Meeting Minutes
Savannah River Site (SRS) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) – Full Board Meeting
Courtyard Historic District, Charleston, SC
September 25-26, 2017

Attendance – Monday, September 25, 2017

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

DOE/Contractors
Avery Hammett, DOE-SR
Jean Ridley, DOE-SR
Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Terry Spears, DOE-SR
David Borak, DOE
Bernice Jenkins, DOE
James Tanner, S&K
Chelsea Gitzen, S&K
Federica Staton, S&K
Kristen Huber, SRNS

Agency Liaisons
Susan Fulmer, SCDHEC
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Gregory O'Quinn, SCDHEC
Sandra Snyder, SCDHEC

Stakeholders
Tom Clements, SRS Watch
Logan Campbell, Westinghouse
Jack Edlow, Edlow Int'l
Chuck Messick
Parrish Staples

Opening: Earl Sheppard, CAB Vice Chair
Mr. Sheppard welcomed everyone to the meeting.

CAB Chair Update: Nina Spinelli, CAB Chair
Mr. Sheppard 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 the agenda for the day.

Agency Updates

Jack Craig, Site Manager, Department of Energy – Savannah River (DOE-SR)
Mr. Craig began by noting the recent hurricane Irma. He continued by summarizing the road paving and infrastructure improvement: with a goal of 1 major road per year on the site being paved. He then described the purpose and other details regarding the SRS Teaching Radiation Energy And Technology workshop. He continued by summarizing the status of the 2018 & 2019 budgets. Next he described the status of all disposition programs on site including repairs, construction and installation.

He summarized the structural stability issue with the H-Canyon exhaust duct – analyzations are still being done and will be submitted to DOE in late October. He continued to note the site security forces are still on strike with no significant impact to site operations.

Q&A Session

Bill Rhoten, CAB member, asked regarding Westinghouse being the subcontractor on the cesium removal project – will their bankruptcy in any way affect the ongoing aspects of this project & how? Mr. Craig noted there are no impacts from their bankruptcy and they're doing a great job thus far. He also noted Savannah River Remediation is overseeing that contract.

David Hoel, CAB member, asked if there had been any environmental noncompliances or violations since the previous CAB full board meeting. Mr. Craig replied that SRS had one noncompliance regarding an air inspection conducted by South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control in July 2017. He explained that he did not know the details, but the issue was resolved shortly after the inspection and there were no fines or penalties associated with that. The other issue he noted was that during the hurricane due to the high level of precipitation SRS exceeded some of their permit levels through the waste water treatment system which is now back under control and part of their normal reporting to DHEC. Mr. Hoel then asked if there were any DOE noncompliances, to which Mr. Craig responded there had been none. Mr. Hoel then asked for a status update on the double stacking project. Mr. Craig noted that budget cutbacks resulted in dialing back LW programs. Mr. Tanner noted that an upcoming presentation would answer that question and any similar ones. Jean Ridley, DOE-SR, noted the shield canister transporter is currently being upgraded to include a fire suppression system and hydraulic protection which prevents any double stacking efforts from being done. Mr. Hoel asked for a status update regarding WIPP shipments. Mr. Craig replied that 9th and final shipment had been made and negotiations are underway for the upcoming year's shipments. Mr. Hoel then asked about a drone spotting recently. Mr. Craig noted it was an alleged sighting and ended up being a helicopter in the distance and therefore a nonevent. Mr. Hoel then asked about the status of all contracts on site, and Mr. Craig replied that they're still under consideration by DOE. LW contract had been extended through the end of December 2017. M&O contract expires July 2018.

Dawn Gillas, CAB member, asked if any processing is still being done in H-Canyon after the exhaust duct issue. Mr. Craig responded that SRS is still processing the Canadian waste. Ms. Gillas asked if the exhaust duct issues affect that processing, to which Mr. Craig replied it did not and that processing had been approved. She then asked how many WIPP containers were included in the plutonium downblending totals provided to the CAB. Mr. Craig noted he did not know that exact number but could provide it later.

Doug Howard, CAB member, asked if Mr. Craig had any idea how long the SRS security forces strike would last. Mr. Craig replied that he did not. Mr. Howard asked if contingency forces is skeleton or person for person. Mr. Craig noted it did not, that it is non-union forces from the site, guards from other sites, and about 59 of the guards who were previously on site. These guards man critical functions and work in two shifts instead of four: 12 hours a day, six days a week. Mr. Howard then asked if they're covering all contingencies or just the critical ones. Mr. Craig responded that they're covering all site activities including the barricades and protection of materials across the site.

Susan Corbett, CAB member, asked how prepared SRS is to take on a category 4 hurricane like Irma. Mr. Craig replied that SRS has a large Emergency Management organization on site which trains for these types of events. Most facilities on site are prepared for events much worse than hurricanes. The concern is for the trailers on site as well as trees. Under the hurricane planning, trailers were evacuated and road clearing was continuous. Ms. Corbett asked about backup generators. Mr. Craig noted all critical functions on site included back up generators which a good amount of fuel is kept on hand for. SRS generates a lot of its own power on site through an on-site power system. In the event of an outage there is about 15 days of fuel to power the entire site with.

Gil Allensworth asked if SRS has heard what the FY 2019 budget will look like from OMB. Mr. Craig replied that in a week from Thursday the first meeting with OMB will be held.

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

Ms. Wilson noted the previous director left and there is an interim director currently. She continued to note that days before an impending hurricane such as Irma, DHEC begins emergency preparations. Impact on SC was minimal. SC has a generous supply of groundwater as a whole, while other areas of the coastal areas have less. The groundwater at the coast is more scarce than others in the state and have been designated as capacity use areas. To become a capacity use area, there are permits and inspections along with specific regulations to ensure that area can handle that kind of groundwater withdrawl. Another goal is to preserve these groundwater areas. A new capacity use area is being looked at currently for Aiken, Allendale, Barnwell and other surrounding counties. Preliminary discussions note SRS believes this would have an adverse effect on site operations.

She continued to note the previous agreement with SRS included tank closure milestones which are still being negotiated and she anticipates they will continue for a while.

Q&A Session

Ms. Corbett asked why milestones need to be revisited. Ms. Wilson noted SWPF will be a key part of getting rid of legacy waste. Milestones were set previously around the completion of that facility, which was delayed for a number of reasons.

Narinder Malik, CAB member, asked if SCDHEC is still monitoring the groundwater for contaminants on site and in surrounding areas, to which Ms. Wilson replied they are. Mr. Malik then asked if the frequency of monitoring could be reduced. Ms. Wilson replied that SCDHEC had no current plans to reduce the frequency of groundwater monitoring. Mr. Malik then asked regarding the cesium removal project what the minimum level of contaminants are. Ms. Wilson replied that there are ranges for how much contamination can be left in the state for disposal which are included in the SDU permits. These same limits are applied to the cesium removal project.

Mr. Hoel asked if there are any new enforcement actions since the previous full board meeting. Ms. Wilson responded that any she is aware of have been resolved.

Larry Powell, CAB member, asked what the purpose of the re-evaluation of groundwater in SC. Ms. Wilson noted there are a number of factors including higher use, drought, or other factors. Mr. Powell asked if the evaluation was with regards to the groundwater level or contamination. Ms. Wilson replied that it is with respect to quantity.

Administrative & Outreach Committee Update: Eleanor Hopson, Chair

Ms. Hopson noted that Chair and Vice Chair will be voted on in November. Applications for new members are available. The current copy of the Board Beat magazine are also available. She asked for members to volunteer for upcoming outreach opportunities.

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

Ms. Gillas noted the recommendation response on the agenda would be voted on the next day. She also noted the next day's presentation on the agenda. She then noted the day, time and location for the next FDSR meeting.

Nuclear Materials Committee Update: Larry Powell, Chair

Mr. Powell summarized the open recommendations for NM. He then reviewed the next NM meeting day, time and location.

Strategic and Legacy Management Committee Update: Bob Doerr, Chair

Bob Doerr, CAB member, summarized all open recommendations and the previous SLM meeting. He then noted the upcoming SLM meeting day, time and location. He also noted the presentations on the agenda for the next day.

Waste Management Committee Update: Gil Allensworth, Chair

Mr. Allensworth summarized the previous WM meeting. He then noted the presentations on the agenda for the next day. He then noted the upcoming WM meeting day, time and location.

Discussion of Draft Recommendation: "Oppose Receipt of German SNF for Treatment & Storage in the US"

Mr. Hoel recounted the history and background behind this recommendation. He then read the recommendation aloud.

Ms. Gillas noted the reason why an additional recommendation to halt SRNL research on this SNF was due to the fact that the research is funded by Germany and it is irrelevant to the rest of the recommendation.

Joyce Underwood, CAB member, asked if the US had an agreement with Germany to accept this SNF. Mr. Hoel answered there is no agreement or contract. DOE has a policy objective to return US-origin SNF. DOE also acknowledged this SNF is not a proliferation concern. Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR, noted that the US and SRS does take back material that is not necessarily a nonproliferation risk such as low enriched uranium. The determining factor is whether or not it is in the best interest of the US which is decided by DOE.

Dan Kaminski, CAB member, asked if the graphite spheres were safe enough to be held. Ms. Maxted replied they are not, they are held in lead-lined casks.

Mr. Malik asked if the material is not received, what would be the disadvantage of the research. Ms. Maxted replied that there would probably be no research in that event. Mr. Malik then asked what the advantage of this research would be. Ms. Maxted noted the advantage so far is volume reduction and graphite reactors were inherently safe when used for nuclear power since it's a very controllable reaction. So if there becomes a disposition path then it can be used as a safe nuclear power. Mr. Malik then asked if Germans can handle this SNF. Ms. Maxted noted that is being looked into but the answer is most likely no that they don't have a permanent repository or the facilities to deal with this SNF.

Mr. Allensworth asked who the individuals noted in this recommendation are who created the memo which is the entire basis for this recommendation since it cites the SNF as a nonproliferation risk. Mr. Hoel answered that they're with NNSA. Mr. Allensworth asked if there have been any updates since August 1st, 2013. Ms. Maxted replied no. Mr. Allensworth noted Paris terrorists had knowledge of the location of this material and technology has changed in the past 4 years. Ms. Maxted noted that

it is possible to use this SNF for malicious intent. Mr. Allensworth asked if NNSA had declined to give an Atoms for Peace presentation as the CAB had requested, which Mr. Tanner noted was correct. Mr. Allensworth asked about the Atoms for Peace treaty. Ms. Maxted noted it was a policy, not a treaty, put in place by president Eisenhower. Mr. Allensworth noted if this SNF is a proliferation risk, is there a problem with it coming to SRS? Mr. Hoel noted that would change a lot of things.

Ms. Gillas asked if the HEU in the graphite balls recoverable and usable. Ms. Maxted noted it is recoverable, but due to the fact that the thorium that is also in the kernels, you get U-233 ingrowth which is a high dose so SRS' fuel fabricators can't handle that in their facilities so it cannot be sent to a fuel fabricator. Ms. Gillas asked if the thorium could be separated out. Ms. Maxted replied no, but it is the U-233 that can't be separated from the U-235.

Mr. Allensworth asked if the final results have been released, to which Ms. Maxted replied that the assessment is currently at DOE-HQ getting approval.

Mr. Malik asked what the finding is, to which Ms. Maxted replied she cannot comment until DOE has released it.

Ms. Gillas noted if there is a re-assessment of the nonproliferation risk of this SNF and it is deemed a nonproliferation risk, this recommendation would be null and void so she suggested the wording to be changed.

Mr. Howard asked if the consensus of all of the feedback the CAB support team received from members of the public was in favor of this recommendation. Mr. Hoel answered yes. Mr. Howard said as a representative of the public he is obligated to uphold their desires. Mr. Hoel summarized the public's support of this recommendation.

Ms. Underwood noted the Atoms for Peace policy is old and asked if anyone planned on reinstating that policy or legislation relating to it so the US can uphold its word. Ms. Maxted replied that she did not know of any legislative action working to reinstate Atoms for Peace. She continued on to note there are other agreements regarding nuclear materials in other countries and the US. She also noted that such a question would be better posed to the NNSA or state department.

Mr. Allensworth noted that many of the comments emailed to the CAB support team were copied and pasted as if part of a letter writing campaign instead of a collection of opinions from a broad spectrum of the local public.

Ms. Corbett noted that graphite reactors in her opinion were a thing of the past and largely unstable to use making her horrified this would be considered as a viable alternative moving forward. She noted that Cher Noble involved a graphite reactor. She continued to note that Germany is a stable country and instead the US should take nuclear materials from a country like Nambia. She then summarized the public's opinion regarding this recommendation in support of it.

Tom French, CAB member, corrected Ms. Corbett's statements regarding Cher Noble are incorrect since the technology is vastly different.

Mr. Tanner asked who among the CAB members was confident in making a vote on this recommendation the next day. The majority said they were, to which he asked if anyone needed any additional information to be able to make that decision. There were no additional questions.

Discussion of Draft Recommendation: "Ad Hoc Committee proposed by S&LM Committee"

Mr. French summarized the history behind the recommendation to begin an ad hoc committee as discussed at the previous SLM committees. Mr. Allensworth thanked Mr. Craig regarding his help on this topic of budget and pension, then summarized the potential ad hoc committee's concerns.

Mr. Doerr asked if this meeting will be publicized, and Mr. Tanner said it would – essentially it will be a regular committee meeting except it has an expiration date and a deliverable requirement. Mr. Doerr then asked if this meeting would be held within an SLM committee, to which Mr. Tanner replied it would be separate.

Mr. Tanner noted that an expiration date would be set for this committee and could be renewed with DDFO approval.

Mr. Hoel noted that according to the CAB SOPs any non-CAB members attending an ad hoc committee would not be able to vote.

Mr. Powell noted he has no objections to the ad hoc committee but he does not believe the pension program can be changed. Michael Mikolanis, DOE-SR, noted that the CAB's perspective is a positive addition to help try to solve this problem.

Mr. Howard asked if the purpose of this ad hoc committee is to make the public more aware of the pension budget issue. Mr. Tanner noted that the purpose of the CAB is to provide recommendations to DOE and as a side effect this brings public attention to things such as the pension budget issue.

Mr. Mikolanis noted a change to the number and specified members of the proposed committee which was accepted.

Mr. Tanner then went around to each CAB member and asked for anyone who wanted to nominate or volunteer for this committee. Six members volunteered.

Ms. Maxted noted the answer to the question asked during Mr. Craig's agency update is 670 drums shipped to WIPP under the pu downblend.

Public Comment

Parish Staples introduced himself as a newly retired DOE official who previously served on the nuclear threat reduction nonproliferation program's global threat reduction initiative. He noted he was the director for the European-African office of threat reduction. He then expressed his surprise with the CAB's opposition to the research using the German SNF and summarized why he feels this work should continue.

Chuck Messick began by noting he's also retired DOE NNSA. He asked the CAB to wait to make such a recommendation about the German SNF until DOE has made a decision as to a path forward. He continued by summarizing the Atoms for Peace program history.

Suzanne Rhodes introduced herself as representing the League of Women Voters of SC and noted their primary interest is getting the waste in the tanks treated and nationally nonproliferation. She then summarized the LWV's history with this topic.

Jack Etlow introduced himself as the president of Etlow International Company and noted he and his father have been working around SRS since 1963. He then displayed a non-uranium-bearing graphite pebble sample much like the German SNF discussed in the aforementioned draft recommendation and offered it to be passed around by the CAB members. He noted this his oppositions and reasons for opposition to the German SNF draft recommendation.

Tom Clements noted he had brought the German SNF to the cab back in 2013 because DOE didn't raise the issue. He noted SRS put out a list of NEPA documents and noted the document related to the assessment of this SNF is still not finished. He then noted he had contacted people in Germany and there is no rush there to get it to the US. He continued to note that nonproliferation assessments need to be done on this new technique in processing. He further noted he had unanswered FOIA requests. He continued by saying there is no public support for accepting the German SNF except from former DOE employees. He stated Germany is no longer funding the research and does not think they plan on providing any more funding. He went on to read information provided from a FOIA request regarding drones, which is best summarized by saying all of these un-confirmed sightings are very different in colors, shapes and sizes. He equated drone sightings over SRS to clown sightings in SC from years prior.

END OF DAY 1, September 25, 2017

Attendance – Tuesday, September 26, 2017

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

DOE/Contractors
Avery Hammett, DOE-SR
Jean Ridley, DOE-SR
Thomas Johnson, DOE-SR
Maxcine Maxted, DOE-SR
Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR
James Tanner, S&K
Chelsea Gitzen, S&K
Federica Staton, S&K
Kristen Huber, SRNS

Agency Liaisons
Gregory O'Quinn, SCDHEC
Jon Richards, EPA
Sandra Snyder, SCDHEC
Heather Cathcart, SCDHEC
Susan Fulmer, SCDHEC

Stakeholders
Tom Clements, SRS Watch
Ed Wannamacher. BWXT
Chuck Messick
Parrish Staples

CAB Chair Opening and Update – Earl Sheppard, CAB Vice Chair

CAB Vice Chair Earl Sheppard opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

Meeting Rules & Agenda Review: James Tanner, CAB Facilitator

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

Presentation: Mercury in the Liquid Waste System – Aaron Staub, SRR

Mr. Staub began his presentation by explaining his background at SRS. He then presented a graphic explaining the LW system at SRS and why mercury in that system is an issue. He provided a detailed and all-encompassing description of this issue and system. The Mercury in the LWS at SRS program began in 2015 and initially the focus was the impact on worker protection and monitoring. Another focus was worker communication of all of the hazards involved. Analysis was done on the gloves and these materials including how they affected them. Additional analysis was done to tank forms, saltstone, and performance assessment impact. He then described what some of these analyses found.

In 2016 an integrated assessment began on mercury behavior globally in the LWS. A long term mercury management plan and advisory panel were both created. He then presented a graphic to explain long term mercury management. Additional alternatives are currently being looked at including other forms of mercury removal like ionic mercury to enhance the removal of mercury. SRNL has recently established the capability to measure methylmercury in radioactive samples. $1.5 million has been awarded to SRNL in FY 16 and 17 for alternate mercury removal technology research.

Q&A Session

Mr. Malik asked if there's a requirement regarding notifying the public about how much mercury is in each tank. Mr. Staub noted that he did not know what the reporting requirements are for that. Mr. Malik noted that he believes they're reported annually. He then asked if there are permit requirements associated with these facilities. Mr. Staub replied yes, there are.

Mr. Kaminski asked if the primary concern is of a fire hazard or exposure hazard. Mr. Staub responded that exposure is a primary concern. Mr. Kaminski then asked in relation to the testing of the gloves, what were the results. Mr. Staub noted that there are 4 or 5 different glove types used on site and work planning including hazard analysis and screening restricts the approved list of PPE allowed for individual tasks. Mr. Kaminski then inquired what the additional safety measures carried out

were. Mr. Staub replied that they're strict on ventilation requirements and one change made was to the threshold limits which are below the amounts required.

Mr. Doerr asked if mercury produces value to the world and why it is found naturally occurring. Mr. Staub noted that mercury is an important catalyst for fuel dissolution at SRR for plutonium extraction. He also noted the value was greater during the cold war era.

Mr. Hoel inquired as to why there was an increase in organic mercury in the system. Mr. Staub answered that he does not know if SRR is at a point yet where they can say exactly why that is. He then explained the findings in depth with technical detail that have been found regarding organic mercury thus far. He noted the chemistry occurring in the waste tanks is incredibly complex. Mr. Hoel then noted that some of the mercury is eliminated through the evaporator system which he presumes that means the mercury is going into the air. Mr. Staub corrected him, stating that the mercury is a capture point in that part of the system and not admitted to the air. It is condensed, collected and recycled to H-Canyon. Mr. Hoel then asked what the air permit limit value is. Mr. Staub noted that he did not know what that value is. Mr. Hoel further asked what species of mercury have been detected. Mr. Staub replied that SRR has looked at basic elemental mercury, monomethyl mercury, dimethyl mercury, total mercury to see if there's a balance not seen individually. They can account for between 85-90% are in one of the aforementioned species which is primarily monomethyl. Mr. Hoel then asked which of those forms has the greatest risk to worker safety. Mr. Staub noted it depends, from a direct exposure concern the answer would be dimethyl which is present at the smallest quantities overall comparatively. Mr. Hoel then asked if the captured mercury is recycled and not disposed of. Mr. Staub answered that it is correct.

Ms. Corbett asked if new mercury is being made. Mr. Staub answered that is correct. She then asked what happened with the closed tanks. Mr. Staub replied that 51 tanks are on SRS and 43 are active 8 are closed. During the closure process there are a variety of regulatory steps to determine the waste removal and residual, then assessments further are done with regards to future impact. Some small amount of residual mercury would remain. Ms. Corbett then asked if the mercury released into the environment is liquid or vapor, to which Mr. Staub replied it is vapor. Ms. Corbett additionally asked if that mercury collects in the environment. Mr. Staub noted that it dissipates through airflow pathways through the different stacks. Ms. Corbett asked with regards to the evaporator, will that impact the other function which a low PH level is required for. Mr. Staub replied that there is an acceptable range for that which SRS has remained in. Ms. Corbett asked if a higher PH level is used would that cause a higher rate of mercury to be extracted. Mr. Staub answered that he doesn't have a solubility chart but he estimates it's within a range of ten, which means it's a substantial difference. Ms. Corbett then asked if the disposal path would be off site. Mr. Staub replied that is correct.

Mr. Sheppard asked what a TCLP is and how vigorous that process can be. Mr. Staub replied that it is Toxicity Characteristic Leeching Procedure is a standard methodology for assessing the performance of different disposal systems. Generally a sample of the material of interest is diluted with acid and then agitated to promote mass transport, then the acid is removed and sampled to determine what the effectiveness of that acid is with regards to removing contaminants. That is an aggressive test of the SRS waste farm.

Presentation: DHEC: State Oversight of Cleanup – Shelly Wilson, DHEC

Ms. Wilson began her presentation noting what DHEC does not regulate – storage of SNF and NM which DOE self regulates by large. She then summarized & explained in detail DHEC's four major roles – protection, emergency preparedness, improvement and oversight.

Ms. Wilson continued by noting HLW is the single largest environmental threat in the state of SC due to the way it's stored in tanks which are at a risk of leaking. This is why the National Defense Authorization act is so important, as she notes, since it enabled the state to have a strong, decision-making voice in whatever residuals remain in the state. HLW is regulated under state wastewater program and covered by the hazardous waste permit cleanup authority. It's also addressed through the FFA process.

Q&A Session

Ms. Gillas asked if cuts being made to regulatory agencies like DHEC affected their regulatory abilities. Ms. Wilson responded that they did not.

Eleanor Hopson, CAB member, asked about whether a monitoring program exists in GA as it does with DHEC in SC. Mr. Mikolanis replied that it did not but the CAB previously created and submitted a recommendation on this topic which is why there are meetings ongoing with regards to the Shell Bluff community.

Bobbie Williams, CAB member, asked where the perimeter lies around the site boundary for monitoring the environment. Beth Cameron, SC DHEC, answered that the DHEC oversight program depends on the medium being monitored. They go from 25 miles from the center point up to 50 miles, and background samples from across the state for comparison.

Mr. Hoel asked if Ms. Wilson had any thoughts or concerns regarding the number of noncompliances within the past year which is uncharacteristic of the site. Ms. Wilson noted that she does not have any thoughts on that, and most of the violations in question are considered minor.

Mary Weber, CAB member, asked why Ms. Wilson noted SNF storage is not within the DHEC ability to regulate, but under the DHEC protection programs they do have jurisdiction over and regulation concerning radioactive waste transportation. Ms. Wilson replied that if something is classified as radioactive waste, it is different from NM or SNF. Ms. Weber then asked if NM or SNF is transported to the site from Canada for example, would DHEC have jurisdiction over that. Ms. Wilson responded that DHEC has no say in whether or not those materials can come to SRS but it does have the ability to inspect the transport in some cases.

Ms. Corbett asked if DHEC has a cumulative account of all mercury released in SC by all permitted locations. Ms. Wilson answered that there's a different way the cumulative account is taken – through federal standards. She further noted that DHEC conducts ambient monitoring throughout the state.

Mr. Howard asked what the percentage is for funding from the federal government for DHEC. Ms. Wilson replied that it varies and DHEC gets a substantial amount.

Larry Powel, CAB member, asked if SRS had ever denied DHEC plant access. Ms. Wilson replied that no, SRS had never denied them access.

Presentation: Final Approved FFA Appendix E – Brian Hennessey, DOE-SR

Mr. Hennessey began his presentation noting he is the FFA project manager. He summarized the background of the FFA for context. He then summarized Appendix E which provides a lifecycle list of cleanup milestones for SRS waste sites. DOE updates Appendix E annually and submits it for approval to SC DHEC and EPA in November. He then explained all of the documents included in these milestones, including a remedial investigation work plan, a remedial investigation report with baseline risk assessment, a feasible study, a proposed plan, a record of decision, a remedial action implementation plan, a land use control implementation plan, and a removal site evaluation report/engineering evaluation/cost analysis. He then summarized the actions dictated in these documents which allow SRS to meet the milestones agreed to in this FFA.

He noted the major changes in this FY 17's FFA Appendix E include C-Area Groundwater: Characterization activities found trichloroethylene and tritium in the groundwater above their respective contaminant levels of 5 micrograms per liter and 200 picoCuries per milliliter. TCE and tritium plumes extend south and west from the C-Area Reactor Building to Castor Creek and to Fourmile Branch. TCE exceeds the MCL in the unnamed tributary to Castor Creek. A removal action is proposed to reduce the TCE moving into surgace water so that the MCL is no longer exceeded in the unnamed tributary to Castor Creek. The removal action will also support the final remedial action for the remaining tritium and TCE plumes in C-Area groundwater. The removal action will be discussed in the removal site evaluation report/engineering evaluation/cost analysis scheduled for submittal to the regulators for their review in September 2017. The final action for the C-Area groundwater will be delayed. The dates for the final action will be updated in the Revision 0 FY 2018 Appendix E submittal.

He continued noting the major changes regarding P-Area Groundwater: Characterization activities found chlorinated volatile organic compounds and tritium in the groundwater above their respective MCLs of 5 micrograms per liter and 20 pCi/mL. cVOC plumes originating from the northwest side of the P-Area Reactor Building Complex are migrating westward and are intersecting Steel Creek. A removal action is proposed to address the cVOC plumes that are discharging into Steel Creek. Tritium plume and related surface water exceedances will be addressed as part of the final action. The removal action will be discussed in a report scheduled for submittal to the regulators for their review in October 2017. The final action for the P-Area Groundwater will be delayed. The dates for the final action will be updated in the Revision 0 Fiscal Year 2018 Appendix E submittal.

He further continued noting the major changes regarding the Wetland Area at Dunbarton Bay in Support of Steel Creek Integrator Operable Unit: The Issue Record of Decision and Remedial Action Start dates for the Wetland Area at Dunbarton Bay were moved from June 30, 2017 and September 30, 2018 to June 30, 2023 and September 30, 2024 respectively. This move allows SRS to accomplish the near-term removal actions for C-Area groundwater and P-Area groundwater. These actions to improve groundwater quality and protect affected streams have a high value for SCDHEC, EPA and DOE, so they are being prioritized. Wetland Area at Dubarton Bay has been characterized; it is stable, poses no threat of migration, and is in an isolated and inactive area of the site (P-Area) with little or no potential for exposure. The remedial action for the Wetland Area at Dunbarton Bay will be conducted after the currently planned interim remedial action for the A-Area Ash Pile (788-A), A-Area Coal Pile Runoff Basin (788-3A), and Stormwater Outfall A-013 (i.e. Issue Interim Record of Decision date of November 28, 20121 and Interim Remedial Action start date of March 5. 2023).

He then explained a graphic depicting future milestone timelines. He then presented a list of other key milestones within the next 2 FYs. He also summarized the status on upcoming remedial/ removal decisions documents.

Q&A Session

Ms. Corbett asked if plumes all eventually end up in the Savannah River, to which Mr. Hennessey replied they do. She then asked how far are the plumes are from the river and how long it will take them to migrate. Mr. Hennessey noted they discharge into local streams which discharge eventually into the Savannah River. In C-Area, the TCE by the time Castor Creek flows into Four Mile Branch which is 8 or 9 miles from it's confluence with the Savannah River, it is no longer measurable. Ms. Corbett then asked where does it go, to which Mr. Hennessey replied that it is diluted by fresh water coming into the streams and is further evaporated when the groundwater becomes surface water. With regards to the fish, Mr. Hennessey noted the SRS' program called the integrated operable unit program monitors biota including fish in all of the streams. Volatile organics do not pose an ecological risk to the biota in these streams.

Ms. Gillas asked if the delays Mr. Hennessey mentioned were due to the removal actions, to which he replied it was not responsible directly.

Ms. Corbett then asked if there's a place which contains information regarding each tank and the characterization of the materials left inside of them. Ms. Ridley answered that information is included in each tank's final closure plan.

Ms. Wilson added that DHEC monitors levels of all contaminants in the Savannah River and would communicate any concerns regarding elevated levels. Ms. Gillas asked if there have been any elevated levels recently. Ms. Wilson answered no, there was not.

Presentation: Budget Update – John Lopez, DOE-SR

Mr. Lopez began his presentation by introducing himself as the director of the office of integration and planning at SRS. He then displayed and explained a graphic depicting how planning is scheduled for each FY budget. He noted that SRS is currently under a continuing resolution for FY 18 which means the site operates at FY 17 levels for the next couple of months or so until December 8th, 2017. For FY 19 SRS received the site target. DOE-SR has sat down with DOE-HQ to discuss what scope of work can and cannot be done with that target budget. He then explained future steps for the FY 19 budget. He noted there was a new PBS added for cybersecurity within the EM budget. He also noted this is something all DOE sites are doing. He further noted PBS 12 and 11 will be joined into one PBS 11c pending Congress approval. PBS 41 is another new addition for surveillance, maintenance and deactivation of F-Canyon. He then summarized the remaining PBS which did not change.

All of the priorities in each PBS are grouped into one of four categories: support safe operations & site services, operational support, cleanup activities to meet compliance milestones and commitments, and progress in other EM mission activities. Mr. Lopez then went into detail about each priorities. He then went on to explain how priorities are established in each annual budget for the site. He then displayed a graphic relating to FY 17 and 18 budgets and explained it. He then presented a legacy pension graphic and went into detail about each facet.

Q&A Session

David Vovakes, CAB member, asked if the $23 million Mr. Lopez mentioned would be given to the new cybersecurity PBS would also be carved out of the site's budget. Mr. Lopez replied that yes, it would. Mr. Vovakes then asked if that was mandatory, to which Mr. Lopez replied that it is.

Mr. Howard asked if the Centerra strike affected the upcoming FY 18 budget. Mr. Lopez replied that he does not believe so, although he noted there might be a slight increase in cost.

Ms. Gillas asked if PS 30 is for D&D of facilities, to which Mr. Lopez agreed. She then asked why a new PBS 41 is being proposed. Mr. Lopez answered that PBS 30 does not take over a project until it's ready for D&D. Ms. Gillas then asked if SRS is operating under a continuing resolution from a budget that is less than what is given in FY 18, then the site should be good. Mr. Lopez answered yes and no, it depends on where the buckets are. For the first three months of the year, yes, SRS will be ok. After that three months, if SRS is still operating under a long-term continuing resolution, then it would start impacting the site work force.

Mr. Kaminski asked if the pension budget would be carved out from a percentage of all PBS, to which Mr. Lopez replied that's correct, the pension budget is pro-rated based on funding. The more funding a PBS gets, the more funding that can then be allocated for the pension.

Ms. Williams asked about the PILT payments and why Barwell County is getting the bulk of the payments. Mr. Lopez answered that it depended on acreage and the majority of the site falls in Barnwell County.

Mr. Hoel asked what is the most recent IPL which could be shared with the CAB. Mr. Lopez responded FY 18. Mr. Hoel asked if a copy could be given to the CAB, which Mr. Lopez agreed to do. Mr. Hoel then asked for the letters sent to DOE by SC DHEC and the EPA regarding their preferred priorities, which Mr. Lopez agreed to do.

Mr. Howard asked if DOE could go before Congress and articulate the impact of the funding deficits like DoD does. Mr. Lopez answered that is done through the appeal process in writing unless requested to appear in person.

Mr. Kaminski asked if NNSA will help fund the SRS pension budget defecit. Mr. Lopez answered it is. Mr. Kaminski asked further if the budget for cybersecurity is needed since other areas of the federal government also have funding for cybersecurity. Mr. Lopez noted that he could not answer that question since it falls outside of his area of expertise.

Mr. Allensworth asked what the cybersecurity budget will go towards. Mr. Lopez noted that falls outside of his area of expertise, but this new PBS will have to contribute to the pension as well.

Mr. Doerr asked how long the PILT law has been in place. Thomas Johnson, Associate Deputy Manager of SRS, answered that it has been in place since 2003. Later in the meeting, he clarified this statement and noted the last major legislation regarding PILT was in the 2003 time frame which dealt with multiple fiscal years of how PILT would be funded. The original legislation came into existence in 1976. For the 2003 legislation, language was included to make PILT funding 100% mandatory.

Presentation: Glass Waste Storage Status – Roberto Gonzalez, DOE-SR

Mr. Gonzalez began his presentation by introducing himself as the Waste Disposition Program Director. He then presented a graphic of the vitrification process and explained it. Currently there are two GWSB which contain 4,602 storage positions. After the double stacking effort is completed, that number of storage positions will increase to 6,864. Additional storage capacity will not be needed until FY 29. To date, 4,155 canisters have been produced, with an estimated total being 8,170 by the end of the campaign. After FY 29, 1,306 more positions for canisters will be needed. Mr. Gonzalez then presented graphics and photos depicting the double stacking process.

Q&A Session

Nina Spinelli, CAB chair, asked what the plan is for the remaining positions needed to store canisters. Mr. Gonzalez replied that a number of possibilities are being looked at including double stacking GWSB 2.

Mr. Kaminski asked how much money was saved by double stacking instead of opening another GWSB. Mr. Gonzalez responded that $143 million would have been needed to construct a new GWSB.

Ms. Corbett asked if the canisters contain plutonium. Mr. Gonzalez corrected her noting that none of the canisters contain plutonium, they contain a mix of different elements which were previously kept in the tanks and migrated to the canisters in the GWSB mixed with glass to render it inert. Ms. Corbett then asked if these materials were intended to go to Yucca Mountain or some other permanent repository, which Mr. Gonzalez answered that is correct. She then asked if they were sent to a permanent repository, if they would need to be removed from the canisters, which Mr. Gonzalez replied to stating they would not. She then asked what the life expectancy of these canisters are. Mr. Mikolanis noted that the storage would not rely on the canisters themselves to survive since over time they will deteriorate but the glass matrix would prevent contamination.

Mr. French asked what the new top plug is made out of on the double stacked canisters. Mr. Gonzalez responded that it is tempered steel.

Ms. Underwood asked what caused the plugs to become stuck and need a replacement. Mr. Gonzalez answered that during the earlier years of the site, the engineering was not as precise as needed causing the plugs to not be measured to the dimensions of the hole which then resulted in them getting stuck.

Presentation: SRNL Annual Update – Dr. Terry Michalske, SRNL

Mr. Michalske began his presentation by introducing himself as the director of SRNL. He noted SRNL has about 1,000 employees on site and also employs about 300 other people who work for SRNL. He then estimated the SRNL budget for FY 18 at $240 million. He then displayed photos depicting SRNL focuses and explained what they represent. He then provided graphics and photos depicting the missions of the SRNL mobile plutonium facility and explained them. Mr. Michalske then stated SRNL is partnering with Augusta University for cybersecurity innovation and education at AU's new School of Computer and Cyber Sciences and summarized how that would work for students and SRNL.

Mr. Michalske continued by stating SRNL partnered with SRS and Homeland Security to close the airspace above the site and conduct cybersecurity testing. He noted there are a number of issues with using SRS as a testing site. He then presented and explained a graphic depicting SRNL local and national partnerships.

Q&A Session

Mr. Lyon asked if the technology Mr. Michalske mentioned with regards to making radiological contamination visible is patentable. Mr. Michalske replied that the device is patented but the technology is not proprietary – digital dental x-ray.

Mr. Allensworth asked about the partnership between USC Aiken and SRNL. Mr. Michalske responded that it is pending approval by the current administration.

Mr. Hoel asked about a recent article talking about SRNL research into a tritium extraction technology, which Mr. Michalske explained.

Ms. Corbett asked for clarification of the logos displayed on a previous slide, which were read aloud, then she asked if this technology which Mr. Lyon asked about could be used to find materials possessed by persons intending harm to others and bring them to justice. Mr. Michalske confirmed that was correct and went into detail about experiments done to this effect using that technology to find anyone re-processing NM or SNF. Ms. Corbett then stated wouldn't we know if someone was re-processing this material so this technology could be more useful in finding these materials kept by persons intending to do others harm. Mr. Michalske replied that we would not necessarily know if people were re-processing these aforementioned materials.

Mr. Howard asked regarding the FBI office located within SRNL works with the SRNL employees. Mr. Michalske answered that after 9/11 the FBI noted they needed the ability to have more capabilities than available at Quantico., which is why they partner with SRNL. Mr. Howard then asked what percentage of the work done at SRNL is classified. Mr. Michalske replied that about 65% of their work at SRNL is for various security agencies.

Ms. Underwood asked if the DoD members who collaborate with SRNL on the mobile facility are trained by SRNL or within the DoD. Mr. Michalske replied that there is a number of DoD personnel trained to handle radiological materials and SRNL works with and helps train them.

Presentation: Federal Advisory Committee Act – David Borak, EM-SSAB DFO

Mr. Borak began his presentation by introducing himself as the DFO for all CABs (EM SSAB) within DOE. He then summarized his background. After that he summarized the history behind EM SSABs and their origin which is the FACA established in 1994. There is one charter for the EM SSABs, and there are currently eight local boards organized under the EM SSAB umbrella charter. These eight local boards are brought together biannually at the EM SSAB chairs meetings. Where the EM SSAB is able to speak in one voice. All EM SSABs are made up of representative members not necessarily experts.

The purpose of the FACA is to ensure that advice by advisory boards/committees is objective and accessible to the public, formalize the process for establishing, operating, overseeing and terminating advisory boards, create the Committee Management Secretariat, and require that boards advise and recommend, not decide and implement. Benefits of FACA include transparency and participation improves citizen trist in government, and FACA requirements lend credibility to the boards' advice.

Key players include the GSA Committee Management Secretariat, DOE-HQ including the Committee Management Officer and the DFO, DOE Field Sites including DDFOs and alternate DDFOs, Federal Coordinators and Local Board Staff, board members, and liaisons including state, local and tribal representatives.

The basic legal requirements of FACA are: a charter outlining the committee's mission and specific duties, allow for open access to committee meetings and operations meaning meetings must be accessible to the public and announced in the federal register as well as committee documents must be maintained and made available for public inspection, maintain fairly balanced membership, and provide an opportunity for public comment. If these requirements aren't met, members of the public could sue DOE and ask them to scrap the advisory board. He noted the point of these boards are to gain public trust, especially when doing something like cleaning up nuclear materials. He then listed all of the EM SSAB guiding documents: FACA, DOE Committee Management Manual, EM SSAB Charter, EM SSAB Guidance, and local board SOPs. Each site board is unique much like the surrounding community, which carries into their individual SOPs.

The importance of community involvement in cleanup decisions include: allowing DOE to consider local stakeholder values and concerns before making a decision, if stakeholders are not involved early in the process, they may have reason to doubt, criticize or challenge cleanup decisions, recommendations improve policy and technical processes of complex cleanups by providing independent input, ensure open and transparent decision making, and provide opportunities to educate and ensure future informed engagement and participation.

DFO and DDFO requirements under FACA include: knowing how FACA, regulations, DOE guidance and all related agency policies apply to the board and ensure compliance, approving agendas for each board meeting, calling, attending and adjouring every board meeting, maintaining required committee records like costs, minutes, membership, etc., preparing federal register notices, preparing annual reports to the CMO summarizing board activities, nominating members for appointment, ensuring all ethical standards are met by board members, and ensuring that meetings are held at a reasonable time and place, accessible to the public.

EM SSAB member responsibilities include: attending regiular meetings and learning about the site's EM cleanup mission, providing recommendations at the request of the site management and EM leadership, working collaboratively and respectfully with other board members and liaisons, abiding by the terms and conditions of the EM SSAB Charter and guiding documents, and notifying the DDFO of any potential conflict of interest. Mr. Borak noted that members are not experts because that would then qualify them as special government experts which are required to do a financial disclosure form which discloses all finances to ensure they have no conflict of interest. If there is a conflict of interest found, that SGE could be subject to criminal penalties. EM SSAB members are not subject to the same federal ethics regulations as federal employees and SGEs. As a matter of policy, however, DOE asks that these members refrain from any use of membership which is, or gives the appearance of being motivated by the desire for private, professional or financial gain, recuse themselves from decisions and discussions related to real or perceived conflicts of interest, act impartially, and avoid the appearance of impropriety, and seek immediate guidance, beginning with the DDFO, if they are offered anything of value such as a gift, gratuity, loan or favor in connection with advisory committee service. He further noted that working as a contractor on a site would not disqualify someone as a EM SSAB member.

Mr. Borak went on to describe best practices for work plan implementation, including the purpose of a work plan, which he categorized as identifying where DOE needs help and what issues EM SSAB members find important. Members and staff need to regularly assess activities and outcomes. Work plans are modified as needed throughout the year to evaluate new business in light of the original work plan, ask questions before leaping into new activities, allow the DDFO to review and approve modifications (which is required), keep the work manageable, and so that modifications can be proposed by members as well as DOE.

He defined a subcommittee as any group which advises an established committee. He also noted that they must act under the policies that have been established by their parent committee, have their advice and recommendations reviewed and approved by the parent committee prior to submission to DOE officials, obtain DDFO approval before they are established, and the purpose should align with the EM SSAB's mission and directly support work plan activities. He also noted that it is not a requirement but a best practice to treat all subcommittee meetings like full board meetings including opening them to the public, publishing notice on the board's website, and including a public comment period. Subcommittees cannot vote on recommendations as to whether or not to forward them to DOE or transmit them to DOE directly.

Q&A Session

Mr. Kaminksi asked with regards to the ad hoc committee proposal, if a CAB member who is also a pension recipient could serve on that committee. Mr. Borak answered that the DDFO should make that decision, and that subcommittee members could recuse themselves from voting on any recommendations.

Mr. Hoel asked why the SRS CAB is the only EM SSAB which is not allowed to create letters and only recommendations. Mr. Borak replied that DOE is required by law to respond to recommendations and anyone from the public can send DOE a letter without the requirement from DOE to respond, although he noted that they generally do since it's the right thing to do. Mr. Hoel noted that he disagreed, then quoted the SRS CAB SOPs which set requirements for amending said SOPs which does not allow for DOE to make changes without SRS CAB approval. Mr. Borak responded that EM SSAB SOPs are at the bottom of the list of guiding documents which he mentioned during his presentation and presented in a pyramid form. He continued to note the SOPs don't hold more weight than anything above them, and boards exist to provide DOE with help and advice to serve at the pleasure of DOE which is why DOE pays for the boards. He further noted that DOE reserves the right to change SOPs as well as membership. Mr. Hoel asked where that authority is written, to which Mr. Borak answered it is written from the FACA on down through the list of guiding documents prior to the SRS CAB SOPs. Mr. Hoel then asked if there are any other sites at which the NNSA has an advisory board. Mr. Borak replied that they have no authority over EM SSAB and have none of their own. However DoD has advisory boards, some of which are closed to the public for security reasons.

Ms. Weber noted that as mentioned during Mr. Borak's presentation, if DOE isn't asking for recommendations on a topic they're less likely to listen to the advice provided through those recommendations – and she feels DOE-SR does not ask for any recommendations on any topics. Mr. Mikolanis responded that has been true in the past, but DOE-SR is getting better about that in the past year and has asked for SRS CAB feedback regarding the Annual Site Environmental Report, the Curation Facility, and the War Museum. For things like the tank farms, he noted that it is more technical expertise that is needed if issues arise in those areas. Moving forward, he stated that DOE-SR staff is trying to find areas in technical issues for which CAB input would be beneficial.

Mr. Howard asked if CAB members are obligated to inform the public of what occurs at meetings or to bring public input to meetings. Mr Borak responded that legally and ethically board members are not bound to do that, but that is the whole point behind advisory boards.

Mr. Allensworth asked why a CAB member who is also an SRS contractor can't vote. Mr. Borak answered that the overall philosophy is if the board is voting on something that could benefit a board member financially on a personal level, they should

recuse themselves. Mr. Mikolanis added that an individual can choose to recuse themselves from voting in whatever area they feel is appropriate, and if in doubt, recusing themselves is the best option – and if a board member recuses themselves and changes their mind later that is an option depending on the situation.

Mr. Borak then posed hypothetical situations to quiz the CAB. The first question was regarding what constitutes as a full board meeting. The first example being CAB members attending a BBQ together. The answer is no, unless CAB business is discussed there. Next, he asked if DOE receives a call from a member of the public that lives in a county near the site which is not represented on the CAB, does that person have a right to sit on the CAB. The answer is they can apply but they do not have a right, which was determined in a previous court case for a government science advisory board. After that, he asked if Ms. Spinelli is joined at dinner by 10 other CAB members and recommendations are discussed, is that a board meeting. The answer is that it does not hold a quorum so it is not a board meeting. He then noted that GSA has determined that if board members are discussing board business via email and enough members are discussing the topic to reach a quorum that is considered a board meeting. Next, he asked if the DDFO can't attend an upcoming meeting but all the board wants to do is get together to go through the language in one of the recommendations, is this allowed. The answer is no, the DDFO must be present. Ms. Spinelli asked if that scenario happened, could Mr. Mikolanis designate someone to act in his place to follow regulations. Mr. Borak answered yes, this is why co-DDFOs exist. If neither can come they can designate someone else.

Since there was ample time left in the agenda for this topic, Mr. Tanner opened up questions to the public.

Tom Clements asked what constraints regarding public involvement and interaction with the CAB exist during any phase of a CAB meeting. Mr. Borak replied that FACA leaves this interpretation very open noting public are allowed to attend meetings and make public comments. He also noted that the SRS CAB goes as far as to ask for public opinion prior to voting on recommendations which is not a requirement. A DDFO has the right to restrain public comments if they get out of hand and he has experienced meetings becoming disrupted with inflammatory public comments generally getting out of hand which would be an opportunity for the DDFO to step in and end public comment or the meeting altogether as well as ask any public comments be written and submitted to DOE.

Ms. Corbett asked if CAB members are allowed to speak to members of the press. Mr. Borak answered that members of public are allowed to talk to the press but CAB members are asked to not mention or imply that they represent the CAB with their opinion. Ms. Corbett then asked if the press asks about the CAB's opinion on a topic would it be alright to answer, to which Mr. Borak replied that if the questions are regarding a specific recommendation then facts can be relayed, but he suggested against speaking for the CAB. Ms. Corbett then asked if the press asked questions such as "what is the CAB doing about this specific topic?" would it be alright to answer. Mr. Borak responded that information is made available to the public implying they would not need to ask CAB members about it unless asking for their opinion. He then gave an example of a board member writing an editorial in the local newspaper giving his personal opinion, however his byline included his position within the advisory board.

Mr. Hoel noted that SRS CAB SOPs state that the chair or vice chair are designated to speak to the press on behalf of the CAB.

Mr. Kaminski noted to be aware that members of the press typically have tape recorders going at all times.

Public Comment

Tom Clements spoke about his background and the role of the CAB as he perceives it.

Chuck Messick spoke in favor of the German SNF program at SRS and encouraged the CAB to wait to make a decision about this program until DOE-SR itself makes a decision about this program.

Voting: Recommendation 343 – SRS Strategic Plan

Mr. Doerr summarized the response to this recommendation and the background behind the recommendation. A motion to vote on it was made and seconded, and the majority voted in favor.

Voting: Recommendation 344 – Prescribed Fires

Mr. Doerr summarized the response to this recommendation and the background behind the recommendation. A motion to vote on it was made and seconded, and the majority voted in favor.

Voting: Recommendation 345 – Pollinator Land Use for the SRS

Ms. Gillas summarized the response to this recommendation and the background behind the recommendation. A motion to vote on it was made and seconded, and the majority voted in favor.

Mr. Doerr asked for a status update on Recommendation 338, which Mr. Tanner noted would happen asap.

Voting: Draft Recommendation

Oppose Receipt of German SNF for Treatment and Storage in the U.S.

Mr. Powell summarized the response to this recommendation and the background behind the recommendation. A motion to vote on it was made and seconded. 9 voted in favor and 9 voted in opposition, with 2 abstentions. Mr. Tanner noted that Rose Dobson-Elliott, CAB member, had left an absentee ballot in favor of this recommendation which tipped the scales in favor. Multiple CAB members then noted that someone had voted twice. Mr. Tanner noted that the absentee ballot upon further inspection was unclear as to whether it was in favor or against it since Ms. Dobson-Elliot noted she would like to see the recommendation tabled rather than for or against. Mr. Mikolanis and Mr. Tanner discussed this for a moment and another vote was called discounting the unclear absentee ballot as an abstention, which resulted in 10 in favor, 9 opposed and 2 abstentions. The recommendation passed by 1 vote.

Voting: Draft Recommendation

Ad Hoc Committee Formation

Mr. French summarized the proposal and it's background. Mr. Kaminski asked if the 6 CAB members mentioned will be part of the committee in addition to the CAB chair and vice chair. Ms. Weber asked if the full board creating ad hoc committee is allowed under EM SSAB guiding documents since this would be a subcommittee and would need to answer to the committee which formed it. Mr. Tanner clarified that the CAB is classified as a committee under the guiding documents and therefore has the ability to create subcommittees. Mr. Doerr provided background regarding how the proposal began. The motion was made to vote on this proposal, and it was seconded.

~Meeting adjourned

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