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Open Meeting / Announcements

Chair's Opening Remarks
- Agenda approval

Public Comment

U.S. Department of Energy Update

RWAP Facility Evaluation Improvement Opportunities (Work Plan Item #7)
- DOE Presentation
- NSSAB Discussion and Determine Path Forward

Break

NSSAB Recommendation for NNSS Communication Plan for Groundwater Sampling Results (Work Plan Item #5)

Ways to Increase/Enhance Communication Regarding Waste Transportation and Disposal (Work Plan Item #9)
- Update on tour of Hanford Site in Washington
- Update on tour of Waste Control Specialists in Texas
- NSSAB Discussion and Determine Path Forward

NSSAB Recommendation for FY 2015-2016 Membership

Other NSSAB Business:
- Update on EM SSAB National Chairs' Meeting in Hanford, WA
- EM SSAB Draft Recommendations
- Update on Yucca Flat External Peer Review
- Updates on Devil's Hole Workshop
- NSSAB Recommendations and DOE Responses for Work Plan Items #4 and #6
- UGTA Technical Information Exchange (TIE)
- Student Liaison Project Update

Liaison Updates
- Clark County
- Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations
- Elko County Commission
- Esmeralda County Commission

Barb Ulmer, Facilitator
Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair
Barb Ulmer, Facilitator
Scott Wade, DOE
Jhon Carilli, DOE
Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair
Barb Ulmer, Facilitator
Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair
Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair and Donna Hruska, Vice Chair
Donna Hruska, Membership Chair
Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair
Bill Sears
Edward Rosemark / Jack Sypolt
Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair
Donna Hruska, Membership Chair
Phil Klevorick
Richard Arnold
Charlie Myers
Ralph Keyes
Lincoln County Commission
Nye County Commission
Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office
State of Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
U.S. National Park Service
White Pine County Commission

Kevin Phillips
Dan Schinhofen/Frank Carbone
John Klenke
Chris Andres
Genne Nelson
Mike Lemich

Liaison Discussion Wrapup Scott Wade, DOE

Meeting Wrap-up/Assessment/Adjournment Barb Ulmer, Facilitator

- Next Full Board Meeting-Wednesday, July 16, 2014
  National Atomic Testing Museum, Las Vegas, NV
  - 4 p.m. Educational Session: Limitations on Transport Modeling
    by Leonard Konikow, Emeritus Scientist, U.S. Geological Survey
  - 5 p.m. Full Board Meeting
## NSSAB MEETING ATTENDANCE

**Full Board Meetings**

**October 2013 through September 2014 (FY 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>11/20/13</th>
<th>2/19/14</th>
<th>3/19/14</th>
<th>5/21/14</th>
<th>7/16/14</th>
<th>9/17/14</th>
<th>Max Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Bienenstein</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Fisher</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Goldsmith</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Hruska</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Kastelic</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Keiserman</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Moore</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Rosemark</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sears</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Sypolt</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIAISONS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elko County Commission</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esmeralda County Commission</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County Commission</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Meadows School</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye County Commission</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nye Co. Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of NV Division of Env Protection</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Natl Park Service</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Pine Co. Commission</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** √ = Present, Term Limit, E = Excused, U = Unexcused, RM = Remove, RS = Resign
Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program Facility Evaluation Improvement Opportunities Work Plan Item #7

Jhon Carilli
Low-Level Waste Activity Lead
U.S. Department of Energy, Nevada Field Office
Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB)
May 21, 2014
NSSAB Work Plan Item #7

One or two NSSAB members to observe a Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program (RWAP) Facility Evaluation for understanding and provide a recommendation with process improvement opportunities.
Background

- Cold War-related activities and nuclear research generated Low-Level Waste (LLW) at sites across the country

- Department of Energy (DOE) is responsible for consolidating and disposing LLW generated by DOE clean-up activities

- Annually, the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) disposes approximately 5% of the total waste generated in the Environmental Management (EM) Program
Regulatory Authority for LLW Disposal

- Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended
- DOE Order 435.1 and DOE Manual 435.1-1
  - Disposal Authorization Statement
    - Performance Assessment/Composite Analysis (PA/CA) – analysis of the impacts to protect workers and public
    - Disposal Facility Monitoring Plan
    - Closure Plan
    - Maintenance Plan
    - NNSS Waste Acceptance Criteria
    - Annual Review of PA/CA
Regulatory Authority for LLW Disposal (continued)

- Independent review by LLW Federal Review Group

Synopsis: Facility Evaluations are one of numerous requirements which allow the NNSS to accept waste for disposal
NNSS: Ideal Location for LLW Disposal

- Low precipitation
- High evapotranspiration
- No surface water
- No pathway to groundwater
- Isolated location
Key Terminology

- **Waste Generator Sites**
  - DOE and Department of Defense sites that generate LLW and mixed LLW radioactive waste

- **Waste Stream**
  - A waste or group of wastes from a process or a facility with similar physical, chemical, and radiological properties
Key Terminology (continued)

• NNSS Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC)
  – Document that establishes rigorous disposal acceptance criteria for waste generator sites and their proposed waste streams

• Waste Profile
  – Application by a generator to dispose a waste stream at the NNSS that demonstrates compliance with the NNSS WAC
Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program (RWAP)

The RWAP consists of three programs shown below:

- Waste Acceptance Criteria (Facility Evaluations)
- Waste Acceptance Review Panel
- Waste Assistance and Technical Support
Facility Evaluation Background

• Utilizing an annual schedule, every active generator is visited at least every two years.

• Conducted by certified RWAP personnel at the generator’s location in two different manners:
  – Audit – *comprehensive* Waste Certification Program review
    o Review of entire program
    o Multiple day visit – 3-5 days on average
  – Planned – generator receives notification and provides requested program documents for RWAP review before on-site visit
Facility Evaluation Background (continued)

- Surveillance – *focused* Waste Certification Program review
  - Review of a specific area with limited scope
  - Visit lasts 1-2 days on average
  - Impromptu - generator receives minimal notification for security measures only
Purpose of RWAP Facility Evaluations

- Facility Evaluations evaluate compliance and implementation for the following program elements:
  - Quality Assurance
  - Waste Traceability
  - Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Waste Characterization (hazardous waste characterization)
  - Radiological Characterization
Quality Assurance (QA)

- Verify that generator has an approved site QA Plan demonstrating compliance to the NNSS WAC
- Verify that generator has an approved NNSS WAC Implementation Crosswalk and performed an annual review of referenced procedures, processes, and methods
  - Implementation Crosswalk - generator’s description of how NNSS WAC requirements are met
- Verify that the generator has the required training to perform self assessments
- Verify waste disposal packaging and contents
Waste Traceability

- Verify waste containers are controlled to ensure integrity and packages not compromised
- Verify inspections and acceptance testing are conducted
- Verify containers are properly stored, moved, and shipped
- Verify control of measuring and test equipment
RCRA Waste and Radiological Characterization

• Verify that waste characterization methods and procedures employed document the physical and chemical characteristics

• Verify that generator’s waste characterization documentation matches the approved waste profile submitted to DOE

• Verify that controls are in place to verify and evaluate stabilization methods, packaging, labeling, sealing, separation, segregation, and prohibited item removal
DOE Role

- Oversees waste acceptance and disposal and approve waste profiles
- Ensures environmental protection and worker and public safety
- **Observes and/or conducts shadow assessment of NNSS Federal contractor during Facility Evaluations**
  - Shadow assessment – formal process in which DOE evaluates that contractors are performing Federal duties and responsibilities properly
State of Nevada Division of Environmental Protection Role

• Oversees hazardous waste management as outlined in the RCRA (includes Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order)

• Provides joint oversight with DOE by participating in RWAP processes per an Agreement in Principle

• **Attends and observes DOE, NNSS Federal contractor, and generator during Facility Evaluations**
NNSS Contractor Role

• Reviews waste profiles for compliance with the NNSS WAC
• Maintains and provides technical support for NNSS WAC
• *Performs Facility Evaluations (audits and surveillances) and oversees any corrective actions*
• Verifies the waste can be safely disposed
• Ensures the disposal facility will continue to meet requirements
• Ensures environmental protection and worker and public safety
• Ensures waste originated from DOE or Department of Defense
NNSS Contractor General Auditor Training

- **Required Reading**
  - RWAP procedures
  - NNSS WAC
  - Waste generator approval process
- **On-the-job training**
  - Checklist review and completion
  - Corrective action plan and objective evidence reviews
- **Classroom training**
  - Root cause analysis
  - Auditor/lead auditor classroom training; requires passing score on exam
- **Proficient oral and written communication skills**
NNSS Contractor
Auditor Specific Training

• Auditor:
  – Participate in a minimum of four RWAP Facility Evaluations under the guidance of a qualified Subject Matter Expert (SME)

• Lead Auditor:
  – Participate in a minimum of two RWAP Facility Evaluations as Lead Auditor (LA) under the guidance of a qualified SME/LA
NNSS Contractor Functional Specific Training

- Radiological Characterization Auditor:
  - Participate in a formal training course in radiation detection, radiochemical analysis, or radioactive waste management

- Chemical Characterization Auditor:
  - Participate in a formal RCRA training course
Facility Evaluation Process

- Notify waste generator of Facility Evaluation
- Request program documents for review
- Review shipment discrepancy log
- Develop checklist
Facility Evaluation Process (continued)

- Brief RWAP team of scope & responsibilities
- Perform interviews of generator personnel
- Observe work being performed
- Conduct in-briefing with generator personnel
- Evaluate and document objective evidence
- Issue report approximately 30 days after Facility Evaluation
Facility Evaluation Process (continued)

• Brief generator during exit meeting of any Observations and/or Corrective Action Requests (CAR)

  – Observation – a weakness in a generator’s QA or waste certification program that, if left uncorrected, could result in a condition adverse to quality
    o Requires a written response by generator
    o Maintains approval to ship waste to NNSS
  – CAR – document that tracks deficient (requirement violation) conditions adverse to quality until satisfactorily resolved
    o Requires in-depth investigation by generator
    o Suspends approval to ship waste to NNSS
Facility Evaluation Process (continued)

- Formal CAR closeout process:
  - Generator determines a root cause based on its investigation
  - Generator provides a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to DOE that identifies problem and its proposed solution
  - DOE reviews the CAP and accepts or rejects until satisfied that generator has a viable solution
  - RWAP performs on-site verification once CAP is completed
  - DOE approves generator to ship waste after verification determines compliance
  - Process takes approximately 60 days
NSSAB Path Forward

• Provide DOE a recommendation with RWAP Facility Evaluation process improvement opportunities
  – Recommendation has no official due date
    o Dependent on scheduled Facility Evaluation with NSSAB members (dates on next slide)
    o Report resulting from Facility Evaluation will take approximately 30 days after site inspection is complete
    o Final resolution of any CARs discovered typically takes at least 60 days
NSSAB Path Forward
(continued)

• Travel funding is available to send two NSSAB members to observe an RWAP Facility Evaluation:
  – Oak Ridge Reservation – Oak Ridge, Tennessee – June 16 – 19, 2014*
  – Argonne National Laboratory – Argonne, Illinois (near Chicago) – July 7 – 10, 2014*
  – Options: Send one member to Oak Ridge and one member to Argonne OR send two members to either Oak Ridge or Argonne

• NSSAB discussion and decision on member attendance

*Note: first and last day for travel
May 21, 2014

Ms. Kelly Snyder, DDFO
U.S. Department of Energy, Nevada Field Office
P. O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

SUBJECT: Recommendation for the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) Communication Plan for Groundwater Sampling Results (Work Plan Item #5)

Dear Ms. Snyder,

The Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) was asked to provide a recommendation, from a community perspective, to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) on ways the NNSS Communication Plan for Groundwater Sampling Results may be enhanced.

After a briefing on February 19th and Board deliberation at the March 19th and May 21st Full Board Meetings, the NSSAB recommends that the DOE develop a graphic representation that depicts the location of the underground tests, the direction groundwater is traveling, and current basic sampling results (where DOE has found contamination and where it has not). This graphic representation could be available to the community on the Nevada Field Office’s website. The NSSAB recommends that DOE research the best format to depict this information that is easily accessible and understandable by the general public.

Additionally, The NSSAB is interested in providing further feedback in fiscal year 2015 on how DOE communicates sampling results to the public as the communication plan continues to be developed as the models mature and additional data is collected.

The NSSAB appreciates the time provided in briefing the subject and looks forward to providing additional feedback in the future.

Sincerely,

Kathleen L. Bienenstein, Chair

cc: D. A. Borak, DOE/HQ (EM-3.2) FORS
    M. R. Hudson, DOE/HQ (EM-3.2) FORS
    R. F. Boehlecke, EMO, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV
    K. S. Knapp, EMOS, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV
    C. G. Lockwood, EMOS, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV
    S. A. Wade, AMEM, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV
    B. R. Wilborn, EMO, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV
    B. K. Ulmer, N-I, Las Vegas, NV
    NSSAB Members and Liaisons
May 21, 2014

Ms. Kelly Snyder, DDFO
U.S. Department of Energy, Nevada Field Office
P. O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

SUBJECT:  Recommendation for FY 2015 - FY 2016 Membership

Dear Ms. Snyder,

After preparation and review, the Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) would like to make the following recommendation regarding the FY 2015-16 membership.

The NSSAB has grouped potential membership appointments into three prioritized categories (candidates have been identified by application number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority One</th>
<th>Priority Two</th>
<th>Priority Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-26</td>
<td>14-14</td>
<td>14-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-01</td>
<td>14-35</td>
<td>14-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-10</td>
<td>14-31</td>
<td>14-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-07</td>
<td>14-05</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-32</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>14-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-25</td>
<td>14-08</td>
<td>14-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-21</td>
<td>14-02</td>
<td>14-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-28</td>
<td>14-18</td>
<td>14-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is requested that Priority One candidates be given the highest priority with candidates from Priorities Two and Three selected to ensure maximum Board balance and diversity. Additionally, the Board does not recommend any applicant who is not listed above.

While we realize the final decision regarding membership lies with the Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management, we appreciate the opportunity to participate in the recruitment/interview process. We look forward to welcoming new
members to the Board in the coming year, thus ensuring continued stakeholder involvement in the Environmental Management activities at the Nevada National Security Site.

Sincerely,

Kathleen L. Bienenstein, Chair

cc: D. A. Borak, DOE/HQ (EM-3.2) FORS
    M. R. Hudson, DOE/HQ (EM-3.2) FORS
    R. F. Boehlecke, EMO, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV
    C.G. Lockwood, EMOS, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV
    S. A. Wade, AMEM, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV
    B. K. Ulmer, N-I, Las Vegas, NV
    NSSAB Members and Liaisons
Mr. David Huizenga  
Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management  
U.S. Department of Energy, EM-1  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585  

Dear Mr. Huizenga:  

**Background**  

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) Chairs note the examples below that illustrate some of the positive benefits resulting from EM remediation efforts such as:  

- Fernald, Ohio, where an operational uranium enrichment plant has been deconstructed and the area reconstituted as parkland;  
- Oak Ridge, Tennessee, where the East Tennessee Technology Park now occupies the area previously dominated by the K-25 Gaseous Diffusion Plant;  
- Rocky Flats, Colorado, where a nuclear weapons production facility has been replaced by flourishing rangeland and now serves as a wildlife refuge; and  
- Hanford in Washington state, where the B Reactor Preservation Project has been completed and is under consideration for national historic preservation.  

In every case of EM site remediation, the environmental recovery constitutes a powerful example of how the joint efforts of the Department of Energy (DOE) and community leaders have resulted in a return to the local community and to society of areas or facilities previously exposed to and/or contaminated by nuclear activities.

**Recommendation**  

With full recognition of the presence and value of formal public relations and outreach programs within each DOE facility, and building upon these capabilities, the EM SSAB Chairs recommend that DOE:

- Sponsor an independent examination of the remediation efforts of DOE EM, with the intent of producing video clips and/or lengthier documentaries suitable for...
public viewing through a variety of platforms and for academic/scholastic purposes.

- Engage the various EM sites in developing and producing such materials (and referencing those that already exist), so that local resources (e.g., local television organizations and academic science programs) may make use of these materials to address local issues and specific concerns.

Such communication tools would help DOE EM to further capitalize on the presentation of past and emerging EM sites to inform the public about cleanup activities at former nuclear sites to maintain and improve support for environmental cleanup.

Steve Hudson, Chair
Hanford Advisory Board

Herbert Bohrer, Chair
Idaho National Laboratory
Site EM Citizens Advisory Board

Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair
Nevada SSAB

Carlos Valdez, Chair
Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board

David Hemelright, Chair
Oak Ridge SSAB

Ben Peterson, Chair
Paducah Citizens Advisory Board

William E. Henderson II, Chair
Portsmouth SSAB

Marolyn J. Parson, Chair
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board

cc: Kristen Ellis, EM-3.2
    David Borak, EM-3.2
Dear Mr. Huizenga:

Background

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) believes the fiscal year 2015 budget request is insufficient to meet the cleanup obligations facing the EM cleanup sites. We also believe that the Department of Energy (DOE) needs to honor the agreements and established milestones between the federal government, the states, Tribes and affected stakeholders in a more timely fashion.

How Underfunding Increases Cost and Risk

- Funding shortfalls increase the long-term cost of cleanup to the American taxpayers.
- Flat funding increases cleanup costs because it does not consider inflation or escalation of added costs.
- Continuing funding shortfalls result in the downward spiral of additional delays and more costs.
- Continued use of facilities past their design lives increases risk, as has been demonstrated by recent reports of leaking double shell tanks at the Hanford site.
- Loss of institutional knowledge inhibits cleanup efficiency and increases costs.

Cleanup Commitments Must Be Honored

The United States government is obligated to meet existing cleanup commitments and establish new commitments for cleanup in a timely fashion. At the larger sites, much of the low hanging fruit, the most easily completed work, is done. The remaining cleanup at these sites is more complex and will cost more money. This fact cannot be ignored. Some sites, such as Fernald and Rocky Flats, have completed all cleanup activities. Many remaining sites are facing the most difficult, risk laden, and expensive cleanup activities across the DOE EM complex. There are also sites, such as Paducah, whose end state metrics have yet to be established.
We believe these cleanup obligations must be met in real time, not delayed. Every year DOE needs to honor their current commitments by requesting all funding to support cleanup activities and milestones, and request funding for newly established milestones.

The EM SSAB, comprising about 200 people, is composed of eight regional citizens advisory boards from communities in Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Nevada, New Mexico, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee and Washington. We are cumulatively representative of a stakeholder population totaling millions of people who are affected by generator sites, transportation routes and disposal sites.

**Recommendation**

The EM SSAB requests that:

- DOE meet its cleanup obligations by requesting all annual funding required to support cleanup activities and milestones at each site we represent to complete committed cleanup activities, without delay.
- DOE expedite milestone establishment, and requests funds for those sites that do not have site end state cleanup milestones in place.

The EM SSAB requests that you share this recommendation with the Secretary of Energy.

Steve Hudson, Chair  
Hanford Advisory Board

Herbert Bohrer, Chair  
Idaho National Laboratory Site EM Citizens Advisory Board

Kathleen Bienenstein, Chair  
Nevada SSAB

Carlos Valdez, Chair  
Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board

David Hemelright, Chair  
Oak Ridge SSAB

Ben Peterson, Chair  
Paducah Citizens Advisory Board

William E. Henderson II, Chair  
Portsmouth SSAB

Marolyn J. Parson, Chair  
Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board

cc:  Kristen Ellis, EM-3.2  
     David Borak, EM-3.2

EM SSAB Chairs’ Recommendation 2014-
February 19, 2014

Ms. Kelly Snyder, Public Involvement Lead  
Environmental Management Operations Support  
U.S. Department of Energy, Nevada Field Office  
P.O. Box 98518  
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

SUBJECT: Recommendation Regarding Groundwater Open House  
(Work Plan Item #4)

Dear Ms. Snyder:

The Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB) was asked to provide recommendations, from a community perspective, to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) in regard to its Groundwater Open House (Work Plan Item #4), on ways the Open House could be enhanced in the future (i.e., format, advertising, and subject matter).

After receiving an overview at the November 20th Full Board meeting and attending the Groundwater Open House on December 11th in Beatty, Nevada, the NSSAB recommends that the following enhancements be considered in the planning process for future Open Houses:

- Hold Open House during hours when people are off work and not during the dinner hour
- Hold Open House on a weekend to increase attendance
- Provide refreshments and/or inexpensive giveaways to entice people to attend and include in the promotional materials
- Provide an additional poster at the entrance informing the public that if additional information is needed; do not hesitate to ask any staff at the event for assistance
- Provide additional demonstrations/props to promote written materials/posters, as the computer graphics, ant farm, core samples, radiation yardstick, etc., encouraged the public to ask questions that lead to a better understanding of the subject
- Include information on travel reimbursement for potential Members at the NSSAB display

Members of the Board in attendance at the Groundwater Open House felt that the level of technical information on the posters/displays was appropriate for the public in attendance and that the correct subject matter experts were available.
The NSSAB appreciates the opportunity for representatives of the Board to attend and observe the Groundwater Open House and we hope that these recommendations will be beneficial as DOE moves forward in planning for future public outreach events.

Sincerely,

Kathleen L. Bienenstein, Chair

cc: D. A. Borak, DOE/HQ (EM-3.2) FORS  
M. R. Hudson, DOE/HQ (EM-3.2) FORS  
R. F. Boehlecke, EMO, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV  
S. A. Wade, AMEM, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV  
W. R. Wilborn, EMO, NNSA/NFO, Las Vegas, NV  
B. K. Ulmer, N-I, Las Vegas, NV  
NSSAB Members and Liaisons
RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATION REGARDING GROUNDWATER OPEN HOUSE (FISCAL YEAR 2014 WORK PLAN ITEM #4)

The Nevada Field Office (NFO) greatly appreciates the Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board’s (NSSAB) participation in and recommendation regarding the NFO’s Groundwater Open House that took place in December 2013. The NSSAB’s presence at the event created an important awareness of your community involvement in the Environmental Management Program.

Below are the Board’s recommendations and the NFO’s responses.

NSSAB Recommendation: Hold Open House during hours when people are off work and not during the dinner hour
NFO Response: This recommendation will be considered during the planning of future events. In the past when determining the time of outreach events, we typically contact community offices to understand what other events are taking place in the area and what time residents typically prefer to attend outreach events. Historically, we have been told that events need to start no later than 5:00 p.m. Additionally, our experience has shown that outreach events are typically well attended up until 7:00 p.m.

NSSAB Recommendation: Hold Open Houses on a weekend to increase attendance
NFO Response: This recommendation will be considered during the planning of future events.

NSSAB Recommendation: Provide refreshments and/or inexpensive giveaways to entice people to attend and include in the promotional materials
NFO Response: Per Federal Appropriations Law, appropriated funds may not be used for personal gifts or refreshments unless there is specific statutory authority, or an agency can prove the expense is necessary under the Necessary Expense Doctrine. Although providing refreshments and/or inexpensive giveaways are desirable, they are not considered a necessary expense in the context of appropriations availability.

NSSAB Recommendation: Provide an additional poster at the entrance informing the public that if additional information is needed; do not hesitate to ask any staff at the event for assistance
NFO Response: This recommendation will be implemented at future events.
NSSAB Recommendation: Provide additional demonstrations/props to promote written materials/posters, as the computer graphics, ant farm, core samples, radiation yardstick, etc., encouraged the public to ask questions that lead to a better understanding of the subject.

NFO Response: This recommendation will be implemented at future events.

NSSAB Recommendation: Include information on travel reimbursement for potential Members at the NSSAB display.

NFO Response: This recommendation will be implemented at future events. Additionally, this information was included in advertising material during the recent NSSAB membership drive.

Thank you again for your participation and feedback on the Groundwater Open House. We look forward to the Board’s continued participation in future outreach events. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (702) 295-2836.

Kelly K. Snyder
Deputy Designated Federal Officer

cc via e-mail:
D. A. Borak, DOE/HQ
M. R. Hudson, DOE/HQ
B. K. Ulmer, N-I
NSSAB Members and Liaisons
NSTec Correspondence Control
C. G. Lockwood, NFO
B. R. Wilborn, NFO
NNSA/NFO Read File
March 19, 2014

Mr. Scott Wade  
Assistant Manager for Environmental Management  
U.S. Department of Energy, Nevada Field Office  
P. O. Box 98518  
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518

SUBJECT: Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB)  
Recommendation for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Baseline Prioritization—Work Plan Item #6

Dear Mr. Wade:

The NSSAB has completed its annual review and prioritization of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Nevada Field Office Environmental Management (EM) activities for the FY 2016 budget submittal.

At the March 19 Full Board meeting, the NSSAB was provided a list of EM activities and was asked by DOE to prioritize them by related groupings. The items listed below were ranked by the Board from the highest to the lowest priority, as follows:

1. Area 5 Radioactive Waste Management Disposal Operations
2. Pahute Mesa Geologic, Hydrologic, and Flow & Transport Analysis and Evaluation
3. Pahute Mesa Aquifer Tests
4. UGTA Annual Sampling Activities
5. Soils Studies
6. Off-Site Soils—Two Corrective Action Units (CAUs) (tie)
6. NNSS Soils—Three CAUs (tie)
7. Frenchman Flat Groundwater Characterization Closure Activities
8. Yucca Flat

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the annual budget prioritization and for the assistance provided by the EM staff. The federal staff took the
time to meet with the NSSAB and provided detailed information. We sincerely appreciate this support and look forward to your response regarding this year’s budget submittal.

Sincerely,

Kathleen L. Bienenstein, Chair

c:  D. A. Borak, DOE/HQ (EM-3.2) FORS
    M. R. Hudson, DOE/HQ (EM-3.2) FORS
    R. F. Boehlecke, EMO, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
    J. T. Carilli, EMO, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
    C. G. Lockwood, EMOS, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
    T. A. Lantow, EMO, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
    K. K. Snyder, EMOS, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
    W. R. Wilborn, EMO, NNSA/NSO, Las Vegas, NV
    B. K. Ulmer, N-I, Las Vegas, NV
    NSSAB Members and Liaisons
RESPONSE TO THE NEVADA SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD (NSSAB) FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2016 BASELINE PRIORITIZATION RECOMMENDATION – WORK PLAN ITEM #6

On behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Nevada Field Office, I would like to personally thank the NSSAB for discussing and evaluating the Environmental Management (EM) tasks included in the FY 2016 baseline. The NSSAB's baseline prioritization continues to be important to the Nevada Field Office as well as the entire EM program, as it is a significant component in developing our budget recommendations to DOE/EM Headquarters.

Additionally, I would like to thank the NSSAB for the dialogue during the March 19, 2014, Full Board meeting on this Work Plan item. The detailed discussion allows my staff to understand the board's perspectives and insights on the baseline prioritization, and the written comments provided by the Board will be utilized in future planning.

Again, thank you for the time the NSSAB devoted to the FY 2016 baseline prioritization process. We value the NSSAB's input and my staff will utilize the Board's feedback when making baseline decisions for the Office of Environmental Management into the future.

Please direct comments and questions to Kelly K. Snyder at (702) 295-2836.

Scott A. Wade
Assistant Manager
for Environmental Management