Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board (NSSAB)

Full Board Meeting

Bob Ruud Community Center
150 North Highway 160, Pahrump, NV 89060
5:00 p.m. – August 21, 2013

Members Present:	Jason Abel, Kathleen Bienenstein (Chair), Matthew Clapp, Thomas Fisher, Arthur Goldsmith, Donna Hruska (Vice-Chair), Cheryl Kastelic, Janice Keiserman, Michael Moore, Edward Rosemark, William Sears, Jack Sypolt
Members Absent:	Barry LiMarzi
Liaisons Present:	Richard Arnold (Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations [CGTO]), Ralph Keyes (Esmeralda County Commission), Phil Klevorick (Clark County), Tim Murphy (State of Nevada Division of Environmental Protection [NDEP]), Genne Nelson (National Park Service [NPS]), Dan Schinhofen (Nye County Commission)
Liaisons Absent:	John Klenke (Nye County Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office [NWRPO]), Mike Lemich (White Pine County Commission), Charlie Myers (Elko County Commission), Kevin Phillips (Lincoln County Commission)
Department of Energy (DOE):	Robert Boehlecke, Linda Cohn, Kathryn Knapp, Darwin Morgan, Kelly Snyder (Deputy Designated Federal Officer), Scott Wade, Bill Wilborn
Facilitator:	Barb Ulmer (Navarro-Intera [N-I])
Scribe:	Rochelle LaGrow (N-I)
Others Present:	Robert Adams (Pahrump, NV), Chris Andres (NDEP), Butch Borasky (Pahrump, NV), Jim Haber (Las Vegas, NV), Carla Jaggar (Las Vegas), Darrell Lacy (Pahrump, NV), Dan McDermott (The Mirror, Pahrump, NV), Sherri McMahon (City of Las Vegas), Amanda Nelson (Congressman Steven Horsford, Fourth District, N. Las Vegas, NV), George Sausman (Pahrump, NV), Holly Woodward (Las Vegas, NV), Michael Voegele (Las Vegas, NV), Michael Zaman (Pahrump, NV)

Open Meeting/Agenda Review/Chair's Opening Remarks

Following opening remarks and agenda review, Member Art Goldsmith moved to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Facilitator Barb Ulmer reviewed the Public Comment procedures.

Robert Adams expressed his concern that U-233 and U-235 is not low-level waste (LLW) and should not be going to a LLW facility. Mr. Adams also stated that he is concerned that the DOE is circumventing nuclear waste protocol by using secure travel routes. The State of Nevada and the applicable counties and communities should be advised first of the intent to travel through their areas and should have a say in establishing safe travel protocols.

U.S. DOE Update *(Scott Wade, Assistant Manager for Environmental Management)*

Scott Wade explained that the Waste Acceptance Criteria (WAC) is utilized by DOE to set the standards and requirements for receipt of LLW at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS). Since 1991, the WAC has undergone 16 updates (10 formal revisions plus administrative change notices) to reflect changes in DOE Orders that set requirements for LLW and changes in operational requirements for the NNSS. There have been concerns that the WAC, Revision 10, dated June 2013, was issued to accommodate Consolidated Edison Uranium Solidification Project (CEUSP) material (U-233 and U-235), which was not the case. Revision 10 of the WAC included the addition of classified matter requirements and increased the plutonium equivalent gram limit from 300 to 12,000 based on DOE's Documented Safety Analysis (DSA) update in the summer 2012. The DSA was conducted for another waste stream (radioisotope thermal generator), not for the CEUSP, to ensure that the packaging could be safely handled, transported and disposed at the NNSS.

Mr. Wade stated that the final Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) was issued in February 2013. The next step is the issuance of the Record of Decision (ROD), the document that publishes DOE's informed decisions based on the SWEIS and used as the basis that DOE will work within during the next decade at the NNSS. The issuance of the ROD is expected by the end of calendar year 2013; the length of this process is not unique to this EIS. There have been concerns raised regarding the changing of transportation shipping routes. There was a request by Nye County and the Attorney General's Office to look at a range of transportation options for the shipment of LLW during the SWEIS process. A review of transportation routes was also completed due to changes in transportation infrastructure in Nevada. The SWEIS satisfied these requests and the final SWEIS documents that no change to current transportation commitments will be made.

In regard to CEUSP, Mr. Wade stated that the Governor of Nevada and the Secretary of Energy have met and through their interactions have decided to form a working group to continue dialogue regarding the potential for CEUSP material shipment to and disposal at the NNSS.

Mr. Wade addressed concerns involving the perception of the lack of public involvement in discussions regarding CEUSP material by stating that DOE has held over 40 discussions with various entities, local and tribal governments, and stakeholders. Future outreach activities in Nye

County are being planned concerning the CEUSP materials, and a groundwater open house is being planned for later this year.

<u>Reports/Discussion/Recommendation: Community Environmental Monitoring Program (CEMP) (Work Plan Item #6)</u> *Chair Bienenstein and Member Michael Moore*

Chair Kathleen Bienenstein and Member Michael Moore attended the CEMP Workshop in Tonopah, Nevada, on July 15-17, 2013. Member Moore provided the following presentation to inform the Board of their observations.

- **NSSAB Work Plan Item #6**
  - CEMP – Provide a recommendation to DOE regarding potential ways the CEMP could be enhanced to ensure it reflects current missions
- **Recap**
  - DOE in the process of defining the future direction of CEMP based on today's mission and operations at the NNSS
  - Kathryn Knapp (DOE) briefed NSSAB regarding the CEMP at its May 15 Full Board meeting
    - Briefing included a list of items for NSSAB members to consider while attending CEMP workshop
- **Funding Profile**

Activities	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Program Management	179K	213K	221K	220K	214K
Monitoring Stations	1,073K	959K	1,050K	1,057K	1,037K
Training Workshop	161K	257K	134K	304K	134K
Website & Data Management	224K	240K	108K	108K	115K
Total Cost	**1,637K**	**1,669K**	**1,513K**	**1,689K**	**1,500K**

- **List of Items Considered During CEMP Workshop**
  1. **Should DOE continue funding the CEMP?**
     - Yes, CEMP provides peace of mind within communities surrounding the NNSS
  2. **Are the proposed ideas for CEMP better aligned with the current National Nuclear Security Administration mission and Environmental Management activities and remediation efforts?**
     - Yes
       - CEMP Groundwater Monitoring:
         - Focus on monitoring down-gradient water at the current CEMP stations at Beatty, Amargosa Valley, and Tecopa
         - Support detection levels of 300 picocuries/liter for tritium
           - If tritium detected, higher sensitivity measurement should be used, if needed
         - Do not support monitoring of water up-gradient of the NNSS as water does not flow uphill

        - Support current annual CEMP testing
    - Air Monitoring:
        - Support current frequency of monitoring
        - Support eliminating air portion of CEMP monitoring stations at Duckwater, Pioche, Caliente, Boulder City, and Milford and Delta, UT
            - For the past 20 years, CEMP air sampling data have indicated no off-site dose representing a public health threat from past or present NNSS activities
            - Other CEMP monitoring stations located in closer proximity of the down-wind path of the NNSS
            - Funding could be redirected and utilized by the CEMP that provides more value to the community and DOE
    - Transportation Routes:
        - Do not support installing additional CEMP stations along radioactive waste transportation routes

3. **Is the cost of the program balanced and funding well spent?**
    - Overall, there is not enough information to make an informed recommendation
4. **Should the DOE continue to monitor even if radioactivity is not detected and activities do not change? If so, how long?**
    - Yes, reevaluate every five years
5. **For stations that equipment is removed/needs replacement, should equipment be replaced with less sensitive/expensive equipment?**
    - Yes, if monitoring equipment needs replacement at active stations, replace with less sensitive/expensive equipment
    - Do not repair or replace weather monitoring equipment at meteorological-only stations at Nyala, Twin Springs, Stone Cabin, and Medlin's Ranch
        - Decommission and use parts for active stations
6. **Is CEMP website user friendly and is the data communicated effectively on the site?**
    - Yes, website is user friendly for its intended functionality
        - Do not support making website less "technical-looking" as it is not DOE's responsibility to provide "pretty" website to provide information
        - Graphical enhancements costly and provide little additional value
        - Development time is better spent on keeping the website up to date
            - News: Are events less than one year?
            - Station and network status: should only show stations that have current issue
                - When a station is repaired, provide a brief update on the nature of the repair and when completed
        - If Quick Response (QR) codes are used, also include human readable text by the image
        - Establish website metrics and get a baseline
7. **Is CEMP brochure understood and is the program effectively communicated?**
    - Yes, but needs updating (i.e., email address, number of stations, etc.)
8. **Should there be term limits for the Community Environmental Monitors (CEMs)?**
    - DOE is considering term limits for CEMs to expose more people to the CEMP

        - Pros:
            - More exposure to different people in the community
            - The CEMP network would increase due to the new person's network being added to the existing
            - Allow for a more active participant if current CEM is low-performing
        - Cons:
            - Loss of expertise
            - Learning curve
            - Lose stability
    9. **Is the level of training, time, and material appropriate?**
        - Based on current setup, it is appropriate
        - If term limits applied, the workshop format and content should be reevaluated
    10. **Should workshop be expanded to include more entities?**
        - Yes!
            - Local officials
            - First responders
            - Teachers
            - NSSAB
- **Additional potential ways the CEMP could be enhanced to ensure program reflects current EM missions:**
    - Establish performance metrics for CEMs
        - Measure communication to public
            - Goal to increase public interest and visitations to CEMP stations
    - Eliminate CEMP station at Boulder City
        - It is inaccessible to the public (located on St. Jude's Ranch for Children)
        - Not on a transportation route
        - No benefit to DOE or community
- **Discussion**
    - Discussion of draft recommendation letter included in meeting packet

After thorough Board discussion, the draft recommendation letter included in member packets that was based on Chair Bienenstein's and Member Moore's observations from the CEMP workshop will be amended to include the following recommendations from the NSSAB:

- DOE should continue to fund the CEMP, as it provides peace of mind within communities near the NNSS.
- DOE should continue working with the CEMs to better align the existing CEMP with current NNSA missions and Environmental Management (EM) activities and remediation efforts.
- Regarding CEMP groundwater monitoring, the DOE should:
    - Focus on annual down-gradient water monitoring at the current CEMP stations in Beatty, Amargosa Valley, and Tecopa
    - Collect groundwater samples and analyze them with equipment that could detect tritium levels of 300 picocuries/liter (pCi/L). If tritium is detected, then more sensitive equipment should be used near the station if needed
    - Discontinue monitoring water up-gradient of the NNSS, as water does not flow uphill

- Regarding air monitoring, the DOE should:
  - Eliminate air monitoring at Pioche, Caliente, and Milford and Delta, Utah, for the following reasons:
    - For the past 20 years, CEMP air sampling data have indicated no off-site dose representing a public health threat from past of present NNSS activities
    - Other CEMP monitoring stations are located in closer proximity of the down-wind path of the NNSS
    - Funding could be redirected and utilized by CEMP that provides more value to the community and DOE
  - Continue current frequency of monitoring at all other stations even if radioactivity is not detected and activities do not change
  - Reevaluate the need for air monitoring every five years
- DOE should not install additional CEMP stations along radioactive waste transportation routes.
- DOE should eliminate the CEMP station in Boulder City as it is inaccessible to the public, not on a transportation route, and provides no benefit to DOE or the community, and relocate this CEMP station to Searchlight, Nevada.
- DOE should replace monitoring equipment with less sensitive/expensive equipment when it needs replacement at active stations.
- DOE should not repair or replace equipment at meteorological-only stations at Nyala, Twin Springs, Stone Cabin, and Medlin's Ranch stations. In the event of equipment failure, the stations should be decommissioned and the parts used for active stations.
- The CEMP website is user friendly for its intended functionality. DOE funds should not be spent to make the CEMP website less "technical-looking." Graphical enhancements are costly and would provide litter additional value. Website development would be better spent keeping the website up to date. If QR codes are used in promotional materials for the CEMP website, also include human readable text by the image; therefore http://cemp.dri.edu should be printed by the QR code. Metrics should be established to determine a baseline for number of visits to the CEMP website; so the effectiveness of a new program implemented can be determined readily.
- The CEMP brochure is understandable and effectively communicates the program, but should be updated (i.e., email address, number of stations, etc.).
- The CEMP workshop appeared to be at the correct level in terms of training, time, and materials. DOE should reevaluate the workshop format and content every six years.
- DOE should establish performance metrics for the CEMs as a means to measure communication to the public with the goal of increasing public interest and visitations to the CEMP stations.
- DOE should expand the CEMP Workshop audience by inviting local officials, first responders, teachers, and the NSSAB.
- The NSSAB does not have enough information to make a recommendation on whether the cost of the CEMP is balanced and funding is well spent.

Member Goldsmith moved to approve the draft recommendation letter as amended to include the previous stated recommendations. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Reports/Discussion/Recommendation: Waste Acceptance Review Panel (WARP) (Work Plan Item #7) *Chair Bienenstein and Member Thomas Fisher*

Chair Bienenstein and Member Thomas Fisher attended WARP meeting(s) at the Nevada Field Office (NFO) in June 2013. Chair Bienenstein stated that the meetings were very informational and the personnel involved were helpful and answered her questions satisfactorily and explained the extensive process that a generator undergoes to send waste for disposal at the NNSS. Chair Bienenstein explained that all waste profiles must be reviewed and signed by the DOE Radioactive Waste Acceptance Program (RWAP) Manager, the WARP Lead, the NNSS Facility Manager, a Performance Assessment representative, the Nuclear Safety Criticality reviewer, and the RWAP Lead. Chair Bienenstein affirmed that the WARP process is not a rubber stamp, but is very detailed and all involved parties' inputs/concerns are taken into consideration and resolved by the generator before the waste profile is recommended for approval to NFO's EM Operations Manager.

During a WARP meeting, Member Fisher noted that he was pleased to learn that waste profiles from generators who were unable to adhere to procedural requirements were not approved by the WARP automatically, even if the generator had been approved in the past. In fact, Member Fisher stated that he was surprised the NFO encounters incomplete documentation on waste profiles from current generators that have previously shipped waste to the NNSS. Member Fisher was impressed that NFO conducts annual on-site visits to generator facilities to instruct and to ensure generators follow all the proper procedures, rather than just being satisfied with a paper trail. Member Fisher agreed that it was a very informative experience.

Chair Bienenstein and Member Fisher stated that based on their attendance at these meetings, they have no recommendations that the Board can provide to enhance/refine the WARP process. Chair Bienenstein suggested that the WARP provide periodic updates to the NSSAB and the community.

The recommendation for the work item was tabled until the next Full Board meeting to provide Board members the opportunity to review Chair Bienenstein and Member Fisher's notes from the June WARP meetings. The NSSAB Office will provide meeting notes via email and request that all comments be provided to the NSSAB Office. Based on comments received, a recommendation letter will be drafted for final Board discussion/approval at the September 18, 2013, Full Board meeting.

Review Questions for Rainier Mesa/Shoshone Mountain Peer Review Panel (Work Plan Item #3) *(Bill Wilborn, DOE)*

- **NSSAB Work Plan Item 3**
  - Review Questions for Rainier Mesa/Shoshone Mountain Peer Review Panel – Review the draft questions developed for the Rainier Mesa/Shoshone Mountain Peer Review panel and provide recommendations on how they could be enhanced
    - DOE is seeking NSSAB recommendations on a set of draft questions prepared for the panel to answer during the review
    - NSSAB recommendations originally requested by September 18, 2013
- **NSSAB Members Received a Rainier Mesa Groundwater Briefing at Stockade Wash Overlook – November 2012**

- **Background for External Peer Review**
  - Required during the Corrective Action Investigation stage of the Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFACO)
  - Held once internal review and NDEP acceptance of the Corrective Action Unit (CAU) flow and transport modeling work is completed and documented
  - Specific CAU questions are developed for the External Peer Review panel to answer after completing their evaluation (these questions are drafted for NSSAB consideration later in the presentation)
  - Second CAU to undergo peer review
    - Frenchman Flat in 2010
- **External Peer Review Process**
  - External Peer Review panel consists of scientific experts in multiple disciplines (i.e., regulatory, geology, hydrology, physics, modeling, radiochemistry, etc.)
  - Planning to completion typically takes a full year
  - Conduct a mock-up peer review internally to prepare
  - Provide tours, presentations, and discussions for External Peer Review panel to become familiar with activity
  - Participate in additional discussions after review is completed, if necessary
  - DOE receives report and close-out from the External Peer Review
  - Complete additional work if necessary, or request approval from NDEP for the Rainier Mesa model
- **Questions for External Peer Review**
  1. Is DOE's understanding of the Rainier Mesa/Shoshone Mountain flow and transport system sufficient to support the FFACO strategy?
     - Transport of contaminants is limited entirely to unsaturated zone or to unsaturated zone and saturated zone flow paths that remain well within the NNSS boundaries for 1,000 years
     - Public exposure to contaminated groundwater above maximum contaminant levels unlikely
     - Buffer zones will be adequate to accommodate residual uncertainty due to limited simulations
  2. Do the simulation results based on appropriate compounded conservative assumptions address uncertainty to maximize the potential for radionuclide transport?
  3. Do simulation results illustrate transport direction and groundwater-velocity that provide sufficient information to support identification of monitoring well locations, use restriction boundary(ies), and Closure Objectives?
  4. Does the flow and transport report and referenced material provide sufficient documentation?
  5. Have all issues raised by past External Peer Reviews been properly addressed and documented in the report?
- **NSSAB Input**
  - Provide DOE a recommendation from the community perspective for ways the draft review questions for the Rainier Mesa/Shoshone Mountain Peer Review panel could be enhanced (are we missing any key elements or thought processes?)
  - Recommendation originally requested by September 21, 2013; this deadline can be changed.

In response to Board questions, the following clarifications were provided:

- The panel from the Frenchman Flat External Peer Review included members from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the U.S. Geological Survey, and individuals involved in regulatory science (modeling background, geochemistry, etc.).
- The contaminants will be defined and explained if a reviewer does not have a background on radiological sources, geochemistry, or radiochemistry, as necessary.
- There is classified information that will not be available to the reviewers due to security protocol, but they will be able to answer the posed questions without that knowledge.
- Compounded conservative assumptions are multiple uncertainties layered over one another. For example, taking the entire radionuclide inventory involved with a test conducted above the groundwater and using that data set as though the entire inventory was in the groundwater. Over time, that uncertainty would be compounded based on other assumptions that have been built into the model.
- Certain things could be masked by using compounded conservative assumptions; however, it is more cost effective to use a conservative method and the only items in danger of being masked are local parameters. This is combatted by having multiple conceptual models within the model package that documents the modeling activities and their follow-through.

After discussion, the Board decided to move item to FY 2014 Work Plan.

Liaison Updates

Clark County *(Phil Klevorick)*
Liaison Phil Klevorick thanked DOE for holding an Intergovernmental Meeting with the liaisons prior to the NSSAB meeting, during which his questions were answered satisfactorily; however, he feels that some of the discussion from the intergovernmental meeting would benefit the NSSAB.

Consolidated Group of Tribes and Organizations *(Richard Arnold)*
Liaison Richard Arnold expressed gratitude for the support and interest in the CGTO becoming a liaison on the NSSAB. Liaison Arnold provided background information that the CGTO has been in existence for 26 years working with the DOE, and specifically with the NNSS since 1990, and consists of 16 culturally affiliated tribes (Southern Paiute, Western Shoshone, Owens Valley Paiute/Shoshone). The CGTO is not just interested in archaeological resources, but in transportation, U-233 and U-235 shipments, CEMP, hydrology, biology, etc. Liaison Arnold informed the Board that the CGTO has been involved in a number of projects, i.e., developed Ethno-botany Reports, conducted American Indian Perceived Risks Study for Transportation of LLW, interacted extensively with NNSS with the culturally affiliated tribal governments, developed Indian text for the NNSS SWEIS and Greater-Than-Class-C (GTCC) EIS that has been identified as a model by DOE Headquarters for any national initiatives with tribes. CGTO is involved with other DOE sites at Hanford and Los Alamos. The CGTO was recently formally appointed to the State Tribal Government Working Group to represent tribal perspectives relating to the NNSS along with other DOE sites with EM activities. The CGTO participates in the DOE/EM's National Transportation Stakeholder's Forum, and recently Liaison Arnold accompanied DOE EM representatives to examine shut-down sites for nuclear power plants in Oregon, California, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and looked at transportation modes. They participate in Nuclear Waste Policy Act Section 180 Planning Committee meetings to examine future activities and funding opportunities. Liaison Arnold closed with noting that the CGTO works with the NNSS to develop culturally appropriate co-management activities, including revegetation projects.

Esmeralda County Commission *(Ralph Keyes)*
Liaison Ralph Keyes had nothing to report.

Nye County Commission *(Dan Schinhofen)*
Liaison Dan Schinhofen reported that Nye County is not opposed to U-233 and U-235 waste being disposed at the NNSS, but continued dialogue between Nye County and DOE is necessary and Nye County looks forward to working with DOE.

State of Nevada Division of Environmental Protection *(Tim Murphy)*
Liaison Tim Murphy had nothing to report.

U.S. National Park Service *(Genne Nelson)*
Liaison Genne Nelson reported that their primary interest in EM activities is the study of contaminant migration of groundwater that may affect the quality or quantity of NPS water resources. Transportation of waste to the NNSS for disposal is of potential concern to the NPS should either the transportation corridors or the nature of the LLW materials transported be changed in the future.

Liaison Discussion Wrap-Up *(Scott Wade, DOE)*

Scott Wade informed the Board that DOE received feedback that it would be of value to hold detailed discussions with NSSAB liaisons. In a transparent manner, DOE wishes to foster discussions between intergovernmental members by hosting meetings with the liaisons during the hour before the scheduled Full Board NSSAB meetings with the first meeting occurring on August 21, 2013. The chair and vice-chair from the NSSAB are welcome to attend these meetings. The next Intergovernmental Meeting will be held an hour prior to the September 18th NSSAB meeting.

Mr. Wade reiterated topics discussed during the August 21st Intergovernmental Meeting. The GTCC EIS is undergoing Headquarters review and does not have a planned issuance date, and he will keep the NSSAB apprised as more information comes available. The topic of the SWEIS was discussed and status included during the DOE Update. Another topic discussed was a May 29, 2013, meeting between the DOE and intergovernmental members and questions regarding who should be included and flexibility of meeting dates. A lengthy discussion was held regarding the status of the CEUSP and its path forward, also covered under DOE Update. Mr. Wade informed the Board that he was unaware of DOE undergoing a traffic/ transportation study in Nevada, but will update the NSSAB if there are changes. The last item Mr. Wade shared was that there is a great interest to continue dialogue between the Nye County Commission, the public, and the DOE regarding the CEUSP material.

Other NSSAB Business *(Chair Bienenstein and Vice-Chair Donna Hruska)*

During the Membership Committee update, Vice-Chair Hruska informed the Board that letters including a student liaison application were mailed to 60 private and public high schools principals. The application process was focused to the Las Vegas valley due to the travel involved for students to attend meetings. Completed applications from interested sophomores and juniors were requested by Friday, September 13, 2013. The next Membership Committee Meeting will be held on Thursday, September 19, 2013, from 2 - 4 p.m., to review the applications and recommend candidates to fill the vacant student liaison position.

Chair Bienenstein noted that DOE responses regarding the following NSSAB recommendations were included in member packets:

- DOE Response to NSSAB's Recommendation Regarding CAU 105: Area 2 Yucca Flat Atmospheric Test Sites, Evaluation of Corrective Action Alternatives (Work Plan Item #1), dated June 18, 2013
- DOE Response to NSSAB's Recommendation Regarding NNSS Integrated Groundwater Sampling Plan (Work Plan Item #8), dated June 25, 2013

Chair Bienenstein announced that chair and vice-chair elections will be held at the September 18, 2013, Full Board meeting. NSSAB Members are asked to review the chair/vice-chair responsibilities included in the member packet and contact the NSSAB Office if interested in either position.

The Chairs' Conference Call on June 18, 2013, included updates on the EM budget and waste disposition items, including CEUSP material, GTCC EIS, and that the first federal waste shipment was received by a commercial facility in Texas. Chair Bienenstein and Vice-Chair Hruska withdrew the NSSAB sponsored draft recommendation letter regarding a national work plan as three of the eight sites felt that the plan would not be flexible and provide the autonomy to develop their own work plan items.

Vice-Chair Hruska noted that she has been participating on the planning committee for the EM SSAB National Chairs' Meeting scheduled for October 15-17, 2013. The meeting is being hosted by the Portsmouth SSAB which has conducted an in-depth study of community attitudes regarding the site, and at the national meeting they intend to share how this community study was utilized to arrive at community consensus. Vice-Chair Hruska offered to give up her seat at the meeting in order that both urban (Clark County) and rural counties are represented from the NSSAB. Any NSSAB Member that resides in a rural county that is interested in attending the national meeting was to contact the NSSAB Office by close of business on August 22, 2013.

During the EM SSAB National Chairs' Meeting, Chair Bienenstein informed the Board that each SSAB has five minutes to ask one question to David Huizenga, Senior Advisor for EM. Each SSAB also has five minutes to provide a priority #1 issue (FY 2013 accomplishment or activity) during a round robin. After Board discussion involving possible round robin topics of transportation, groundwater and U233 material, the Board decided that further discussion/ideas may directed to the NSSAB Office via e-mail and questions/round robin topics will be refined at a later date.

The next Full Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 18, 2013, at 4 p.m. at the National Atomic Testing Museum in Las Vegas, Nevada, with the agenda focusing on developing the NSSAB FY 2014 work plan. There will not be an educational session before this meeting.

Board members appreciated the informational DOE presentations at the educational session and the meeting. Public comment procedure was discussed and protocol was reviewed. Members stated that they appreciated DOE's efforts in meeting preparation and content.

Member Moore moved the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.