Mr. James Tanner, Facilitator, provided an overview of the agenda. He pointed out the emergency exits, restrooms, and asked attendees to place mobile devices on silent mode. He said DOE was recording the meeting and no personal recording devices should be in use. He said questions could be submitted in writing to the registration table. He explained that questions would be reviewed during the lunch break, and those that could be addressed would be answered in the afternoon Q&A session. Other questions would be responded to via email by August 15, 2018. He said the presentation, questions, and answers would be posted online. He then introduced Mr. Mike Budney, SRS Manager, to begin the presentation.

Welcome & Site Overview

Mr. Mike Budney, SRS Manager, said the purpose of the presentation was to discuss the top activities at SRS and how those projects faced major challenges moving forward. He said the meeting would only address technical issues and there would be no discussion of procurement related activities. He addressed SRS history, current missions, and budget. He discussed the current workforce breakdown and listed current SRS major prime contracts. He highlighted activities pertaining to nuclear materials missions and Savannah River National Laboratory. He addressed the Liquid Waste Program, a separate prime contract, saying there were several interconnected activities with the M&O contract. He discussed solid waste operations, area closure, and deactivation and decommissioning. He showed the SRS budget profile for fiscal years (FY) 2014 through 2019 before explaining how various programs were funded by shared Site overhead cost pools. Mr. Budney explained pension liability was a significant issue and explained DOE-SR was working closely with Congress to address the legacy pension issue. He addressed areas DOE-SR was proud of and areas that remained challenging at SRS.

Environmental Cleanup: Nuclear Materials & Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL)

Mr. Tony Polk, DOE-SR, discussed various processes for H-Area, L-Area, and K-Area facilities within the Nuclear Material Program. He pointed out infrastructure challenges stating aging infrastructure for operating nuclear facilities was over 60 years old with some original support systems still in place. He said key infrastructure issues for Nuclear Material facilities were the H-Canyon exhaust tunnel, roof leaks, modernization of key electrical distribution, and operational efficiency and throughput upgrades. He said Nuclear Material Risk Reduction Challenges involved
the unknown disposition pathway for Spent Nuclear Fuel, removal of material from building 235-F, and surveillance and maintenance costs for deactivated facilities. Mr. Polk said the technical business challenges pertained to the aging workforce and attrition. He said overcoming attrition through hiring, training, and retaining a skilled workforce was difficult. Lastly, he emphasized the operational efficiency with limited budgets and resources would be a challenge to achieve mission objectives.

Mr. Polk provided an overview of SRNL infrastructure challenges. He said a DOE-Laboratory Operations Board assessment determined that 63 percent of SRNL facilities were sub-standard or inadequate due to facility infrastructure being well beyond its service life. He described specific areas requiring modernization efforts that would resolve infrastructure challenges. Mr. Polk then addressed SRNL technical business challenges.

**Environmental Cleanup: Area Closure/ Deactivation & Decommissioning (D&D)**

Mrs. Angelia Holmes, DOE-SR, addressed challenges for environmental cleanup, enhancement of environmental data systems, and D&D activities. She said a common theme mentioned throughout the workshop was the issue of attrition and the difficulty to maintain the skill base. She addressed soil and groundwater remediation. She said DOE-SR was very proud that since 1993, all 3,765 Federal Facility Agreement milestones and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act permit commitments had been met. She discussed the D-Area Ash Basin, which was one of the largest waste units remediated, beginning back in year 2015. She discussed future remediation activities at the Wetland Area at Dunbarton Bay before discussing D&D activities to date.

**National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA)**

Ms. Nicole Nelson-Jean, NNSA Savannah River Field Office Manager provided an overview of NNSA discussing the various sites across the country within NNSA. She mentioned the program areas at SRS before discussing graphics and charts showing the budget and alignment of NNSA activities. She addressed tritium activities, including the core enduring tritium-related missions. She said infrastructure recapitalization, maintenance issues, and human capital management were NNSA’s technical challenges. She discussed gaps and risks stating capabilities existed in Cold War legacy buildings that increase infrastructure risks, operational risks, and safety risks to the mission. She summarized her presentation by listing the “take aways” from NNSA activities at SRS.
Program Support/ Crosscutting Issues: Interface Management (IM)

Mrs. Jennifer Nelson, DOE-SR, said there was a disciplined process for Interface Management services at SRS involving multiple contractors, federal, and state agencies and over 200 documents. She explained IM provided a disciplined approach to support all tenants, which was necessary to manage all expectations on the Site. Mrs. Nelson described the IM Team and how DOE-SR utilized the IM process to keep DOE-HQ informed of evolving projects and programs. She showed a diagram of the interconnected interface services at SRS before showing pictures of IM activities at SRS.

Program Support/ Crosscutting Issues: Common Infrastructure

Mrs. Holmes said the scope of common infrastructure was to manage and maintain Site utilities, common infrastructure, and other services to enable mission accomplishment. She explained that common infrastructure challenges involved the maintenance or modernization of administrative support facilities, roadways, electrical distribution system, energy efficiencies, and the integrated maintenance management system. She provided a snapshot that described individual common infrastructure metrics around SRS.

Program Support/ Crosscutting Issues: Safety and Engineering

Mr. Scott Nicholson, DOE-SR, listed several safety and engineering challenges. He mentioned the Contractor Assurance System, which was a large program EM was focusing to improve. He stated DOE would continue to partner with SRS contractors to do what was best for mission success, while protecting the worker, public, and environment.

Program Support/ Crosscutting Issues: Cyber Security/Information Technology (IT)

Mr. Lewann Belton, DOE-SR, said it was the responsibility of Cyber Security and IT to help enable the mission, but to do that in a secure manner to ensure the mission-directed systems were not impacted. He provided an overview of the service landscape at SRS. He said challenges for Cyber Security and IT were building and sustaining an environment to support all tenants, maintaining compliance, tracking cost, managing rapid changes, hiring, modernizing and remaining aware of risks.

The workshop adjourned for lunch and resumed for a Q&A session.
QUESTIONS & ANSWER SESSION

Question: (Tony Polk) What is the status of SRNL migrating to a stand-alone business unit including DSA updates? What challenges remain to achieve full "stand alone" status?

Phase 1 of the separate and independent business unit was complete late last calendar year. And as an example of those things that migrated over for SRNL to have under their control included ESH and QA, engineering resources, rad protection, waste regulatory and environmental compliance, enterprise risk management, workforce management, contracts and partnerships, finance, procurement, and communications. So, phase 2 of that process is about to kickoff. The Department challenged the contractor to do this in a net sum zero funding environment. In other words, we couldn’t have any increase to overall cost for the Site as a result of this separate and independent business unit. So, the approach we took was to step through the processes and take that into account so that we could be sure of the success as we move forward of SRNL being able to operate more and more fully as an independent business unit. Secondly, the new DSA to meet and bring SRNL’s DSA up to current standards and requirements is complete and implementation is in progress. We expect that implementation to be complete late next calendar year; September is the target. As far as the challenges that are still out there relative to stand-alone independent business unit, the platforms, software, applications, much of the business systems and things that run those have been set up for the Site. So, to separate out a business unit completely when you are still relying on those systems, and some of the people associated with it, is difficult and especially to do that under the requirements that we set to attempt to make that split without any increase to cost. So those are some of the challenges that still stand out there as what we are going to do at the laboratory relative to those systems and how we use those systems and whether or not some of the needs for operating a business will be performed in house or whether those services will be bought.

Question: (Tony Polk) Is the F-Area Complex - particularly the F/H Laboratory currently part of the SRNL? If not, are there specific challenges to transition responsibilities from the Nuclear Materials Program to SRNL?

SRNL provides the analytical services, owns the folks that do that, runs the programs that do that, but the facilities in F/H Complex are owned by Nuclear Materials. A number of years ago, we determined what the cost was to keep that facility open, to provide and supply electricity, steam, the other things that are necessary to keep the facility operating, and then the two primary users of those analytical services, which are Nuclear Materials and Liquid Waste, pay a reimbursement cost for the operation of those facilities. But, the other infrastructure that supports that, ventilation in the area, operations and maintenance cost of the facilities and the equipment, those things are borne by Nuclear Materials. So, in the process of the F/H consolidation, the primary concern there is with the cost associated with the laboratory itself and what has to be done to move those resources without having any effect on the customers that are requiring those analytical services out of F/H laboratory. And so, from a responsibility and transition standpoint, the two are going to have to work together because making the facilities available in SRNL at the main campus and being able to move those operations, including the equipment and analytical devices that are necessary, has to be well coordinated between the facilities. Most of that is the responsibility of SRNL, but Nuclear Materials plays a role as they begin to shift out and take those facilities so they can be deactivated and we can reduce the cost there.
Question: (Tony Polk) Does the extension of DOE Authority to secure additional foreign Spent Nuclear Fuel and Nuclear Materials change the future SRS inventory projection? If so, what impact at L and K Areas are specifically anticipated?

If additional materials are identified and NNSA, who really has the authority for those non-proliferation activities across the world, identify new materials that are not in the current inventory of those that have been identified, then yes, there will be an impact. Those impacts are primarily associated with L Area. And in addition to that, should the Department as it moves forward, consider again the swap with Idaho for the aluminum-based fuel to be processed at Savannah River, or some other method, for those materials to come, then yes inventory at L-Area is going to be a concern and there will have to be planning and facility changes to be able to accommodate that depending on how it lines up. The reason for that is specifically, there are about 3,650 spaces for storing the nuclear fuel (MTR fuels) and 200 HFIR locations. And so, we have to manage those to be able to deal with the anticipated future receipts. Right now, we have that planned and lined out for those that have been identified so far. And then what we are going to process through H-Canyon to be able to work that without any significant change to L Area, but any additional fuels would require us to relook at that entire system to understand how we would handle it.

Question: (Tony Polk) HB-Line is currently being flushed and de-inventoryed, and not needed. How far do you plan to go with HB-Line? Do you plan to fully de-staff and turn over to D&D? Or is it to be kept in ready standby for future missions?

Our plan is to de-inventory and lay up the facility. It will be left in a condition that would be recoverable at some cost. We do not plan to turn it over to D&D at this time. But, the primary goal there is to be able to reduce the overall costs in H-Area now that the mission it was working in concert with NNSA is no longer and we see no near-term need for it.

Question: (Tony Polk) What volume of transuranic waste will be generated from 235-F deactivation? Will it be classified as contact-handled (CH) or remote-handled (RH) TRU waste?

It is expected it all will be contact-handled. As far as the volume is concerned, because volume is primarily determined by way of the number of containers associated with it, we still have not fully defined what the curie content for the containers will need to be for the 238 material. Plus, we have other equipment that resides in those cells that is going to come out, some of which is likely to not be able to fit in the standard drums. It may require the larger box packaging. So really until we get into it and understand with the first waste streams that we pull out, it’s a little bit difficult to determine exactly how much TRU waste volume will come from 235-F.
Question: (Tony Polk) H- Canyon Complex: 1) What is the total budget for all work performed EM & NNSA  2) How is the budget split EM & NNSA?  3) What is the respective workforce numbers for H-Canyon complex, EM mission at complex, NNSA at complex, Management, maintenance, etc.  4) Can the government define the mission and design life for H-Complex? Missions should include near and long-term and funding agencies (EM, NNSA, etc.)

1) The total budget for H- Canyon complex for FY19 is approximately $175M.
2) $175M is the EM budget and does not include HB-Line, which is being prepared for layup.
3) Approximately 160 FTEs are assigned to the H-Canyon facilities. All are EM.
4) H-Canyon was placed into service in 1955. That is more than 60 years of service and beyond its design life. Its primary mission is to process and down-blend Highly Enriched Uranium Spent Nuclear Fuel currently stored in L-Area’s water basin. The fuel has been collected from foreign and domestic research reactors as part of NNSA’s non-proliferation/global threat reduction mission. HEU that can meet specifications is down-blended with natural uranium and supplied to a Tennessee Valley Authority vendor to provide fuel for TVA reactors. Spent fuel that cannot meet specifications is transferred to the Liquid Waste System. Current planning requires canyon operations through FY 2040.

Question: (Tony Polk) What is the timetable for completing the long term strategic evaluation of H canyon and could DOE make the report available?

In September, DOE-SR is scheduled to begin a strategic evaluation of H-Canyon in consideration of its current and potential missions. The results of the evaluation will be included in the strategic planning documents for the Site and for the Nuclear Materials program. A date for updating the approved and releasable documents is not yet scheduled.

Question: (Tony Polk) What is the remaining duration of HEU blend down program?

The current planning is 2040.

Question: (Tony Polk) (1) Why is HB-Line being deactivated since it can support H-Canyon in processing plutonium containing materials?  2) Does dilute and dispose operation within the TRU waste shipping regulations and WIPP acceptance criteria? (I assume not) Are needed revisions now in place?

We currently see no near-term activities for the Department that involves the need for HB-Line. As a result of the NNSA activities going away, we are going to place that facility in a lay-up condition and save some costs and be able to apply those dollars to the Canyon processing activities and things like infrastructure. EM’s activities for the plutonium materials that we own that are not MOXable, we describe as a downblending activity. Dilute and dispose is the description that’s used for the materials for NNSA.
Question: (Angelia Holmes) Graves Environmental performed a 50K remediation project in 300-Area in 2007. We employed a new method of soil removal by driving steel caissons, removing contaminated soil via auger method, backfilling with clean soils and extracting caisson. This method worked very well as it greatly reduced the amount of soil disturbed as no benching of excavation site was required. We would like to meet with the proper personnel to discuss the implementation across the entire DOE Complex.

We are amenable to that. Please contact me for getting in contact with the correct person who can speak to you concerning that soil remediation project.

Question: (Angelia Holmes) How much power is used at SRS? (Megawatt) Is there interest in additional and alternative clean energy sources of power? For environmental monitoring - how often are streams sampled or is there continuous monitoring?

In FY17, we used approximately 320 megawatts for that year. That’s usually average. Yes, there is interest in additional or alternative clean energy sources of power. We have to balance that with other environmental considerations. We also have to look at if it will reduce our further energy costs and that it does not create a risk to our mission or to Site operations. There is continuous monitoring. Samples are taken in the streams every 2.5 hours. There is information gathered and we also do a composite of that information on a monthly basis. For stream water quality, samples are taken on a monthly basis.

Question: (Nicole Nelson-Jean) 1) Does DOE/NNSA intent to change the OCI Guidelines at SRS  2) Doe you plan to streamline the contract proposal process as was done at Los Alamos?

There is no intention of changing the federal guidelines or any other guidelines related to Organizational Conflict of Interest. The second question – Los Alamos National Laboratory is a DOE-NNSA site. So NNSA is the landlord at that particular site. Here at Savannah River, currently NNSA is a tenant. So, we will continue to work with our EM colleagues on any process and proposals for contract issues and activities.

Question: (Nicole Nelson-Jean) Are there any capital projects under-way or planned for tritium mission?

Yes, the Tritium Finishing Facility (TFF) Project will construct two new facilities to relocate tritium reservoir processes currently in H-Area Old Manufacturing into safe, reliable, modern buildings. Scope for the project includes a facility to house nuclear equipment processes; a facility to house non-nuclear process equipment; demolishing and replacing existing warehouses; as well as project design, safety basis development, and relocation of utilities, fences, and an access road. Dependent upon funding, the TFF Project is currently projected to start capital work in Fiscal Year 2021 and be completed in Fiscal Year 2029.
Question: (Jennifer Nelson) Prioritization of M&O activities was mentioned in the Interface Management presentation. What criteria or methodology is used in this prioritization process?

That process is safety first. Mission second. And risk assessment. Then determination of essential Site services and the needs of the tenants that are on site. A good example would be the paving of the roads. We came together, looked at the roads that aren’t most used and we paved those first. Then we had collaboration on the next roads that would be paved.

Question: (Jennifer Nelson) Where could I find a listing of current contracts and contract holders, especially for Area closure deactivation?

All DOE contracts are listed on the DOE website. Currently, we do not have a direct contract for area closure or deactivation. And right now, the way it works is the M&O would subcontract for this type of work for DOE.

Question: (Lewann Belton) Can you describe the communications infrastructure (radios/pagers/wireless) used onsite for Fire/EM and other purposes. What are the current challenges with these capabilities?

Within the last two or three years, we went through a process of correcting our two largest risks onsite which was our radio trunking system and our replacement telephone project. The replacement telephone project was getting parts from Hanford and also trying to get parts through eBay and other locations. Since then, both projects, as of 2017, have been replaced with state of the art redundancy systems that is IP-based and that has server redundancy associated with it. We have full capability from a backup standpoint. We had looked at one point in time piggybacking off one of the labs, from a redundancy standpoint. At this time, we have a full redundancy system on Site. DOE-SR has blanketed the Site for the most part with wireless in areas that we can. And some of those technologies, like for the national lab standpoint where there is Cat. 3 wiring in that facility, we have implemented wireless in that environment. So, as needed, we are putting wireless communications as funding is available.

Question: (Mike Budney) Is the Department willing to consider innovative ideas (such as new facilities founded by public/private partnerships) to address site aging infrastructure challenges. These new facilities could be onsite within the site security fence, onsite outside of the site security fence, or offsite of the SRS property. (In addition to the AMC).

Yes, we are willing to consider those. They are a hard road to get to because we have a lot of people to convince besides those of us here at Savannah River to do those type of things. AMC is already an example where it has been difficult to get that project approved. We are still working it. Headquarters has it for action now. But, yes, we are willing to consider any innovative ideas. And I would say that the current Administration is open to those innovative ideas. They are working hard to try and figure out how to do AMC for us. It’s just a matter of working through all the hoops to make something like that happen.
Question: (Mike Budney) We understand that there has been a study to look at long-term strategy for H-Canyon. Can you elaborate on this effort?

We are just putting together the team to go do this. We have had a lot of different, four or five, initiatives brought to our attention about work that could be done in H-Canyon going forward that is not done there today. Some of that is complex and involves foreign entities. So, we are putting together the team. I’ve talked to EM-1 about this to figure out how we would integrate such. We have to have a long-term strategy that integrates all these efforts and figures out which ones you can actually do and what sequence you could actually do them. So, we are just starting to work on that. We like the idea of having long-term missions at H-Canyon.

Question: (Mike Budney) What is the status of the planned Advanced Manufacturing Lab at USC-Aiken?

DOE-Headquarters has that for action now. It’s a matter of how we fund that opportunity going forward. I don’t have a timeline for when that’s going to get sorted out.

Question: (Mike Budney) We have observed some decays at SWPF of the latest being the manufacturing of the valves in the process line, the cause appears to be some valves that were determined to be obsolete. New values have been ordered causing delay and at considerable cost. The issue is this. Is DOE sure that the issue was with the valves themselves. Was a thorough root cause analysis done of this? Could it be that this problem may be with the control and instrumentation system? Would it not be worthwhile to go back and 1) Do a thorough, rigorous root cause investigation 2) trouble shoot the process control panel and electrical system?

That really is not a question that fits with today’s workshop because that’s a different contract activity. But I will tell you that the process has been very carefully analyzed to figure out what the issue was. We are confident that we got the right answer in place and the fix for the valves.

Question: (Mike Budney) With this recent Anne White memo around different options for SRS, it appears that this analysis will impact the site, therefore the RFP. Can you discuss the impact from a scope, technical, and schedule impact?

We are not going to discuss solicitation progress, but we are engaged closely with NNSA in the study about how the two organizations ought to be positioned on the Site. It does not change the scope of the work. All these things still have to get done. So that’s really an internal discussion for who is going to be landlord and tenant, and who takes responsibility for what activities. All those activities we discussed will still be done by an M&O contractor. If something changes in that relationship, we will figure out how to manage that acquisition going forward, but it does not change the technical nature of the work.

Question: (Mike Budney) Are there any plans for replacing the current Emergency Operations Center?

An Alternatives Analysis has been completed and discussions are being held to determine the best path forward.