

NUCLEAR ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
Gressette Building, Room # 209
January 12, 2017
1:00 – 4:00

Call to Order – Approval of Minutes Karen Patterson

Attendees: Claude Cross, Carolyn Hudson, James Little, Karen Patterson, Vincent Van Brunt, and Tom Young

It was noted the October 13, 2016 minutes are approved.

Ms. Patterson: In October we had asked NNSA to come and talk about the MOX project. They declined for a variety of reasons. They gave Senator Tom Young and me the opportunity to talk with Pete Hanlon on the telephone. Some of the items included:

Both for the MOX and the alternative plutonium disposal plan they are operating under FY 2016 dollars, so the MOX program is going the way it has been going on for three or four years. They have enough funds in the alternative to MOX for plutonium disposal to do planning and get through critical design 1 with the funding they have from last year. Mr. Hanlon's comment from October when we talked was they didn't think it would slow down. Now my understanding is we may never get a budget this year so I don't know how that will affect anybody's money moving forward.

Senator Young: Mr. Hanlon mentioned the Department's position may change with the new Administration.

Senator Young: I want to recognize Representative Robert Williams a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives who is in here with us along with Senator Rex Rice and Representative Sylleste Davis. I want to thank them for being here.

Ms. Patterson: I want to second that, thank you for attending.

South Carolina Nuclear Education Update, Rick McLeod, Executive Director, SRSCRO; and Mindy Mets, NWI Program Manager, SRSCRO
(Slides available here <http://admin.sc.gov/node/1543>)

Question from Council:

Mr. Little: This is really interesting to me because I have spent a lot of time in Aiken. One of the things that strike me is the ability to retain people. Aiken is a small town and it is so site specific with the

Savannah River Site. When I was doing this, one of the obstacles we faced was educating the general public about how big and how vibrant the nuclear industry actually was. I am the Chairman of The Carolinas' Nuclear Cluster and we did a study conducted by Clemson University. They found North Carolina and South Carolina hired over 25,000 people in the nuclear industry with salaries totaling over two million dollars and an economic benefit of over twenty billion dollars. Most people don't know how big the nuclear industry is. They tend to focus local whether it is the Catawba Nuclear Station, Oconee or the Savannah River Site; they don't really see the extent of that. So any ability you have to paint that broader picture really helps people see that their life is not going to end or start in Aiken. It may go somewhere else or it may stay there; but, it is pretty vibrant so any thing you can do to broaden that picture really wakes a lot of people up and they may say wait a minute this is a pretty good career path for me or my children to take on.

Mr. McLeod: And all of that is basically on the RAD Team program that Dr. Susan Winsor started. Bartlett Nuclear, Inc. hired several of them right out of school. Bartlett Nuclear, Inc. is a world-wide company providing lab Techs so those folks have a wealth of opportunity there for them.

Mr. Little: I was actually the one that introduced Bartlett Nuclear, Inc. to Dr. Susan Winsor when I was in Aiken and then the facilities in Savannah River calibration laboratories really took off. You have got some real gems there in Aiken Tech. At USC Aiken we are looking at it and it never quite took off, having advanced degree programs taught in science and engineer at USC Aiken. So you probably have the highest concentration of very smart, really engaged, retirees that could be adjunct professors in Aiken and teach some amazing things to folks in Aiken in continuing education. One year I hired one hundred college graduates in Aiken. I had two challenges. The first challenge was entertaining them and the second thing was retaining them. Getting them to stay – they ask what's in it for me. I didn't want them to leave after we invested all this time and effort in them and they wanted to know how they could advance their careers. Some of their skills will be lost with time; the nuclear chemistry, those sciences and technology. Not everyone takes these courses in undergraduate school anymore and it is learned on the job. It's understandable that colleges focus on management but there is not a lot of science and technology at USC Aiken so they say they will do distant learning. But getting someone to stay is like a contact sport so anything you can do to encourage USC Aiken to build that adjunct kind of local college degree program.

Mr. McLeod: That is the program you may want to have Dr. Sandra Jordan, Chancellor, University of South Carolina Aiken come and discuss. She has started an undergraduate engineering program at USC Aiken. It is a stand-alone program so last count I think she had about 200 folks go through that program and I think approximately 25 enrolled the first semester of that program.

Mr. Little: And then you could encourage the employers and some of the agencies whose initials are DOE to start supporting some of that continuing education for employees or potential employees or interns.

Ms. Mets: The seeds you have planted have taken form in other ways as well because I know that the Center for Lifelong Learning is associated with USC Aiken. They will soon be holding some courses there and some folks from Savannah River Site are going to be teaching so the community can better understand Savannah River Site as well. So that is being coordinated through Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness (CNTA).

Mr. McLeod: Another aspect and I don't know if Jack Craig has the numbers or maybe the contractors do. I know from church life and others we are seeing second generation folks coming back to Aiken to potentially work at the site or they grew up around the site and have come back as a dentist or whatever. We are seeing a lot of that which is somewhat surprising. Maybe they get out and have kids and realize Mayberry might not be so bad after all.

Captain Cross: I talk with young sailors that return to their ROTC units to get them interested in the nuclear field. If you are hiring all these new people they look like they might be your best ambassadors. You could have them go out and take someone in their mid-twenties that has a job now in the nuclear field. They could go back to these high schools and talk to the students and tell them about what they are doing, how they got ready for it and how it might be worthwhile.

Ms. Mets: Our employers at SRS are eager to do that at times and so we are able to create the platform for doing that. This is one of the things we work really hard to do during Nuclear Science Week in particular. This is something we will definitely take to heart what you are saying.

Captain Cross: This has been very successful in other areas I know.

Ms. Patterson: Of those thirty-seven thousand workers we are going to need; do you have a breakdown of how many would be certificates or two year degrees versus four or more years?

Mr. McLeod: It is in the report.

Ms. Mets: It is, but a large percentage of them are not the four year degrees.

Ms. Patterson: I know you are the SRSCRO and it's the nuclear workforce initiative but when you talk about cyber and medical I can see where the Savannah River Site, the milieu that Aiken County is in that those would also be good career opportunities; are you going to expand your program to include those kinds of things too?

Mr. McLeod: We have. Think about with the Cyber Command, they are moving to Fort Gordon, GA. They are projecting four or five thousand workers not necessary family members coming in to the Augusta area. I mentioned a third of the Savannah River Site workers work at the Savannah River Site and live in Georgia. Even if we get a half of the third there will be some spillover on the South Carolina side from the Cyber Command type of work.

Ms. Patterson: So you are adding programs that will be appropriate.

Ms. Mets: So we retained our nuclear workforce initiative as we are discussing it here but in addition to that we do other work associated with the workforce as a whole related to manufacturing and such. There definitely is an overlap as I just mentioned you can see that from how students are going but we still keep that nuclear workforce initiative identity as well.

Mr. McLeod: At the roll-out of the report you are referencing we asked folks that attended across the four industry sectors what type of stuff do they want to see? There was a gap they said between the educators and the employers. The educators do not understand. Manufacturing has a similar nuclear misconception, it's dirty, it's not a nice place to work; but, that's a misconception compared to what you normally see in a modern manufacturing plant today. So they had similar misconceptions and they are saying we need to somehow connect the educators with the actual employer so they better understand the jobs and the industry overall. We are working on potentially hosting our first connection forum. It will be manufacturers and educators because we have done so much on the workforce initiative side. We are looking at a broader workforce mainly in those four industry sectors.

Ms. Mets: And the nuclear industry is really heading in that way in a lot of realms and are used to working together and other industry aren't as familiar with that. That is what we are trying to help create in that platform so they can.

Ms. Patterson: You have a great program that you can demonstrate success and I am thinking about how we need to find jobs for people who have lost their jobs. Has anybody come to you or do you know of any programs that are modeled after yours or are similar to yours in other parts of the country? It seems like such a great thing to do if you just put it together.

Mr. McLeod: A lot of what we have accomplished has been supported by DOE and Jack Craig is one of the reasons we have got where we have gotten so far. The initial grant had two other communities that got similar grants at the same time frame and about the same dollar level, five million dollars over five years. One was in the Hanford community and one was in northern New Mexico. We were able, and then again give Jack Craig credit for doing this, to go into the next phase that the other two communities were not. The initial grant was funded under a broad DOE headquarters pot of money. The next phase, the work grant you are seeing that Mindy Mets talked about is actually being funded by Jack Craig and Doug Dearolph at the local level. So we are seeing about a 60%/40% split. EM is putting in the 60% and NNSA putting in the 40%. They see the value of the program locally and that's really where that funding is coming from for that portion of the grant. Now the other Nuclear Workforce Initiative activities some folks get Nuclear Workforce Initiative just bought into the grant. The grants are really subsets of Nuclear Workforce Initiatives. You saw Mindy Mets go through several of the activities that are supported by the Community Reuse Organization (CRO).

Ms. Mets: We get calls frequently and work to share the information about how we do what we do and it's really about building those partnerships and helping create the platform to make it happen and tending that along the way. I think that's where the CRO is in a unique position because of the organization we are able to do that and that's something we work to share. We attend multiple conferences every year to help continue that communication.

Mr. McLeod: We are going to be at 2017 Waste Management Symposia this year and Mindy Mets will be presenting a similar talk on that. One of the big keys is our success in getting the five universities working together. Much less two from the same state, but we have two from out of the state and three from in the state, three universities and two Tech schools early on. When the money came available Dr. Trayhey said: we will give you the money but we better not hear any back biting, any fighting, you divide it up. We were successful in the programs that the schools started because they were not competitive. Each one picked out a niche and they were successful in setting up those niches and that collaboration has extended through the next programs. When you say set it up the skeleton is there. But how it all works together is rather unique in getting those five schools working together. Their close proximity helped us as well.

Ms. Patterson: You seemed to have worked out the kinks and have lots of lessons learned and there are places in this country Michigan, Portsmouth and Paducah; there are all kinds of places if they would just have somebody lead it like you guys are. I think this is something that we shouldn't keep to ourselves.

Mr. McLeod: Paducah has been down as a matter of fact and talked with Dr. Winsor at the time and actually mirrored a RAD tech program up in Paducah. We haven't stayed in contact, they didn't work through us – they work through her. I have talked with Dr. Forrest Mahan, Aiken Technical College President, and I am sure he is aware of what has happened with that program since they have copied it.

Ms. Mets: We share a lot of information about it but do not follow it through while they are using it.

Ms. Patterson: I think you should just give them the platform and give them the skeleton. It has got to be a local effort.

Ms. Mets: Yes and it takes someone tending it at that persistence and people seeing to value it long term.

Ms. Patterson: And that is what you can show them. Thank you. Are there any more questions?

Ms. Mets: Thank you.

SCDHEC Update, Shelly Wilson, DHEC, SRS Federal Facilities

No Slides Used

Question from Council:

Mr. Little: How is this new commitment backstopped? We have these penalties, up to twenty-seven million dollars of penalties, obviously moved aside yet we are committed to spend 22 million dollars. As you know, Congress has to appropriate the money and we saw how DOE is kind of in the middle only with what Congress gave us. It was OMB telling them what you were going to ask for; so how are you going to be sure there is enough money to meet this FY20/22 milestone?

Ms. Wilson: If DOE does not meet the commitments in this agreement then we go back and try to collect that almost two hundred million dollars in penalties and the penalties can continue to grow. So we would collect that plus whatever new has accrued in the interim.

Mr. Little: Yes because in eight more days we have a new guy who is going into the Whitehouse. The new OMB is currently my Congressman who is Mr. Budget Cutter, loves shutting down the government, less is more to him, so how are you going to ensure we are going to get the money they need this two-hundred million dollars extra. We have been running at half capacity at Savannah River right now because of money reasons and not technology limitations. It obviously effects tank closure dates. It's not only the two-hundred million dollars; you have got to restore WIPP to full capacity so how do we know this isn't a promise like I am sorry I can only do what Congress does.

Ms. Patterson: In five years with no budget for this year.

Ms. Wilson: If you know anyone that has had success in collecting penalties from the Federal government I would like to know who they are. It's a common problem.

Mr. Little: All too common.

Ms. Wilson: Instead of citing it out what we feel we have gotten is an agreement to move forward with treatment that's good for South Carolina and granted if they miss a milestone we are back to that central question. But at least the money today the site is getting is going toward treatment.

Mr. Little: But are there intermediate milestones, it's not going to be it FY 20/21. Let's check to see how we are going to do if we owe the money or not.

Ms. Wilson: Every year has a treatment gallon milestone. So yes intermediate 2016 had an amount per gallon treated, 2017, 2018 each year has an intermediate amount of gallons that have to be treated.

Ms. Patterson: So Jack, how high up is this commitment. Is this a Savannah River Site commitment?

Mr. Jack Craig: It is pretty much a Secretary commitment.

Ms. Patterson: Approved by the Secretary. I have never told DOE how to do something, I have always told them what I want them to do. Are you thinking about a strategic plan to sort of make our new Administration understand that we really need this to happen?

Mr. Craig: I can talk about that a little when I get up to do my presentation – I do have a budget discussion. Now that is a challenge, the transition is still kind of murky. I am not sure who you would lobby at this point. Collectively we need to figure that out.

Ms. Patterson: This is great news and I am typically an optimist but I have been living with DOE for too long to think this has a chance.

Mr. Little: In all fairness, I have known Jack Craig for a long time and it's not all DOE's fault all the time.

Ms. Patterson: I am not blaming DOE, I am just saying these sounds wonderful and I will be jubilant if this happens.

Mr. Little: In all fairness to DOE, I would not like your job.

Ms. Wilson: I feel much better about DOE getting money to treat and reduce risks. Even right now given the uncertainty with the new Administration than I do about DOE getting money to pay the penalty and then have to go and treat again. If you look at New Mexico for example they did something similar recently having a lot of penalty money instead of collecting it using it toward environmental benefit.

Ms. Patterson: Thank you Shelly, other questions. I was remiss; Dave Eyer has brought his SRNS mentoring group up here, I am so glad to have you. I think it is good to have people that work at the site get to understand a lot about why the site exists and because of you and because we have some new legislators here I thought I would take just a minute to actually talk about what the South Carolina Nuclear Advisory Council is and does. We were organized by statute by Governor Jim Hodges in early 2000 because of the plutonium coming to the site. So there has to be a council. The makeup of the council as part of the statute includes: two Environmental Appointments (Ms. Karen Patterson and Dr. Dr. Carolyn Hudson), a Nuclear Industry Appointment (Mr. James Little), a Nuclear Power Appointment (Mr. Steve Byrne), two Academics Appointments (Dr. Vincent Van Brunt and Dr. David Peterson), an At-Large appointment (Captain Claude Cross), a Senate Appointment (Senator Tom Young) and a House Appointment (currently vacant). We spent a lot of time on the Savannah River Site because that is a big part of the nuclear industry in this state but as you know we have seven reactors and two under construction. We have a Westinghouse fuel facility; we have the Atlantic Compact (Atlantic Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Management Compact) which is a disposal facility for low level waste from three states (South Carolina, Connecticut and New Jersey). Those are the facilities we look at. The topics we typically focus on workforce and money always. I am very glad to have you here. We need a House

Representative who sits up here with us so if one of our new representatives is interested we would love to have you join us.

SRNL Update, Dr. Terry Michalske, Laboratory Director, Savannah River National
(Slides available here <http://admin.sc.gov/node/1543>)

Question from Council:

Dr. Michalske: The only thing we are missing now is that place that everybody goes to do this work (bridging the gap between Technology and Implementation). The Department of Energy's plan for making this connection of advanced manufacturing to the EM mission and it's what we call Advanced Manufacturing Collaborative. And it's collaborative in the sense that it's going to be located off the Savannah River Site reservation so that it is assessable to university and industry players. We put out a request for this and a really competent team bid and won on this. We have been working with the Department of Energy. Their proposal is to locate this on the campus of the University of South Carolina Aiken.

Ms. Patterson: On the baseball field?

Dr. Michalske: It's actually just a little bit North of the softball field.

Ms. Patterson: How much of this national manufacturing can the RAPID Institute do without a building or a consolidated place for them?

Dr. Michalske: Let me give you an example. Oak Ridge National Laboratory a couple of years ago won one of these for composite material manufacturing. They worked with the state and they got a building. Since then the chief technical officer of Boeing has moved to Knoxville, TN. They have major companies moving into the state because there is a place that they can see, they can be part of, and they can identify with. I think we can do a lot of the work without it but we won't get branded in the way we need in order for this to be successful. We really need the help of the state to make sure this gets the attention that it needs and just doesn't get hung up here and it move forward quickly. DOE has fully approved this. This is not a DOE thing it is an OMB discussion.

Ms. Patterson: I was at the 2016 National EM Cleanup Workshop in September. Rodrigo "Rod" Rimando, Director, Technology Development Office, Office of Environmental Management, U.S. Department of Energy, showed us a video of the advances in manufacturing and robotics, it was incredible. I am one of those who think factories are dirty and people are getting hurt all the time. I was so impressed with that. It is really a good thing.

Dr. Michalske: There is a lot to be gained and it's not the pie in the sky research. This is what is going on in industry today.

Ms. Patterson: It's not that complicated. It's like gloves that make it easier for you to pick stuff up.

Dr. Michalske: Translating it to the nuclear environment requires some work. That's what we want to make sure we are available to do. Working with Rod last fall we had forty experts from around the world in robotics come to look at what we do. They have a lot of wonderful ideas but they have never worked in a nuclear environment. Bring those two worlds together is what we can do in this collaborative. You are right, it's exciting. It's not hard to imagine where all these science advances can happen.

Ms. Patterson: I will talk with you about what we can do to help you.

Dr. Michalske: Thank you.

Mr. Craig: We really see the value of the laboratory in the Savannah River Site mission. In the broader sense we want to make the lab grow to support the whole complex and other customers. One of the things we have done over the last six months is we saw a need to do something different contractually with the laboratory so we agreed with SRNS to break the lab out as a separate business unit under the M&O contract. So if you could spend a couple of minutes talking about the advantages of that as something fairly new. We believe it will help the lab to be more independent and maybe help grow. So you may want to take a few seconds to talk about that.

Dr. Michalske: It is part of a broader initiative in DOE to better define how labs are operated and governed. In particular having the lab as a technical resource for the whole complex and not limited to just the site. Having the lab as a separate unit makes it much cleaner in how we interact and work with contractors and site leadership around the entire complex. It also helps to streamline and prioritize the business of a lab versus the business of a cleanup operation. We hire a lot of PhDs, we hire a different kind of staff, and we are involved in many contracts with companies and universities in our collaborative work. We are managing the business of those joint partnerships. These are just a number of things where it gives us the latitude to design our systems and determining what are the priorities for being a successful national laboratory. These are already paying dividends in our hiring and how well we are actually procuring some of these new partnerships and contracts. It's a very big step for the laboratory and we really appreciate DOE and recognizing this needs to be a national lab and a lab for the entire national endeavor and not only the site, but obviously a big part is the site. This new governance in business system really is an important step in recognizing that and empowering the laboratory and SRNS to operate the laboratory in a way that is more cost effective and efficient.

Mr. Little: I think it is an excellent idea. Jack Craig and I were talking at break about that. It can work in tune to the nature of securing the position as opposed to a procurement system that's buying

commodities and selling PhDs in a joint R&D program and who is going to take this today. Having someone say I will take it, I have never done this before.

Dr. Michalske: Now we do buy commodities too so we can lean on them when we need to do that. The nice thing is we can really focus on the things that are different for a lab.

Mr. Little: Now when are you going to be fully set up, I saw the strategic plan had this in it. When will you be a separate business unit? Now or is it Spring?

Dr. Michalske: We are now. We started in October.

Mr. Craig: I would add this is in addition to what we have done here locally. The EM program at the headquarters level went through reorganization over the last year and they have established their laboratory policy office for EM. The advantage to that we see is a greater focus at the headquarters level on the lab here. As Terry and his staff and others may still do this constantly going out and looking for opportunities for technology and development. You have from a headquarters level looking across the department and looking at opportunities to bring to the lab. We are working them both ways now and that can be helpful.

Mr. Little: A little bit more visibility and leverage there.

Mr. Craig: Right.

Ms. Patterson: So are the labs under one DOE office looking for work for the various labs?

Mr. Craig: EM only has one lab. And the EM lab program is the focus on SRNL.

Ms. Patterson: So this is a reorganization of EM.

Mr. Craig: At the headquarters, that is correct.

Mr. Little: This give you a little more leverage.

Mr. Craig: Naturally if Oak Ridge has an environmental problem we will go to the Oak Ridge National Lab and that is just naturally how it works. Terry has a large presence now out at Richland doing a lot of work for WTP and others.

Dr. Michalske: We opened an office so we actually have a permanent facility there now.

Mr. Little: That is an excellent idea.

Dr. Michalske: To speak to the other labs at the same time we did this when we formed a lab network group that we lead. It brings in the four other labs that really have a major footprint Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Idaho National Laboratory, and Los Alamos National Laboratory that live on clean-up sites themselves. The goal here is not for our lab to do everything but we make sure that what's in the whole lab complex is available to the EM program. There is a lot of neat expertise out there that you won't see just doing these one-on-one discussions.

Dr. Van Brunt: Do you have a matrix of individuals in each of the labs that can focus on individual problems or have you concentrated that at one lab versus another?

Dr. Michalske: What we do across those labs is we have a matrix to what their capabilities are. Not so much the individuals but a lot of the capabilities comes down to individual people. For example, if we are looking at modeling groundwater that is going to be in the wheelhouse of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. So we can work in those ways that will allow us to use what each lab does best.

Dr. Van Brunt: Thank you.

Ms. Patterson: Thank you Terry.

SRS FY-16 Accomplishments and FY-17 Budget Update, Jack Craig, Manager, DOE-Savannah River
(Slides available here <http://admin.sc.gov/node/1543>)

Question from Council:

Ms. Patterson: Why can't you double stack the containers of vitrified high level waste?

Mr. Craig: There are a couple of reasons. One is it is a different construction of facility that was a passive ventilation facility, there was an active in one and part of this has to do with heat loading of the canisters. The canisters in building two have a higher heat loading than building one.

Mr. Little: (Referring to the reprogramming of funds shown on slide 8, items 15-D-402 and 05-D-405). Is the reason you have to go back to Congress because the appropriation kind of kept these line items separate?

Mr. Craig: Yes. Anytime we move more than five million dollars between these PBSs it requires congressional approval. We have authority within the department to move up to five million dollars which we did in parallel with this we moved five million dollars into liquid waste that continued some work there. Anything over that requires congressional approval.

Mr. Little: Is there logic for how you spread the money?

Mr. Craig: There is logic. We have a lot of activities in the liquid waste program now to modify the entire tank farm system to connect the Salt Waste Processing Facility (SWPF). That is the focus. SWPF operation is the big key to this whole program acceleration. So you are right, we made the decision to reduce canister production in FY 2016, FY 2017 and FY 2018 because we had to divert those resources to change the whole configuration of the system to focus on SWPF. SWPF once operational and gets to design capacity will increase our high level waste treatment four to five fold a year. We believe this is the critical path of getting the tanks closed quicker and getting more high level waste treated.

Mr. Little: I think it would be wise to create the graphic that shows when SWPF comes on line and how that acceleration really occurs because I don't think most people know that. They look at this is Congress; we only get 100 canisters and so none for you. It's a redirection of things. I think articulating that graphic showing basically we are re-plumbing the system here. I need to know with or without SWPF on a chart and how it accelerates that piece.

Ms. Patterson: If we don't get the forty million dollars you want to reprogram does that put the SWPF startup in jeopardy?

Mr. Craig: It does. I delays it at least a year and the reason for the delay is part of our one-hundred and eleven million dollars are increases that we requested in FY 2017 that were additional projects we had to do in the liquid waste program to tie into the SWPF program. If we can't do those projects we can't maintain the critical path of that project.

Mr. Little: If you had the money you might not have the workforce to do it.

Mr. Craig: A lot of that workforce is project construction trade. We will have some workforce impact in the liquid waste program of our Savannah River remediation employees not as significant as it would be in SRNS.

Mr. Little: It's like the construction projects I was on; when you tone them down at the workforce leads it's very hard to get those same people back. When you have a nuclear plant right across the river that pays good and it's going to start filling up then getting them back and trained, recalibrated and some people have never worked on a DOE sight. When you lose them it's very hard to get them to come back tomorrow.

Mr. Craig: If you have a workforce reduction, the chances of getting those workers back is not very good.

Mr. Little: They say well Congress didn't appropriate the money you are all gone. They would rather work a commercial project.

Mr. Craig: So if we get the reprogram approved we are in good shape; we are still not at the one-hundred and eleven million dollars level increase we wanted. We are essentially at a sixty-nine million dollar increase over our FY 2016 number.

Mr. Little: That reprogram is a key for you.

Mr. Craig: Yes. We started talking about this with the Hill in August because we knew the potential of a continuing resolution. So we have been looking at what we could do since August. I think we have done a lot of really good homework with them. They understand the need, we are not taking money from another site to do this, it's all a kind of reappropriation within our site and the beauty is we don't need those sixty-one million dollars on these construction projects because they are done. It really shouldn't be controversial it's just getting it through the system.

Ms. Patterson: So would we still do 100 canisters this year?

Mr. Craig: Yes, I think our goal is just over 100.

Dr. Van Brunt: Do you see any impact in change of contractor?

Mr. Craig: We don't plan on it so I didn't mention that. We do have two large contracting actions beginning. One action is right in the middle of the liquid waste contract which is a Savannah River Remediation contract. That contract expires in June of this year 2017. We began procurement of that and our RFP went out last Spring I think or early summer. We are on track to make that award we hope about the April timeframe and that will give them about a 90 day transition period. We will do a lot of partnering with the new contract. Hopefully they will hit the ground running. The SRNS contract expires about a year from that in July 2018. We are just beginning the planning for that. We will probably issue an RFP sometime in the spring for that and it's almost a year behind that. There will be some transition period for that too.

Captain Cross: What's the current status of WIPP, are they receiving new shipments now?

Mr. Craig: They are not receiving new shipments. Last Friday as I believe they disposed of their first 24 drums of Savannah River material that was disposed of last Friday. That was their first operation in about three years. They are not going to be receiving any new waste until they dispose of the waste they have sitting there today. I think they have about six weeks of material sitting there that they have to dispose to make way for other people to ship there and they have some other material on site they will have to accept. We don't have a definitive date yet. We believe we could begin shipping in the early April timeframe. We will know more after I am out there in a couple of weeks.

Ms. Patterson: I am always amazed at how optimistic you can stay. Thank you and good luck.

Public Comments, Tom Clements, Director, Savannah River Site Watch

No Slides Used

Mr. Clements: Good afternoon, Tom Clements, with Savannah River Site Watch. I thought it was interesting Karen mentioned DOE or NNSA for whatever reason wouldn't come to discuss the MOX project and you had a telephone conversation. Unfortunately that is really no surprise because they don't like to talk about what's going on with the project in public. I would encourage you to continue asking them to give you a real presentation. Some of the ones we have had in the past have been so cursory as not to be informative. But I just want to fill you on a little bit of what I know.

Ms. Patterson: I just want to respond to that. Pete Hanlon has agreed to come in April or July; I am the hold up because as far I am concerned until they make some decisions and we have some path there is no point in them spinning their wheels down here with us. So it's not NNSA it is me saying when you have something definitive to say come tell us. Pete Hanlon is more than willing to come.

Mr. Clements: I know he was here back maybe a year ago about the German waste import or some other stuff, blend down maybe. It was mentioned that there may be a change in the program with a change in the political situation with a change in the new Administration. That may certainly be the case since it's up in the air. I cannot see that there can be a change in the program. The Obama Administration had tried to shut it down and I think there are insurmountable problems I mentioned to you many times before. I can't see how circumstances will change related to design and construction problems. Now the politics could change but that's not in my opinion going to impact the design and construction problems. The funding profile could change. We know it is now three-hundred and forty million dollars a year which I regard as keeping the project on an eventual shut down track. It needs two to three times that more as you know per year to make it viable. So it's hanging on by a thread. So I think the first thing we should be looking for is going to get a budget increase, but I still don't think that's going to be enough to straighten out the design and construction problems. And on the construction issue I understand and I am aware that the HVAC contractor Superior Air Handling is probably going to be off the job. CBNI may have taken over some of this work. There is an RFP out for work just last week to take on more of the HVAC work. I understand CBNI has set up a classification system to address the rework. What they can do I guess easily, what needs more work and how it's going to be built the way I understand it. Where is the public information on this; is my big concern. Is that because of Superior Air's mishandling of a lot of the work which has impacted subsequent work from the other trades. Some of the charges for the rework are going to have to go back to Superior Air and they may not be on the project anymore. So it's very confusing on what's going on. NNSA won't answer or there very cursory questions. CBNI will not answer what's going on with the project. This is not stuff we are waiting on to find out what's happening under the new Administration; it is what's happening now and they will not really say what is going on. You may be aware there are two fraud cases going on the MOX project in federal court. One is involving rebar that did not meet quality standards. It's a false claim act in the North Georgia federal court. I saw that the next filings have been delayed until the end of March for the final one by the federal government who has joined the false claims act case with the complainant. The other one is a case brought here in South Carolina by the

federal attorney for fraudulent receipts submitted for some equipment by two individuals. That's also been postponed to the new court period starting I think in March maybe. So those are both proceeding and we know the State of South Carolina has a case because of the failure of the MOX project to start operating and start removing materials. I am not aware of other legal proceedings. I fully expect we will have more fraud case that could come out. I can't say more but I am aware some analyses going on along those route and part of it might be focused on Superior Air Handling and my interpretation that they seriously botched the HVAC work at the project. But I think as I have said I think that the particularly construction problems are going to drag construction out and DOE itself is set to 2048. The people I talk to don't think it can really be finished. But where are we with this project? The change in politics is not going to change some of these on the ground facts. So I am continually supportive of a GAO investigation and investigations by Congress. Those need to be defined and gotten underway. I am not aware if anything is happening right now GAO has told me they are monitoring the situation but they need to have a formal request that defines their project. And just two more items. Related to the MOX project you are probably aware that NNSA released its award fee determinations. I think they posted it on line last week for NNSA projects operations at various sites. They did not post the MOX award fee determination and like every year I filed a Freedom of Information Act Request for it back in December. I got an initial response back saying they are processing the request. We need to see what NNSA's determination is on the contractor CBNI MOX Services Performance and the MOX project. It should have been posted on line last week. I just don't know what they have to hide with this project and why so much of it is obscure. I filed a Freedom of Information Act Request on the plutonium down blend issue on the CD-0 construction decision document which would be the determination if they expand the down blending operations at the Savannah River Site from just the single glove box they have now. I would encourage you Karen in your interaction with NNSA and DOE to ask for the award fee for MOX and for the CD-0 determination and other than that please keep requesting that NNSA come and give that presentation. It sounds like we might get it once the smoke clears. Thank you.

Ms. Patterson: Any other public comments? Hearing none, I thank you very much for coming.

The next meeting of the Nuclear Advisory Council will be held on April 13, 2017.

Meeting adjourned