

**Summary of the FY 2012 Annual Meeting
Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board
Saturday, August 18, 2011, 8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn, Pigeon Forge, Tenn.**

The Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (ORSSAB) held its annual planning meeting to:

- develop an increased understanding of and commitment to the goals of the board,
- agree on strategies for accomplishing the goals,
- evaluate the effectiveness and achievements of FY 2012, and
- begin developing the FY 2013 work plan.

The meeting was facilitated by Jenny Freeman of Strata-G. The agenda is included as Attachment 1.

Members Present

Alfreda Cook	Jennifer Kasten	Gregory Paulus
Lisa Hagy	Jan Lyons	Corkie Staley
Janet Hart	David Martin	Robert Stansfield
Bob Hatcher	Fay Martin	Scott Stout
Dave Hemelright	Scott McKinney	Thomas Valunas
Bruce Hicks	Donald Mei	
Howard Holmes	Maggie Owen, Chair	

Members Absent

Jimmy Bell	Chuck Jensen, Secretary	Sam Yahr ¹
------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

¹Student Representative

Others Present

Dave Adler, Department of Energy-Oak Ridge Office (DOE-ORO) ORSSAB liaison
Susan Cange, Deputy Manager for DOE-ORO Environmental Management (EM) and Deputy Designated Federal Officer
Jenny Freeman, Strata-G
Spencer Gross, ORSSAB Support Office
Connie Jones, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) ORSSAB Liaison
Melyssa Noe, DOE-ORO ORSSAB Federal Coordinator
Pete Osborne, ORSSAB Support Office
John Owsley, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) ORSSAB Liaison

Objectives

Ms. Freeman began the meeting by reviewing general meeting guidelines and describing the objectives for the day (noted above). She commended members for their participation in the Friday evening get-together, which had been designed as an opportunity for members to get to know each other better and talk about issues, such as why they wanted to join the board and what skills they brought to the board. The chairs of the ORSSAB standing committees also discussed their committees' scopes on Friday evening, providing background for the discussions at the Saturday annual planning meeting.

The Role of the Board as it Relates to DOE

Ms. Cange presented an overview of the ORO EM program (Attachment 2) and reviewed its mission, progress, challenges, and key programmatic considerations. She then discussed near-term goals and EM's longer-term strategic plan. Near-term goals include:

- Completing demolition of Buildings K-25 and K-27 at East Tennessee Technology Park

- Continuing to identify ways to address mercury releases at the Y-12 site
- Removing half of the U-233 inventory at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and preparing for processing remaining inventory
- Continuing to process transuranic waste (debris) and preparing for sludge processing

The longer-term strategic plan is to address the following:

East Tennessee Technology Park

- Complete demolition of the highest risk facilities – Buildings K-25 and K-27
- Address remaining facilities after work starts at other Oak Ridge Reservation sites

Y-12 National Security Complex

- Finalize the overall site cleanup strategy/plan
- Initiate characterization, treatability studies, and building demolition preparation
- Begin decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) after K-27 demolition is complete

Oak Ridge National Laboratory

- Complete U-233 disposition and transuranic waste processing
- Initiate cleanup of remaining facilities after work is underway at Y-12

An important consideration that distinguishes Oak Ridge from other DOE sites is that much of the cleanup program here enables other missions taking place on the Oak Ridge Reservation, including those of the DOE Office of Science, the Y-12 National Security Complex, and the DOE reindustrialization program. Ms. Cange said she likes to emphasize the progress the program has made over the last decade, such as the enormous amount of D&D work that's been done and the start of removal of U-233 from the Oak Ridge National Laboratory central campus.

She concluded by talking about the role of the SSAB as it relates to DOE. In FY 2013, she would like the board to focus its activities to:

- maintain awareness of key program focus areas,
- provide recommendations on high-level programmatic decisions and project implementation,
- solicit input from the broader regional stakeholder community, and
- participate in national dialogues concerning the EM program.

The fact that there are so many new people on the board, she said, provides an opportunity for fresh perspectives on EM challenges.

Mr. McKinney asked how much of the ORO EM budget is required for base operations. Ms. Cange said about \$180M. There are a lot of constraints, as well, she said. ORO EM receives two types of funding: defense and D&D, both of which can only spent in certain ways. There are also control points set by Headquarters and Congress that determine what projects certain funds must be spent on.

Ms. Cook asked Ms. Cange to provide her slide on EM progress to the board so it can be used in outreach materials.

Mr. Hicks asked about the role of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. Ms. Cange explained that it's an agency focused on safe nuclear activities across DOE sites. She meets with a board representative monthly, but the representative spends most of his time at Y-12. Ms. Cange offered to supply Mr. Hicks with additional information.

Mr. Martin asked how EM interacts with the Government Accountability Office. Ms. Cange explained that it's a government agency that helps make sure government funds are spent appropriately, so EM

interacts with it in that capacity. The Office of the Inspector General is another government entity that looks over EM activities.

Board Mission and Accomplishments

Ms. Owen discussed the board's mission statement, and Mr. Freeman led discussion about how it is understood by the members.

Mr. Paulus recommended that something be added to the mission about the board serving as an 'acid test' for what DOE is doing. We are probably the only completely diverse group of outsiders that look over what DOE-ORO EM does, he said, and this might be one of the most important things the board has to offer DOE. Mr. Adler said he thought the activity Mr. Paulus was referring to was implicit in the mission statement. Ms. Cange agreed, adding that this sort of 'reality check' is very helpful to DOE when the board is making recommendations.

Ms. Lyon said the phrase "At the request of... the Board may provide..." makes it sound like the board is not very independent. Mr. Adler said there are constraints (such as in the Federal Advisory Committee Act) about what the mission can say because there are limits to the board's scope. Within those constraints, the board's mission can say what the board wants.

Mr. Stansfield recommended taking that phrase out. Ms. Cook recommended omitting the phrase "at the request of...".

Ms. Freeman suggested the board assign a subcommittee to discuss revisions to the mission statement wording. Mr. Martin recommended that it be taken on by the Board Finance & Process Committee.

Ms. Cange noted that a change should be made to reflect the recent DOE-ORO reorganization. ORO EM is now a standalone program reporting directly to HQ.

Ms. Owen reviewed the overall FY 2012 board accomplishments, and the committee chairs presented their committee highlights (Attachment 3).

Board Operations

Ms. Freeman reported that 18 of the member surveys distributed prior to the annual planning meeting were returned, and she completed 15 phone calls to members to gather additional feedback on the survey. The survey responses are generally positive and within normalized ranges, she said, which indicates that the board is working together well. The comments made during the phone calls were very informative and provided some interesting ideas.

Ms. Freeman presented the specific results of answers to the survey questions (Attachment 4). The board's purpose and goals are clear and meaningful, she said, although their measurement is an area not completely understood by members. As to the structure and effectiveness of the board, the main area of disagreement is in members holding each other accountable.

The overall theme from the five questions on skills related to board membership is that the skill set of the current board is good. The only low score was on the question "Board members are willing to devote the effort necessary to achieve board success."

The question on collaboration is a very strong point for the board, as evidenced at last night's working dinner, she said. The issue manager role is an area to be improved. Climate and working approach are very good. Some suggestions were made for training.

“The board is sufficiently recognized by the public for its work” was the one area where there was strong disagreement. What this tells her is that given the amount of public outreach the board does, it’s strange that the public is so unaware. Ms. Cook thought it may be due in part to the fact that the general public does not understand the “language” that DOE and the board speak. They may hear our message but not really understand it, she said.

Mr. Adler noted that “recognized” by the public is sometimes confused with “appreciated”. The public may recognize the board’s work but not appreciate it.

Mr. Martin asked if DOE ever hears anything about the board. Mr. Adler says he gets a lot of feedback, but it’s generally infrequent. Mr. Owsley said he occasionally hears of someone who’s seen the board meetings on television.

Mr. Hemelright suggested adding a “neutral” category to the member survey response categories. Ms. Freeman said that some people do leave a question blank at times.

Ms. Freeman discussed some of the specific comments made, including ideas to increase public awareness. Those, she said, will be provided to the Public Outreach Committee for discussion. Three other categories of comments deserve the board’s attention:

What’s working well?

- Board and committee meetings: structure, presentations, agendas, leadership
- Learning opportunities: tours, trips, presentations, Q&A after the presentations
- Support staff
- Good participation from board members

What can be improved?

- More interaction and collaboration among the committees apart from the monthly board meetings
- More community outreach
- Member continuing education
- More time to get to know each other
- More participation on the committees: equitable number of members

How can DOE more effectively support the ORSSAB?

- Provide sustenance at meetings that occur during normal meal times
- Continue to inform board members: clarify the mission, share information about meetings open to board members, approve member applications quicker
- Attend board meetings and interact with members
- Pay more attention to communication about recommendations
- Provide mileage for board members who have to travel 50 miles or more round trip

Ms. Cange said that providing food at the monthly board meetings is something that DOE can no longer do. Mr. Hemelright said the Nevada SSAB established a fund maintained by donations from members and guests to provide sustenance at their meetings. He recommended that ORSSAB consider that method. Mr. Hatcher suggested a straw poll be taken. A number of members were supportive but not all.

Mr. Valunas said the Board Finance & Process Committee is hoping to get all committees to do a better job of estimating their needs for travel. Still, he wondered why DOE cannot recognize what is realistically anticipated for the board’s travel needs in a given year instead of cutting the suggested travel budget. The board has always gone ahead and spent what it wants to anyway. Ms. Cange said it’s a fixable issue.

Work Plan Topics: Presentations and Discussion

Mr. Adler, Ms. Jones, and Mr. Owsley reviewed topics proposed by DOE, EPA, and TDEC, respectively, (Attachment 5) for the board to consider in its FY 2013 work plan.

Mr. Martin asked whether the recent security incident at Y-12 would impact the EM budget. Ms. Cange, said no, there should be no impacts, other than that Y-12 has withdrawn its scope from the reservation-wide security procurement currently underway. Mr. Martin asked if confidence in DOE's ability to keep people out of long-term stewardship areas has slipped because of the incident. Ms. Cange said that security is always an issue, but the organizations responsible for it can be expected to remain vigilant.

Ms. Freeman asked if the members had additional topics for inclusion in the work plan. Mr. Paulus recommended that a board presentation be scheduled on the missions of the three agencies and what the differences in direction are.

Ms. Hart inquired about the status of DOE's footprint reduction initiative. Mr. Adler said that the initiative is still a focus for DOE. The work being done now for Zone 1 at the East Tennessee Technology Park is part of that footprint reduction process.

Mr. Valunas noted that posting fish advisories is in part a function of DOE activities, but there are other reasons for the postings. It would be good for the board to understand the difference. Mr. Adler agreed, saying that most people think DOE is responsible for all waterway pollution. Mr. Martin said TVA publishes an annual water quality report, which highlights the fact that most problems are from fertilizer runoff and other problems.

Ms. Cange announced that the results of the board's annual Public Environmental Survey were not available for today's meeting because of a new governmental notification requirement. She asked if the members wanted DOE to pursue the survey once the requirement is met or wait until next year. Mr. Hemelright recommended waiting. The issue will also be taken up by the Public Outreach Committee, he said.

Work Plan Topics: Strategies and Actions

Ms. Freeman led the group through a discussion of the suggested work plan topics. She reported that during the meeting break, Mr. Adler, Ms. Jones, and Mr. Owsley came up with a concept for grouping their topics into eight listings that will make it easier for the members to determine how and by what committees the topics will be addressed. Ms. Freeman led discussion of each the listings and asked members to vote on their importance. Committees to work on the issues were then assigned.

1. Groundwater strategy (subtopics: Bear Creek Valley and other related topics)

Importance: High 17, medium 2, low 0.

Committees: EM (lead), Stewardship.

2. Provision of input into EM portfolio plans (subtopics: Y-12 mercury abatement)

Importance: High 18, medium 1, low 0.

Committees: EM (lead), Public Outreach, Stewardship.

Notes: A board presentation should be given to start with, with a working session committee-of-the whole as a follow-on. Mr. Owsley said the Federal Facility Agreement will figure into this, especially since the entire schedule of enforceable and non-enforceable milestones will eventually move into the enforceable zone.

3. Participation in ongoing activities to assure sufficient waste disposal

Importance: High 5, medium 12, low 2.

Committees: EM (lead), Public Outreach, Stewardship.

Notes: Mr. Adler recommended that the topic reside with the EM committee this year since the focus of activities will be on engineering studies and the like. Public Outreach and Stewardship will come into play at the end of FY 2013 and in FY 2014.

4. Input to the FY 2015 budget process

Importance: High 4, medium 6, low 8.

Committees: EM Budget & Prioritization.

5. Hazardous and radioactive materials in long-term storage (subtopics: orphan wastes)

Importance: High 1, medium 9, low 8.

Committees: To be determined.

Notes: Mr. Martin suggested a full board presentation before determining whether the issue should go to a committee.

6. Footprint reduction

Importance: High 3, medium 13, low 2.

Committees: Stewardship (lead), Public Outreach.

7. Clarification of stream postings to the public

Importance: High 2, medium 1, low 15.

Committees: Public Outreach, Stewardship.

Notes: Mr. Owsley cautioned that the stream postings can be clarified, but the board cannot change them. He also noted that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry produced a brochure on the fish advisories several years ago. The Local Oversight Committee was in the process of updating it before the committee was disbanded. He is unsure how far along that effort progressed.

8. Public Environmental Survey

Importance: High 10, medium 6, low 3.

Committees: Public Outreach.

Ms. Cange observed that it may make sense for the EM and Stewardship committees to be combined, given comments she has heard that all EM issues relate in some way to stewardship and vice versa. Mr. Martin spoke against it, arguing that the Stewardship Committee brings in some very interested and engaged individuals from the community, and they may not be willing to participate in a combined committee setting.

Mr. Hatcher (the EM Committee Chair) agreed, saying that it's best to have separate 'lead' committees for issues. The two committees can be combined at times when the situation warrants. Ms. Staley (the Stewardship Committee Chair) said that combining the committees could result in extremely long meetings because each committee already has a full plate. Ms. Martin (the Stewardship Committee Vice Chair) echoed Mr. Martin's comment about the public not wanting to participate in a combined committee.

Mr. Martin noted that transuranic sludge processing is not part of the eight topics. Mr. Adler acknowledged that there are issues in the committee carryover lists that are not included in the eight topics. Sludge processing is one of them. DOE understands that the committees will continue to look into these, and that's appropriate, he said. Ms. Cange remarked that there is not much activity of interest to the board regarding sludge processing activities in FY 2013. Project design is about all that will go on. Major activities will begin in FY 2014.

Mr. Martin suggested that instead of empanelling a separate EM Budget & Prioritization Committee this year that its scope be incorporated into Board Finance & Process. The members agreed.

Nominating Committee Report

Mr. Paulus presented the Nominating Committee's slate of candidates for FY 2013 board officers: Mr. Martin: Chair, Mr. Hemelright: Vice Chair, Chuck Jensen: Secretary. The slate will be presented again and a vote to elect officers will be held at the September 12 monthly board meeting. Additional nominations will be called for before the vote on September 12.

Action Items

Open

1. Ms. Cange to provide her slide on EM progress to the board so it can be used in outreach materials.
2. Ms. Cange will supply Mr. Hicks with additional information on the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.
3. The Board Finance & Process Committee will discuss suggested revisions to the ORSSAB mission statement wording.
4. The Executive Committee will address Mr. Hemelright's suggestion to establish a fund gathered from members and guests to provide sustenance at board meetings.
5. Staff will ask DOE to address Mr. Valunas' concern that it is not recognizing what is realistically anticipated for the board's travel needs in a given year.
6. Staff will add to the monthly board presentations list Mr. Paulus' suggestion for a board presentation on the missions of DOE, TDEC, and EPA, and what the differences in direction are.

Closed

None

Attachments (5). Available upon request from the ORSSAB support office.

plo