



Stewardship Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 16, 2012, 5:30 p.m.
DOE Information Center
Office of Science and Technical Information

Committee Members Present

David Martin
Fay Martin, Vice Chair
Roger Macklin
Corkie Staley, Chair
Scott Stout

Absent

Darryl Bonner
Donna Campbell
Susan Gawarecki
Lisa Hagy
Norman Mulvenon
Lorene Sigal

Others Present

Sally Brown, RSI
Sid Garland, UCOR/RSI
Spencer Gross, ORSSAB support office
Dave Hemelright, ORSSAB
Jennifer Kasten, ORSSAB
Joy Sager, Department of Energy Oak Ridge
Office (DOE ORO)
Lynn Sims, RSI

Discussion of Land Use Manager

Ms. Brown provided a follow-up presentation to the committee on the Land Use Manager (LUM) from the October 10 ORSSAB meeting. She reviewed the background of the LUM and showed some online examples of how it is used.

She began with a review of the LUM, which is a system to automate the tracking of stewardship reporting requirements. The main points of her presentation are in Attachment 1.

Currently there are more than 50 sites on the Oak Ridge Reservation with engineering or institutional controls. All of these controls must be tracked and verified each year for the Remediation Effectiveness Report (RER). More than 200 inspections are done each year at various times.

As more areas are remediated and more stewardship requirements are put in place it became clear that the current method of tracking controls with hard copy was time consuming and an inefficient way of recording and retrieving information. After a presentation to the committee on the problem in 2011, the committee drafted a recommendation that ORSSAB approved in September 2011 that DOE find a way to automate the process.

Later that fall the Water Resources Restoration Program (WRRP) began working with Mijara Corp. to adapt a program already being used by the Navy in its base realignment and closure program. WRRP has recently begun using LUM in a testing phase.

The LUM automates stewardship tracking by having all CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act) requirements in the system to collect, maintain, and track status (Attachment 1, page3).

Attachment 1, page 4 is a diagram of the LUM tracking process. Stewardship requirements identified in decision documents are loaded into the system. Those requirements are tracked and verified using laptop notebooks in the field. The information can then be reported out of the system as needed.

Advantages of LUM include centralized data storage, standardized content and reports, easy access in the field, accountable record of inspections, and assurance nothing is overlooked (Attachment 1, page 5).

Ms. Brown said the data from the system will be accessible to the public to provide reports of stewardship requirements and why they are in place. The public will be able to access the LUM mapping features through the Oak Ridge Environmental Information System (<http://www-oreis.ettp.energy.gov/oreis/help/oreishome.html>). The system uses the Stewardship Map developed by the Stewardship Committee. The public will be able to access the map and click on a watershed. That will bring up a window showing the description of the land use controls in place (Attachment 1, page 7). Pages 7-12 of Attachment 1 show the various publically available mapping features.

Ms. Brown then went online to demonstrate some of LUM's application features used by administrators and inspectors. From the LUM home screen authorized personnel can add a new controlled area or edit an existing one; begin an inspection; view the area on a map; and view statistics related to the region (Attachment 1, page 13).

Pages 14-25 of Attachment 1 show the features available to authorized personnel and how they can be used, including site descriptions, site map, stewardship requirements, drivers for requirements, land use restrictions, items to report, related documents, and inspection reports. If a problem is found during an inspection, the inspector can open a site maintenance report to ensure the problem is fixed. The LUM will send a message to the responsible party to ensure the problem is attended. LUM administrators can track the process of the issue.

Mr. Martin asked if the laptops used in the field had wireless capability. Ms. Sims said they do, although there are a few areas on the reservation where there is no signal. She said information can still be captured in the laptop and be loaded into the system when the inspector returns.

Mr. Martin asked if issues found during an inspection are stored in the system. Ms. Brown said she and a colleague keep track of issues. Ms. Sims said a spreadsheet keeps track of the issues and prioritizes them

Mr. Hemelright asked if there was a way for inspectors to make suggestions to improve the system. Ms. Brown said perhaps a helpline could be set up.

Mr. Martin asked who currently owns the system and who will be responsible for it decades in the future. Ms. Brown said LUM is stored on UCOR's server (DOE's prime cleanup contractor), but it ultimately belongs to DOE.

Mr. Hemelright asked if Ms. Brown and Ms. Sims would be available to demonstrate the LUM at the next EM SSAB Chairs' meeting in the spring. He said he would suggest that as a possible topic of discussion at the meeting. Ms. Brown and Ms. Sims thought they would be able to do that.

Mr. Hemelright asked when the system would be fully operational. Ms. Brown said it should be fully implemented by January. She said she will advise the committee when the public accessibility portion is available.

Five-year Review – issues with the review

The 2011 Five-year Review (FYR) for the Oak Ridge Reservation (DOE/OR/01-2516&D2) was issued somewhat later than previous years. The committee wanted to know why there was a delay.

Ms. Sims said DOE, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) , and Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) wanted to take advantage of lessons learned from the 2006 FYR. Ms. Sims explained that the FYR covers the entire Oak Ridge Reservation which included a detailed review of 27 sites. Because there are so many sites and some of these sites are older EPA and TDEC had a large number of comments on the D1 version. Both DOE and the regulators decided to work together and resolve all of the comments before issuing a D2. She said it is expensive to issue multiple versions and the parties involved wanted to reduce that expense as much as possible. She said EPA and TDEC provided 133 comments for the 27 sites.

Ms. Sims said many comments were related to protectiveness determinations. Others were associated with monitoring. She said the FYR resulted in all sites but two being ‘protective’ , another site had a designation of ‘protectiveness deferred’ and will be addressed in an addendum to the FYR.

She said the implementation of the LUM will be useful in subsequent FYRs.

Develop list of questions for November conference call on site transition summary

The committee has been following the development of a Site Transition Process for turning over remediated sites back to its original landlords.

At the August meeting it was suggested that committee members work on a list of questions that could be provided to personnel in Washington working on the site transition summary. They would review the questions and be able to respond to them during a follow up conference call with the committee.

The committee members most interested in the topic, Norman Mulvenon and Lorene Sigal, were not in attendance to discuss proposed questions. Also the 13-step guidance for transition became available only recently. Mr. Martin thought it would be best to allow members to review the 13-steps and develop questions to discuss at the November 20 meeting.

The committee asked Ms. Sager to see if DOE Headquarters personnel would be able to participate in a conference call with the committee on either December 4, 6, or 10.

Action Items

Open

1. Committee members will develop a list of questions prior to a conference call with DOE headquarters regarding the site transition summary and the 13-step guidance document.
2. Ms. Sager will research the possibility of a local site to use as a test for the site transition process. **Status.** Ms. Sager said she has been trying to learn about South Campus as a possibility for a test transition. She said DOE EM is still doing some groundwater monitoring in that area. She had asked Sue Smiley about a test transition. Ms. Smiley thought it deserved further discussion, but suggested waiting until after the November elections and the FY 2013 budgets are agreed upon. Mr. Mulvenon clarified his interest in this as more of an exercise to see how well the process works and not so much as a final transition. He suggested waiting to see what the 13-step guidance document looks like before going further.
3. Ms. Sager will schedule a conference call with DOE Headquarters in November to discuss the site transition summary and 13-step guidance document (conditional on availability of guidance by mid-October). **Status.** The committee wanted to delay the conference a month in order to review the 13-step guidance and develop questions about the guidance and the

current Site Transition Summary. Ms. Sager will see if personnel in Washington will be available for a conference call on either December 4, 6, or 10.

Closed

The meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Attachments (1) are available through the ORSSAB support office.

rsg