

Meeting Minutes
Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) – Full Board Meeting
Hilton Garden Inn – Augusta, GA
September 24th & 25th, 2018

Attendance – Monday, September 24th, 2018

<u>CAB</u> Brian Chemsak Betty Cook Susan Corbett David Eisele Thomas French Dawn Gillas Jim Guille Charles Hilton Eleanor Hopson Douglas Howard Dan Kaminski Narinder Malik Gregg Murray Larry Powell Joyce Underwood David Vovakes Mary Weber Bobbie Williams	<u>DOE/Contractors</u> Zack Todd, DOE-SR Jim Folk, DOE-SR Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR de’Lisa Carrico, DOE-SR Amy Boyette, DOE-SR Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR Avery Hammett, DOE-SR Pam Marks, DOE-SR James Tanner, S&K Chelsea Gitzen, S&K Federica Staton, S&K	<u>Agency Liaisons</u> Jon Richards, EPA Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC Grace Anne Martin, SCDHEC Susan Fulmer, SCDHEC Gregg O’Quinn, SCDHEC Sandra Snyder, SCDHEC <u>Stakeholders</u> Tom Clements, SRS Watch Mark Ellison, Jacobs Michael Graham, Bechtel Chuck Messick Suzanne Rhodes, SCLWV Janie Scott, GA WAND Ed Wannamacher, BWXT Becky Rafter, GA WAND Lindsay Harper, GA WAND
---	--	---

CAB Chair Update: Doug Howard, CAB Vice Chair

Mr. Howard summarized the recent 2018 EMSSAB Chairs meeting held in Alexandria, VA.

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

Mr. Tanner reviewed the meeting rules and agenda.

Agency Updates

Thomas Johnson, Associate Deputy Site Manager, Department of Energy –
Savannah River (DOE-SR)

Mr. Johnson provided an update on various projects and events on site related to the EM purview of the CAB.

Q&A Session

Mr. Malik asked what the target for saltstone is for FY18. Mr. Folk answered that the target is about 700,000 gallons. Mr. Malik then asked what the status is regarding the replacement of the 3H Evaporator pot. Mr. Folk replied that they are proceeding with the procurement of a spare pot in the event that it would be needed, noting they’ve procured all of the material and initiated construction. Mr. Malik then continued by asking what the disposition path would be for the current pot. Mr. Folk responded that in the past similar equipment was buried on site. He further explained the process as flushing out equipment as best as possible to clean it out, and see if it meets requirements to bury it on site inside of a large box.

Mr. Kaminski asked if there’s an associated cost savings for the asphalt millings. Mr. Mikolanis answered that in some cases “the millings are sold back for some cost reduction, but in this instance the contractor did not want to reuse or recycle those so there were no cost savings or reduction for giving the tailings back to them.” He also added that they were used on site in order to strengthen roads which are otherwise just clay. Mr. Johnson also added that the SRS CRO also took some of the millings for reuse as well. Mr. Kaminski further noted that it would save on cost for road maintenance in the future. Mr. Kaminski continued by asking how many more canisters are left to go in order to retain the 1 ton reduction of plutonium. Mr. Mikolanis replied that he could not answer that question on the topic of plutonium, and that what he could say is that their NNSA customer is very pleased with the support that they’ve given them. Mr. Kaminski continued on again by asking if any issues were discovered during the canister tear downs. Mr. Mikolanis responded that there were no issues noted with the destructive examinations of canisters. Mr. Kaminski asked yet another question; if there had been any progress regarding the saltstone

facility feed. Mr. Folk answered yes, the supply of feed has essentially been depleted. Mr. Kaminski then asked if progress had been made on the overall levels of liquid waste. Mr. Folk replied that there is about 35 million gallons total waste across the system, which has remained flat for the past several years.

Ms. Williams asked when the announcement for the liquid waste acquisition will be. Mr. Johnson responded that it is currently in the review process and it could be announced at any time in the immediate or near future.

Mr. Hilton asked when the facilities in outages will be back to processing materials. Mr. Folk answered that the only unit which is inoperable at the moment is the MCU unit, which is the salt-processing unit. He added that it's been down now for about a month or longer, and they've been experiencing some blockage within that system which is preventing the processing of salt, which then supplies feed to DWPF, saltstone, etc. He further noted that the rest of the system is operable and they're really focused on getting MCU cleaned up, going through a rigorous program right now trying to identify what that blockage is and what the cause of that is. Mr. Hilton then asked what the process is for cleaning the MCU unit, and Mr. Folk replied that mostly it's a high-velocity flush.

Jon Richards, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Mr. Richards summarized EPA current projects as well as coordination of activities with DOE-SR, and noted he would be providing more details during his presentation the following day.

Q&A Session

Ms. Corbett asked if hurricane Florence created any concerns regarding rainfall and what the EPA did to prepare SRS for it. Mr. Richards responded that as with Irma and other hurricanes, they ensured their superfund websites were updated and visited each of the superfund sites to make certain each was free of damage. He also added that the EPA maintained constant contact with SRS and other federal facilities throughout hurricane Florence including collecting photos and asking for an assessment, and they're confident in SRS' ability to do its job.

Mr. Kaminski asked if Mr. Richards could include the EPA's opinion as to what the greatest success at SRS has been this past year during his presentation tomorrow. Mr. Richards agreed, and then noted that the fact that when SRS isn't able to finish a certain project due to extenuating circumstances, they instead complete others which he noted he hoped other DOE sites would take note of.

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

Ms. Wilson provided an update regarding general projects under the SCDHEC purview and DOE-SR collaboration. Ms. Martin noted she provided materials regarding the ESOP program on the materials table.

Q&A Session

Mr. Kaminski asked if there are any areas inside SRS which are a concern if flooded and waste is moved like there is in other areas such as waste ponds unrelated to SRS. Ms. Wilson answered that in the 70's and 80's yes, but back in that time period they worked hard to close the open ponds and similar areas so those concerns have already been addressed.

Ms. Gillas asked if there are any other coal ash basins besides those in D Area. Mr. Mikolanis replied that there are a number of ash piles which still need to be remediated, D Area ash being the largest of those piles and the closest to Savannah River.

Mr. Hilton asked what is being done by DHEC for missed deadlines. Ms. Wilson responded that whenever an extension is asked for by SRS they cite some pretty good reasons which may be legitimate, so those reasons and the time are evaluated. She further noted that it isn't a good way to spend time by going after taxpayer's money in court. She also added they would evaluate whether or not the extension is justified and the time proposed is appropriate.

Committee Updates

Administrative & Outreach Committee Update: Eleanor Hopson, Chair

Ms. Hopson announced when and where the next AO meeting would be held.

Facilities Disposition & Site Remediation: Joyce Underwood, Chair

Ms. Underwood summarized the current draft recommendations and announced when the next FDSR meeting will be held.

Nuclear Materials: Larry Powell, Chair

Mr. Powell summarized the current recommendation statuses for NM.

Strategic & Legacy Management: Dan Kaminski, Chair

Mr. Kaminski summarized the current recommendation statuses, reviewed which presentations would be given the following day were requested by SLM, and announced when the next SLM meeting will be held.

Waste Management: Dawn Gillas, Chair

Ms. Gillas summarized the current recommendation statuses for WM, reviewed which presentations would be given the following day were requested by WM, and announced when the next WM meeting will be held.

Presentation

Presentation: SWPF Update – Pam Marks, DOE-SR

Ms. Marks provided a very detailed presentation regarding an update on the status of SWPF.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked who chose the epic positioner. Ms. Marks answered that it was the design from Parsons.

Mr. Malik asked what permits are required to operate SWPF. Ms. Marks replied yes, they will get a separate permit to operate SWPF. Mr. Malik then asked if anyone has calculated what the radionuclide emission will be when the facility is in operation. Ms. Marks responded they have done a full environmental compliance including waste acceptance criteria and environmental permits. Mr. Malik continued by asking when the final ORR would be performed on this facility. Ms. Marks estimated it would be about September of 2019.

Mr. Hilton asked if DOE is bearing the cost of replacing the valves. Ms. Marks replied that they have a cost reimbursable contract with their contractors which covers the cost of the replacement. She further noted that it was a joint decision between DOE and Parsons who both agreed it was the safest and best solution. Mr. Hilton continued on to comment that in his experience, if there's a design flaw then somebody pays other than the owner – either the engineer for bad design or the contractor or the supplier for providing them with things that don't meet the design parameters. He added that he's confused as to why DOE is paying for that. Ms. Marks responded that fundamentally, because they are under a cost-reimbursable arrangement. She also added that of course they have incentives with their contractor to perform to a certain criteria, one of which is delivery on a certain schedule on a certain cost. She continued by adding that because of this issue, they have jeopardized a good portion of that incentive, so the government is getting some recovery as a result of this because of the incentive structure that they put in place.

Ms. Corbett asked how the reduction of the radioactive waste volume for vitrification would work and what that means. Mr. Folk answered that this information included in the first slide is referring to if you were processing all 35 million gallons or up to 100 million gallons once it's dissolved, all of which would have to go through vitrification if steps were not taken with MCU now and SWPF later. Ms. Corbett then asked if once SWPF is up and running if that will negate the need for [ARP] and MCU. Mr. Folk replied yes. Ms. Corbett continued on by asking if they will then go away. Mr. Folk responded yes, they will. Ms. Corbett then asked a series of clarification questions.

Mr. Eisele asked who is writing the DSA and the TSR. Ms. Marks answered that her contractor is, and then DOE approves them. Mr. Eisele asked if she is confident with the contractor writing those documents, to which she replied yes. She further noted there has been a significant level of oversight of the writing of those documents. Mr. Eisele then asked if the SER is being generated by Ms. Mark's staff, to which Ms. Marks responded yes. He continued by asking if she had qualified staff to generate that, to which she also answered yes.

Mr. Powell asked if the epic positioner devices are off of the shelf or if they were built solely for this purpose. Ms. Marks replied that they're essentially off of the shelf, but firmware development was done to make them adapt – but they were not specially made. Mr. Powell then asked regarding the new-generation solvents, what are they and how do they differ from old-generation solvents. Ms. Marks responded that they differ in the size of the molecule that grabs the cesium, and the new-generation solvents have larger openings to grab the cesium.

Mr. Guille asked if while the epic positioners were changed out, did they also have to change the firmware for each installation or if it is a form factor change. Ms. Marks answered that because they stayed with the Westlock product line, fortunately the positioner bolted off and there was some re-wiring which needed to be done. She added that because these are air-activated valves, some re-tubing needed to be done. She also added that they were doing five to eight controllers a day with two two-man crews. Mr. Guille asked who the interfacing software belonged to, to which Ms. Marks replied that it belonged to Parsons who used a support contractor.

Mr. Murray asked how long the self-assessments usually take. Ms. Marks responded that the review itself takes about two to three weeks.

Mr. Howard asked what the cost is for the replacement of the epic positioners. Ms. Marks answered that it's around \$5 million for the controllers and the labor. Mr. Howard then asked if a lower-scale modeling could have been done to indicate that the epic positioners would present problems. Ms. Marks replied that they did do some functional testing outside of construction, including factory acceptance testing and testing by the vendor. She added that she does not believe it would have been an issue found with testing.

Ms. Corbett asked what the name of the new solvent is. Ms. Marks responded it is Max Calix, and the previous solvent is Bob Calix – both are uniquely synthesized material for their operations. Ms. Corbett then asked if it is dangerous to humans, to which Ms. Marks answered no. Ms. Corbett continued on yet again by asking what releases or emissions SWPF will be producing when in operation. Ms. Marks replied that it will produce controlled air emissions which comply with release criteria permits and very small levels of radiation – in the pico curies.

Mr. Kaminski asked regarding the contract incentives if it will be impacted by the \$5 million amount. Ms. Marks responded that it would be way more.

Recommendation Discussion

Recommendation 354: Re-Classifying HLW

Mr. Tanner noted that the WM committee had voted to close this recommendation, which Ms. Gillas agreed with.

Recommendation 355: Budget, Pension & Scope

Mr. French summarized the response to this recommendation.

Draft Recommendation: EMSSAB Chairs Recommendation – Public Engagement

Mr. Howard read the draft recommendation in its entirety and summarized its history.

Draft Recommendation: Pollinator Management Plan

Ms. Underwood summarized the recommendation and its history. Mr. French made a minor edit suggestion which was not accepted. Mr. Powell provided some background as to why this recommendation is important. The decision was ultimately made to send this recommendation back to FDSR to make some significant changes.

Draft Recommendation: Plant Indigenous Flowering Plants on Industrial Landfills

Mr. Kaminski summarized this recommendation and its history.

Public Comment

Tom Clements shared his support for the EMSSAB Chairs Recommendation.

Chuck Messick made some suggestions to the Pollinator Management Plan draft recommendation.

Becky Rafter expressed concern with DNFSB access to SRS documents, and made suggestions to current draft recommendations as well as made announcements regarding her organization – GA WAND.

END OF DAY 1, September 24th, 2018

Attendance – Tuesday, September 25th. 2018

CAB
Gil Allensworth
Brian Chemsak
Betty Cook
Susan Corbett
David Eisele
Thomas French
Dawn Gillas
Jim Guille
Charles Hilton
Eleanor Hopson
Douglas Howard
Dan Kaminski
Narinder Malik
Gregg Murray
Larry Powell
Joyce Underwood
Mary Weber
Bobbie Williams

DOE/Contractors
Jim Folk, DOE-SR
David Bender, DOE-SR
Avery Hammett, DOE-SR
Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR
de’Lisa Carrico, DOE-SR
Amy Boyette, DOE-SR
Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR
James Tanner, S&K
Chelsea Gitzen, S&K
Federica Staton, S&K
Kristin Huber, SRNS
Tamara Baldwin, SRNS
Andrew Albenesius, SRNS
Bob Martini, SRNS
Dr. Vahid Majidi, SRNL
Bill Barnes, SRR

Agency Liaisons
Jon Richards, EPA
Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC
Grace Anne Martin,
SCDHEC
Susan Fulmer, SCDHEC
Gregg O’Quinn, SCDHEC
Michael Bailey, SCDHEC
Karen Sprayberry, SCDHEC
Sandra Snyder, SCDHEC

Stakeholders
Tom Clements, SRS Watch
Enrique Rosado
Mark Ellison, Jacobs
Michael Graham, Bechtel
Chuck Messick
Rick McLeod, SRSCRO
Janie Scott, GA WAND
Suzanne Rhodes, SCLWV

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

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

CAB Chair Update: Gil Allensworth, CAB Chair

Mr. Allensworth summarized the recent 2018 EMSSAB Chairs meeting held in Alexandria, VA and recent events regarding the DOE budget.

Presentations

Presentation: Federal & State Oversight – Jon Richards, EPA & Shelly Wilson, SCDHEC

Mr. Richards gave a very detailed presentation on what oversight the EPA provides in general, and also specifically related to SRS. Ms. Wilson presented on what oversight SCDHEC provides in general as well as specifically related to SRS. She also enlisted her staff members Michael Bailey and Karen Sprayberry to present on the same topics with their individual expertise.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if there had been reductions in the regulations related to SRS regulatory oversight. Mr. Richards answered that he had no knowledge of any.

Ms. Underwood asked regarding a presented list of current focuses would be priorities. Mr. Richards replied that D Area is a priority as of recently, but all milestones and tanks are also priorities. Ms. Underwood then asked if the lower three runs and the tanks are the most problematic areas, to which Mr. Richards responded yes.

Mr. Hilton asked if the ROD addresses the current schedules related to milestone deadlines. Mr. Folk answered that when the milestones were negotiated originally they tried to address the progression of time and they’ll be entering into the same type of negotiations this year as well, noting that schedules may be delayed and changes are addressed during negotiations but they do their best to meet the milestones.

Mr. Malik asked how the CAB could help generate more information about CERCLA and help the EPA. Mr. Richards replied that educating the public would help which can be done through presentations to the CAB. Mr. Malik then asked how CERCLA

and RCRA mesh together when some DOE sites are under one or the other. Mr. Richards responded that most sites started under RCRA and when superfund takes over sometimes they just rolled into their CERCLA program while still fulfilling RCRA functions.

Mr. Guille asked how much of the overall budget for region 4 is devoted to activities taking place at SRS. Mr. Richards answered that personnel-wise about 25% is dedicated to federal facilities.

Mr. Malik asked if SCDHEC is responsible for regulating navigable waters. Ms. Wilson replied yes. Mr. Malik then asked if there has been an environmental release from the tank farms. Ms. Wilson responded there had been a spill in previous years of around 100 gallons which is considered to be a relatively small spill, and there are groundwater plumes underneath the HLW tank farms, but everything is currently protected very well but in the event of a natural catastrophic disaster there would be concerns.

Mr. Howard asked if someone were to go higher than the standards and the client has a problem with that who would resolve that dispute. Ms. Wilson answered that would be within the state system. Mr. Howard asked for a quick example. Ms. Wilson replied that the HLW tank closures are shared between federal, state, EPA and DOE. She continued by using the SWPF as an example, which she said SCDHEC was more stringent with and chose a startup date of their own in a state document.

Mr. Powell asked what the origin is of the 35 million gallons of LW which remain as indicated in the presentation. Ms. Wilson responded that it's from H and F Canyons from processing nuclear materials and spent fuel.

Mr. Hilton asked when the last tank was closed down and when is the next one scheduled to be closed down. Mr. Folk answered that it was Tank 16 & 12 which were closed most recently in 2017 and he expects Tank 15 or 10 will be the next to close in three to four years.

Ms. Underwood asked how long after the pause were tanks beginning to close again. Ms. Wilson replied she believes it was in 2015 when the next tank was closed.

Ms. Corbett asked if there is an estimate as to how many curies would be left in the tanks. Ms. Wilson responded that SCDHEC has set a budget for the tank farms regarding how much material should be left, which is driven by a performance assessment, but the individual tank by tank decision is made on technically did they get enough waste out, and is it within the budget which the performance assessment says science-wise could be ok. She then added that what they can get out of the tanks is normally better than what the budget requires. She continued by adding that about less than 1% of the original radioactivity would end up in the tank residuals. Ms. Corbett then asked if there were a tank which exceeded the budget what would happen then. Ms. Wilson answered that they would not accept that tank for closure, but that has not been the case. She added that the technology currently used enables tanks to be cleared out well below the budget.

Mr. Allensworth asked for an update on ESAB. Ms. Wilson replied that they're doing very well on ESAB, and the data from the last year is on the materials table for this meeting which is available to CAB members and members of the public. Mr. Allensworth asked if we have the funding needed to continue ESAB. Ms. Wilson responded yes.

Presentation: [SRNL Update & Funding](#) – Dr. Vahid Majidi, SRNL

Dr. Majidi provided a synopsis of the SRNL mission and an update on current projects as well as funding.

Q&A Session

Mr. Powell asked how many German graphite spheres SRNL has and when they were brought there. Dr. Majidi answered that those spheres don't have any SNF inside of them, they're just the practice fuel elements which are not irradiated and they were brought to SRNL a couple of years ago.

Mr. Allensworth asked how valuable the research reactor fuel is which comes out of H Canyon. Dr. Majidi replied that it is one of those things which a price cannot be applied to because there are two places where this type of fuel can be purchased: Russia and China. Mr. Allensworth then asked if this could potentially serve as a way to offset the cost of upgrading H Canyon since it is such an old facility. Dr. Majidi responded that he's not necessarily sure if it's a direct offset, but it's a way to bring a compelling mission to the H Canyon which DOE is directly looking for. Mr. Allensworth continued by asking if SRS needs a super computer like Oak Ridge has. Dr. Majidi answered that we actually have access to those computers, many of them are run under a user agreement and SRNL receives preference over other users as a national lab. Mr. Allensworth continued yet again by asking if there was any progress in a partnership between SRNL and USC Aiken. Dr. Majidi replied that it's being supported at the highest level and he's hoping to see it happen very soon.

Ms. Underwood asked if any research was being done to combat social engineering. Dr. Majidi responded no, not social engineering specifically.

Mr. Howard asked if SRNL is utilizing genomics. Dr. Majidi answered that SREL is focused on genomics and its environmental impacts of the non-human residents on site.

Mr. Murray asked if Dr. Majidi could provide a brief update regarding the recent safety pause as well as lessons learned. Dr. Majidi replied that as the SRNL director, one of the challenges he has is that the lab has an impeccable safety record. He continued on by noting since he had become the director, there was an upward trend of incidents which are things that did not cause injury. So, he went on to note, they looked at these incidents and found safety had become second nature causing these near-misses but not serious incidents which they concluded was due to complacency. He further added that there were issues with procedures being followed, as well as a lack of senior management engagement.

Mr. French asked if SRNL will be more independent and visible in the future as it has been increasingly lately. Dr. Majidi responded yes, absolutely.

Presentation: Consent Order NCO-2016-01 – Bob Martini, SRNS

Mr. Martini provided a detailed presentation on the application of Consent Order NCO-2016-01.

Q&A Session

Ms. Weber asked if Mr. Martini could provide some background on the consent order since some newer CAB members may not know why it came about, and for a definition of “no findings.” Mr. Martini answered that in 2015 in the nuclear safety section of the office of enforcement, they experienced two events which impacted their compliance with nuclear safety requirements. He went on to explain that the HB line facility lost power and while restoring it to the facility they did not recognize that one of their pieces of equipment did not have the power restored which was an agitator which was used to stir the nuclear material inside of a vessel. He continued explaining that when samples were taken from that vessel they were not accurate which is a nuclear safety requirement resulting in a control violation. He further added that later that year, they had an event where operators were packaging nuclear material and put it in a different container than was required. He continued on to answer her second question, stating that assessing to requirements was done which is very black and white, answering the question of are requirements being followed or not, therefore “no findings” means an assessor evaluated work against criteria and found that at no time was the work not in compliance with the work documents and criteria. Ms. Weber asked for clarification as to whether or not previous work was looked at. Mr. Martini replied that it was related to current work at the time of the inspection.

Mr. Allensworth asked what was the cost of generating the consent order inspection. Mr. Martini responded that it was conducted by NNSA at no cost to DOE-SR. He added that SRNS also conducted an internal review at their own expense. Mr. Allensworth asked how the consent order was funded, which Mr. Mikolanis answered he would find out and get back to the CAB with a response.

Mr. Eisele asked who conducted the independent review. Mr. Martini replied that he forgot the name of the company but they were subcontracted, both were previously long-time employees of SRS.

Presentation: 3H Evaporator Status – Bill Barnes, SRR

Mr. Barnes provided an annual update to the 3H Evaporator status.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if not putting insulation back on it affects the evaporator performance. Mr. Barnes responded no, it does not.

Mr. Howard asked regarding the two minor leaks if they were there before the major leak occurred. Mr. Barnes answered that “is the predominant theory that those minor leak sites, since the evaporator was put in operation 20 or so years ago but they were only discovered after the major leak and detailed inspections.” Mr. Howard then asked how long Mr. Barnes felt the evaporator will be in use. Mr. Barnes replied he estimated it will last the life of the mission.

Mr. Guille asked where the wash water which is evaporated go. Mr. Barnes responded that the water is condensed, treated, then sent to the affluent treatment facility so it can then be released into the environment.

Ms. Corbett asked who manufactured the evaporator. Mr. Barnes answered that it is Joseph Oat. Ms. Corbett then asked if the replacement evaporator is coming from the same company, to which Mr. Barnes replied yes. He then explained in great detail what they did to ensure the equipment was of the best quality upon completion and during the design process. Ms. Corbett asked if the material caused the welds to deteriorate or what activity would otherwise cause it to deteriorate and eventually need replacing. Mr. Barnes responded that the “experts concluded that the issues are related to welding technique” which was used. Ms. Corbett continued on by asking if those welding technique errors should have been picked up during closer inspection, to which Mr. Barnes answered yes, and instead of SRS QA inspecting a percentage of welds, they now examine 100% of them very closely.

Ms. Underwood asked if placing the materials in a tank further exacerbates the tank problem. Mr. Barnes replied no, it doesn't and equated it to a drop in the bucket. Ms. Underwood then asked when the site is closed if that machine will have to be decommissioned. Mr. Barnes responded no, that it would either be decontaminated and disposed or grouted after all of the waste is removed.

Mr. Malik asked what precautions are being taken to prevent further erosion. Mr. Barnes answered that they cut down steam flow at the repaired major leak site by a third which has changed the erosion rate from 16 years to over 100 years. Mr. Malik then asked if the insulation was causing a problem. Mr. Barnes replied that they do not believe so.

Public Comment

Suzanne Rhodes commented about her organization, the League of Women Voters and their concerns with the tanks keeping waste at SRS in perpetuity as well as a lack of funding to be able to maintain the tanks.

Tom Clements commented on the MOX facility.

Chuck Messick commented on the pollinator recommendations and his congruence with those efforts as well as his support of the German graphite SNF project.

Voting

Recommendation 354: Re-Classifying HLW

Ms. Gillas provided some background on this recommendation and concluded that the WM committee recommends it's closure. Mr. Allensworth called for a motion to vote to close this recommendation which was granted by Mr. Malik and seconded by Ms. Underwood. This recommendation was passed for closure with a vote of 15 yay, 1 nay, 0 abstain.

Recommendation 355: Budget, Pension & Scope

Mr. French provided some background on this recommendation and the BPS committee, then noted the BPS committee recommended it for closure. Mr. Allensworth called for a motion to vote to close this recommendation which was granted by Mr. French, and seconded by Mr. Powell. This recommendation was passed for closure with a vote of 17 yay, 0 nay, 0 abstain. Mr. Allensworth thanked Mr. French for his service to the BPS committee.

Draft Recommendation: EMSSAB Chairs Recommendation – Public Engagement

Mr. Allensworth provided some background on this draft recommendation and asked for a motion to vote to accept it as a recommendation which was granted by Mr. Malik and seconded by Ms. Underwood. This draft recommendation was passed and accepted as a recommendation with a vote of 16 yay, 1 nay, 0 abstain.

Draft Recommendation: Plant Indigenous Flowering Plants on Industrial Landfills

Mr. Kaminski provided some background on this draft recommendation and summarized it as well. Mr. Allensworth called for a motion to vote to accept it as a recommendation which was granted by Mr. French and seconded by Ms. Gillas. This draft recommendation was passed and accepted as a recommendation with a vote of 16 yay, 1 nay, 0 abstain.

Presentations - Continued

Presentation: Common Site Infrastructure – Dave Bender, DOE-SR

Mr. Bender provided a detailed presentation on common site infrastructure & challenges related to them at SRS.

Q&A Session

Mr. Howard asked how the site infrastructure projects are prioritized. Mr. Bender responded that there are almost 10 criteria which determine where a project is on a priority list, some could be related to regulatory requirements and some relate to safety and mission essentiality.

Mr. Guille asked if there had been analysis done with regards to installing solar panels on site facilities. Mr. Bender answered yes, but it did not pass the conceptual stage due to battery technology since they cannot currently be used to power facilities or anything at night.

Mr. Powell asked if there's a schedule related to property maintenance. Mr. Bender replied yes and they time such projects related to design life but they're also largely determined by budget.

Mr. French suggested creating competitions to help accomplish specific goals.

Ms. Corbett asked what the biomass plant is burning as fuel. Mr. Bender responded that they use wood chips. Ms. Corbett then asked what percentage of the fuel they use is comprised of these wood chips. Mr. Bender answered that it's in the 90's, but they also use recycled tires for fuel as well. Ms. Corbett then asked why the tires stockpiled on site aren't being used for asphalt or other things. Mr. Bender replied that he could not answer that question. Ms. Corbett continued on by asking how old Par Pond and L Lake are. Mr. Bender responded that he believes they were created in the 1950's. Ms. Corbett continued on yet again by asking what level of rainfall they're rated to handle. Mr. Bender admitted he did not know the answer but would have to get back to the CAB with a response.

Mr. Malik asked with regards to facilities upgrading their internet who pays for that. Mr. Bender answered that it would be a site management and AM decision and would be a project that would go on the site master infrastructure list. Mr. Malik then asked if while the building roofs were being repaired solar panels could be installed. Mr. Bender replied that would be a good idea to consider.

Ms. Underwood asked what area has the greatest need or is most likely to fail if not addressed. Mr. Bender responded that buildings which employees inhabit are the highest concern. Ms. Underwood then asked what Mr. Bender would like the CAB to do with this information and/or how the CAB could help his area of responsibility. Mr. Bender answered that budgeting is a huge concern, but ideas for improvements also help a great deal.

Presentation: Community Reuse Organization – Rick McLeod, SRSCRO

Mr. McLeod provided his annual update to the CAB regarding the CRO.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if there's somewhere the public can purchase the surplus supplies which CRO obtains. Mr. McLeod replied that govdeals.com is a special website for government surplus which uses a bidding purchase system.

Mr. Howard asked if SRS land will ever be up for public use and if so would the SRS CRO be involved in that. Mr. McLeod responded that was looked at recently, but he doesn't feel the site land will ever be used by the public.

Ms. Hopson asked if SRS CRO workforce grants are only available to students who attend colleges listed in the presentation. Mr. McLeod answered that because SRS CRO is a five-county organization, they can use surplus items to attract businesses to these counties but it would have to be applicable within one of those five counties. He further added that the schools listed are located within those five counties which is a regulation dictated by DOE.

Mr. Howard asked if chemical units from the Army could be used for various exercises or cleanup/decontamination. Mr. Todd replied that DOE-SR matches projects which could be completed by the Army National Guard with their training requirements, but the complex issues on site are probably not a good match for them.

~Meeting adjourned

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