of Defense, National Science Foundation, US Corps of Army Engineers, state funds, and foundations.

Ms. Williams asked if SREL researches all of the species on site. Mr. Rhodes replied no, mostly they research species related to the movement of contaminants such as most of the mammals.

Ms. Corbett asked if anyone had seen any mutations at SRS. Mr. Rhodes responded he didn't have a conclusive answer.

When the Q&A Session ended, Mr. Sheppard acknowledged his deputy general manager Jeff Boss and co-worker Brian Chemsak for attending and supporting him.

Presentation: Status of Liquid Waste Operations – Tom Foster, SRR

Mr. Foster summarized the status of LW operations on SRS currently and future plans.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if Mr. Foster could summarize the issues with the ground under the SDUs. Mr. Foster answered that the underlying ground structure has been studied as part of the performance assessment to make sure the soil can withstand the weight of the structure. Ms. Gillas then asked when the melter was taken out and moved there was stuff which needed to be cleaned. Mr. Foster replied yes.

Ms. Corbett asked where the evaporator would go when it needs to be replaced. Mr. Foster responded it would go onto the on-site burial ground, but determinations as to what would be able to be cleaned up and how it would be classified had not yet been completed. Ms. Corbett asked what the base metal is. Mr. Foster answered it is a G3 Hastelloy. Ms. Corbett asked how putting a cap on the bottom fixed the leak. Mr. Foster replied that he had provided a video of the leak in his presentation which was at the bottom of the cone, which you can see is stopped by inserting the cap. Ms. Corbett asked if it would fill up, to which Mr. Foster responded yes it would, but it would still be contained there. Ms. Corbett continued on to ask if the robots used for such projects are stored. Mr. Foster answered they are stored and re-used in a contained environment.

Mr. Smith asked if the skid was calculated in the cost, which Mr. Foster replied it is. Mr. Smith then asked if the radiation was low enough to classify as LLW and could the unit be transported accordingly. Mr. Foster responded that it was a potential outcome and would depend on the risk assessment.

Mr. Malik asked if salts could deposit and fix the leak themselves. Mr. Foster answered yes it could and has possibly already occurred as they have seen with other leaks.

Ms. Williams asked if the robot used was developed at SRNL, to which Mr. Foster replied one was developed at SRNL. Ms. Williams continued by asking how the leak was discovered. Mr. Foster responded that an alarm was sounded. Ms. Williams continued further by asking if there's any shielding between the rail car and the melter when it was transported. Mr. Foster answered that the box the melter was in provided quite a bit of shielding.

Ms. Corbett asked how far down in the ground the melter is. Mr. Foster answered the box top is at grade level and it is about 25 feet tall. Ms. Corbett asked how one would know if a melter is failing. Mr. Foster replied there were problems keeping the melt pool stable which would then affect the pour stream, and one of the cooling water lines failed causing a short in the electrical heaters. Ms. Corbett asked yet again if internals are cleaned when a melter shuts down. Mr. Foster responded that the design of the melter has a drain plug in the bottom and canisters are positioned underneath the melter for this purpose, but it no longer worked, leaving residual glass in the melter. Ms. Corbett asked if the digging caused any releases, to which Mr. Foster answered no and further explained there are containments in place if a release does happen to prevent it from entering the surrounding environment. Ms. Corbett asked if there's a corrosive effect of salt on the SDUs structure. Mr. Foster noted there

is a liner inside of the SDUs and the type of concrete used is estimated to last through all 10 half lives of the materials inside of them.

Mr. Smith asked if the wells were radiographed when manufacturing the evaporator. Mr. Foster replied they were 100% radiographed which are not necessarily kept for the life of the vessel, but they do have the QA acceptance.

Presentation: Status of Nuclear Materials Operations – Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Ms. Maxted presented a status update on all of the NM operations at SRS.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked when the CAB would be provided with the system plan. Ms. Maxted responded that it is currently under review at HQ, SRS and NNSA but approval is expected to some time in February. Redacted copies she estimated may be available in March.

Mr. Malik asked if heavy water would be shipped to India and Canada. Ms. Maxted noted there is currently over 500,000 gallons still at SRS and at one point they were working with the Canadians since they still use heavy reactors which require heavy water as a moderator, but the problem with heavy water is that tritium exists in it so it's contaminated. She further noted the Canadians are on and off with regards to wanting this heavy water since they have plenty currently. Mr. Malik then asked if it falls under the Price-Anderson Act, to which Ms. Maxted replied it would.

Mr. Howard asked if the down-blended HEU is sent anywhere other than TVA. Ms. Maxted answered they receive all of it currently.

Presentation: Integrated Priority List – John Lopez, DOE-SR
Mr. Lopez summarized the current IPL for SRS.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if the CAB could view what would not be funded in the future. Mr. Lopez noted OMB would not allow that to be shared. Ms. Gillas asked what is included in "DOE managed." Mr. Lopez answered the support services contract, PBS 11C provides money to Los Alamos, and any direct DOE contracts like SREL funding which is under PBS 13. Ms. Gillas then asked of PBS 41 which organization owns that. Mr. Lopez noted Mr. Mikolanis's organization does. Ms. Gillas asked when the FY19 budget would be released, to which Mr. Lopez responded February when the president releases his budget.

Ms. Spinelli asked if there is a cost savings by creating two SDUs at once, to which Mr. Lopez answered if the same contractor is working on both then there is a potential for savings.

Mr. Vovakes asked regarding the FY18 CR if the Office of Management & Budget allows them to request something called CR anomalies where legislative relief is given. Mr. Lopez replied the site requested them but it did not go further than OMB.

Mr. Allensworth asked what would happen at min safe levels in NM. Mr. Lopez responded that H Canyon would be maintained at a high state of readiness but no product would be run through the facility and no foreign fuels would come to the site. Mr. Allensworth asked what the layoffs would be, to which Mr. Lopez answered it would be relative to whatever was awarded in the budget and pension funding. Mr. Allensworth noted a lot of operations would cease and many at SRS would lose their jobs. He then asked everyone to consider what they would encounter if a fixed cost in their budget increased by 38% and how that would impact them.

Ms. Weber noted the budget would be coming out in February but the committee for the CAB that creates the IPL meets again in April. She then asked what Mr. Tanner thought they could do in order to get the IPL to DOE before the budget came out. Mr. Tanner replied that both the drafting of the IPL and editing as well as voting was done at the 2017 March full board meeting. Ms. Weber then asked if a draft could be given to the committee so they can do the same in the 2018 March full board meeting, to which Mr. Tanner responded yes.

Mr. Howard asked if min safe are done on paper or put into practice to rehearse. Mr. Lopez answered nothing is physically, done this is planning done on paper. Ms. Maxted also added that documented safety analysis specifies what minimum staffing and activities need to be done in order for that facility to stay safe.

Mr. Vovakes asked what the OMB response has been to the pension crisis. Mr. Lopez replied that they are communicating as well as site leadership with DOE and all parties are aware. Mr. Craig added FY17 and FY18 requests reflected what was needed for pension funding.

Ms. Williams asked if money saved from building SDU 6 could be moved to pension funding. Mr. Lopez responded that they have proposed to Congress that those funds in addition to those saved during SWPF construction to be moved into the LW program.

Voting: Committee Chairs

Ms. Williams noted she would like Ms. Hopson to continue as chair, which Ms. Hopson noted she would accept if Ms. Williams would serve as her vice chair, which Ms. Williams accepted. Mr. Tanner then passed out the ballots, collected them, and they were taken to be counted.

Presentation: Topics for Consideration: Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation – Avery Hammett, DOE-SR

Ms. Hammett presented topics for consideration for the 2018 SRS CAB work plan. She also presented the topics for consideration from 2017 for reference.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas suggested adding statuses of projects other than D Ash which was accepted.

Mr. Smith suggested topics related to SREL projects such as pollination which was accepted.

Mr. Allensworth noted the SRS CAB scope is to provide feedback on topics DOE-SR asks for input on, which are included in each committee's topics for consideration presentation.

Ms. Corbett suggested updates on solvents. Ms. Hammett asked for specifics and Ms. Corbett noted solvents being remediated which was accepted.

Presentation: Topics for Consideration: Nuclear Materials – Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR

Ms. Maxted presented topics for consideration for the 2018 SRS CAB work plan. She also presented the topics for consideration from 2017 for reference.

Q&A Session

Mr. Malik suggested Price Anderson Act violations and Quality Assurance which was accepted.

Ms. Gillas suggested plutonium disposition options other than blending down which was accepted.

Ms. Corbett suggested environmental impacts of the tritium facility. Ms. Maxted noted that's an NNSA program which does not fall under the DOE EM purview, but information on this facility are included in the environmental report annually for NNSA facilities.

Ms. Gillas suggested 235-F deactivation update, which was accepted.

Presentation: Topics for Consideration: Strategic & Legacy Management – Zach Todd, DOE-SR

Mr. Todd presented topics for consideration for the 2018 SRS CAB work plan. She also presented the topics for consideration from 2017 for reference.

Q&A Session

Mr. Doerr suggested the SREL funding increase as a topic.

Ms. Gillas suggested an update from the SRSCRO which was accepted.

Mr. Powell suggested feedback from DOE which recommendations from the SRS CAB have been helpful and how they impacted their decisions, which was accepted. Mr. Mikolanis noted this would be a good topic to cover in the 2018 work plan.

Presentation: Topics for Consideration: Waste Management – Soni Blanco, DOE-SR

Ms. Blanco presented topics for consideration for the 2018 SRS CAB work plan. She also presented the topics for consideration from 2017 for reference.

Q&A Session

Mr. Malik suggested the hazardous and mixed waste as a topic, which was accepted.

Ms. Gillas suggested GWSB status and DWPF status, along with TRU waste categories, which was all accepted.

Ms. Corbett suggested solid LLW as a topic, which was accepted.

Public Comment

None.

Voting: Recommendation 338

Revision of the Savannah River Site Community Involvement Plan

Ms. Spinelli asked for a motion to vote to close this recommendation, which was made and seconded. This recommendation was passed for closure with a majority vote.

Voting: Recommendation 334

Nuclear Materials Operation Review

Ms. Spinelli asked for a motion to vote to close this recommendation, which was made and seconded. This recommendation was passed for closure with a majority vote.

Voting: Recommendation 348

H Canyon & SRS SNF Program

Ms. Spinelli asked for a motion to vote to close this recommendation, which was made and seconded. This recommendation was passed for closure with a majority vote.

Voting: Recommendation 349

Oppose the Consolidation of Interim Storage of SNF & HLW at SRS

Ms. Spinelli asked for a motion to vote to close this recommendation, which was made and seconded. This recommendation was passed for closure with a majority vote.

Voting: Draft Recommendation

Investigate Feasibility of Reclassifying Certain High-Level Waste to Enable Acceleration of Disposal and Reduction of Costs

Ms. Spinelli summarized the history behind this recommendation and asked for a motion to vote to pass this recommendation was made and seconded. This recommendation was passed with a majority vote.

~Meeting adjourned

All presentations are available for review on the SRS CAB's website: cab.srs.gov