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**ENERGY COMMUNITIES ALLIANCE EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETS WITH SECRETARY OF ENERGY ERNEST MONIZ: ECA STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF DOE WORKING WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

On June 23, the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) Executive Board met with Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz to highlight the importance of the Department of Energy’s (DOE) environmental cleanup, national security, nuclear energy and waste management missions. The ECA Executive Board, including Chair Mayor Tom Beehan from Oak Ridge, TN and other elected local government officials also stressed the importance of regular communication and partnership between DOE and the local governments that are adjacent to DOE facilities. Secretary Moniz agreed that working with local governments is important to the success of DOE.

Earlier in the day, the ECA Executive Board also met with National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Administrator Frank Klotz, Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management Dave Huizenga, and other DOE and Administration officials, as well as congressional DOE staff.

(Continued on page 4)
DOD CONTINUES TO ASSIST COMMUNITIES WITH DOWNSIZING DEFENSE FACILITIES – WHERE IS DOE’S PROGRAM?

Allen County, Ohio, will receive a $219,680 grant from the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) to help it respond to layoffs at the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center prompted by reductions in defense procurement, the Defense Department announced this month. DOE has no similar program despite large layoffs at DOE facilities around the country.

The economic adjustment assistance funds are part of a larger $244,680 project helping the region expand job creation opportunities and assist businesses and workers harmed by defense cutbacks at the facility, formerly the Lima Tank Plant. The effort calls for the region to:

- develop an economic development action plan to leverage regional assets and align them with known economic recovery needs;
- conduct a review of local DoD procurement and potential vulnerabilities in the regional economy to further defense reductions; and
- develop a regional workforce plan to address gaps in workforce skills, prepare affected workers to be competitive for job opportunities and help to preserve a regional industrial base capacity.

OEA’s Defense Industry Adjustment Program supports state and community efforts to organize themselves to respond on behalf of affected communities, workers and businesses; plan local community and economic adjustment activities to lessen local economic impacts; and carry out plans to replace lost economic activity.

Manhattan Project National Historical Park Proposal again passes the House, advances to the Senate

The House of Representatives approved the National Defense Authorization Act of 2015, which included a bipartisan provision sponsored by Natural Resources Committee Chairman Doc Hastings (WA-04) to establish a Manhattan Project National Historical Park. Chairman Hastings stated that there is “strong bipartisan support for this measure and it enjoys broad support from local communities and national advocates for historic preservation and parks.” Chairman Hastings further stated the goal to enact this law before the end of the year.

The Manhattan Project National Park would be established as a unit of the National Park System. The park’s establishment is supported by the Department of the Interior, Department of Energy, and the National Park Service.

Legislative Update

The more things change in Washington the more they stay the same.

Remember how at the beginning of the year House and Senate members said they expected/hoped that the appropriations bills would move through the chambers in the regular order? Well last week that all changed. Now, Congressional leaders are talking about minibus appropriation bills and continuing resolutions. The Energy and Water Appropriations Bill was pulled from the Senate Appropriations committee markup schedule and the timing for the bill in the Senate is not known but insiders do not it expect it to move anytime soon. On the House side, the Appropriations Committee has passed their bill, and it is expected to be taken up by the full House when Congress is back from the Independence Day recess.
ECA Considers WIPP Impacts

ECA is closely watching what happens at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) near Carlsbad, New Mexico. WIPP is critical to the cleanup of the DOE complex and to National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) sites that require waste to be removed to permit modernization of its facilities. DOE needs to determine the cause of the radiological release and to create a solution to reopen the site as quickly and safely as possible. ECA in its meeting with Secretary Moniz stressed the importance of the site to all communities.

In June, filter replacements were safely and successfully completed at WIPP. DOE’s Office of Enforcement notified Nuclear Waste Partnership, LLC, the operating contractor for WIPP, of its intent to investigate at the site. In Congress, the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee approved the Obama administration’s $220 million budget request for WIPP. They also agreed that up to $120 million of surplus from NNSA employee pension funds could be diverted to offset costs at WIPP and help reopen the facility. Now the bill has to get through the Senate.

Impact to Communities considering hosting storage sites.

In the wake of the incident at WIPP, ECA has been asked about the fallout: What might the impact be on a potential host community’s willingness to participate in a consent-based siting effort by DOE for an interim storage or permanent disposal facility?

Before the incident at WIPP, the failure to move defense waste from local communities was a major concern in communities around DOE sites. Even when DOE was experiencing success by moving TRU waste to WIPP, failure to move many other types of radioactive waste resulted in missed cleanup milestones, failure to honor agreements with States, fines and litigation-invested resources – in addition to increased “cleanup” costs.

The temporary shutdown at WIPP should add urgency to the communities’ appeal to the federal government to move forward with a waste strategy, permanent or interim, as soon as possible. DOE and Congress have to make decisions regarding nuclear waste management and disposal.

What happened at WIPP also illustrates the need for DOE to relook at storage and disposal practices at all of its federal facilities to ensure that they are handling, packaging, and tracking waste in a safe manner. In addition, the incident highlights the need for local communities to be given resources to independently verify the impacts of keeping waste in place longer than originally planned. This will help to ensure the protection of the health, safety, environment, quality of life and economic viability of local communities. This is one of DOE’s responsibilities.

Since the Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future issued its final recommendation for a consent-based siting process, potential host communities started to outline what they believe they need to evaluate whether they would host a site. Among the list: scientific review, resources for public education and outreach, and the ability to trust that the political will and means exist to implement new policies or governance plans. To date, neither DOE nor Congress has provided the resources even though communities have asked for funding to begin these activities. It is likely now that communities will add to the list: independent oversight, access to air monitoring information at the site and in the community, better funding for emergency response, better coordination/communication of what is being inserted into waste canisters, and oversight and accountability if the parameters of the waste change.

While the investigations into what happened at WIPP are ongoing, DOE should begin to work with potentially interested host communities to identify sites where federal legacy and commercial nuclear waste can be stored or disposed of safely. These

(Continued on page 8)
Energy Communities Alliance Meets with Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz to Highlight the Role of Local Governments

Mayor Beehan stated that local governments can be DOE’s asset for gaining support for missions and for infrastructure development at the sites, but that for that to occur local governments must be involved in decision-making. Mayor Beehan also stressed the importance of land transfer to local communities.

ECA Secretary Mayor Steve Young, Kennewick, WA offered up his experience in dealing with the Hanford Site, noting that it is much easier to resolve issues that come up at a site when the DOE manager already has a strong working relationship with the local government.

ECA Treasurer Councilor Fran Berting from Los Alamos stated that DOE should ensure that there is regular communication between field/site office officials and local government officials; and that DOE Headquarters leadership and staff should make it a priority to meet with and engage local government and community officials during site visits.

ECA Vice-Chairman Councilmember Chuck Smith from Aiken County, SC identified a concern amongst many communities – the continually changing nature of the mission and the corresponding budget issues. He gave examples from around all of the DOE/NNSA sites where a project was started, identified as a national priority only to be changed, delayed or cancelled. Councilmember Smith highlighted that these changes have an adverse impact on the community, including significant job loss. Secretary Moniz identified that DOE needs to exercise more discipline when developing project budgets and clearly understand the design and costs of the projects. He identified that some projects and their budgets will need to be modified and used CMR and UPF as examples of projects and budgets that have been reviewed and modified.

Other topics addressed in the meeting with Secretary Moniz were: support for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), and opening it as soon as possible; support for Small Modular Reactors (SMRs); and technology transfer activities; and a solution for the management and disposal of high-level and defense waste. Secretary Moniz confirmed that WIPP is still an essential part of the cleanup mission and committed to opening it as soon and as safely as possible. The Secretary stated that the development of new nuclear technologies, including SMRs, is important for energy needs in the future. He expressed hope that by proceeding through the testing phase and the initial Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licensing for SMRs, the initial projects will identify the costs and feasibility of the technology and the potential for use in the United States. He agreed that technology transfer activities are important to both DOE and local communities. Finally, he expressed support for consent-based siting activities and stated that he believes that the next step in nuclear waste management and disposal will be the development of a pilot interim storage site initially targeting waste from decommissioned commercial reactors.

Additional meeting participants included Aiken County Chairman Ronny Young, Oak Ridge City Manager Mark Watson, Savannah River CRO Executive Director Rick McLeod, Los Alamos County Deputy County Administrator Brian Bosshardt.
Secretary Moniz Announces Members to New Commission on National Labs

On May 20, 2014, Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz announced members to the Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories. As directed in the 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act, this congressionally-mandated commission was established to evaluate the effectiveness of the Department of Energy’s 17 national laboratories. The national laboratories comprise a federal research system to provide the Nation with strategic scientific and technological developments. The Commission is responsible for examining whether the priorities of the labs comport with the broader strategic priorities of the Department of Energy. It will conduct a two-part study and present the first phase of its study by February 1, 2015.

The Commission will be co-chaired by Jared Cohon, President Emeritus and Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Carnegie Mellon University, and T.J. Glauthier, President of TJG Energy Associates, LLC. The remaining Commission members include:

- Norman Augustine, Chairman of the U.S. Human Space Flight Plans Committee, NASA and Former Chairman, Lockheed Martin
- Wanda Austin, President and CEO, The Aerospace Corporation
- Charles Elachi, Director of Jet Propulsion Laboratory, NASA
- Paul Fleury, Frederick W. Beinecke Professor of Engineering and Applied Physics, Yale University
- Susan Hockfield, Professor of Neuroscience and President Emerita, MIT
- Richard Meserve, President, Carnegie Institution for Science and Chair of the Environmental Stewardship Subcommittee of Secretary of Energy Advisory Board
- Cherry Murray, Dean, Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (SEAS)
DOE: LOS ALAMOS WON’T MEET DEADLINE TO DISPOSE OF WASTE

The Department of Energy confirmed that it would not meet its deadline to remove drums of nuclear waste from Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. DOE cited safety concerns from the radiological materials as its reason for missing the deadline. Federal officials were asked to remove 3,706 cubic meters of waste from the complex after a wildfire in 2011 threatened the drums. The Las Conchas wildfire burned to within 3.5 miles of the drums’ storage area. New Mexico Governor Susana Martinez made removal of the drums a key priority of her administration.

According to the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED), more than 90 percent of the waste has been removed in the past two years. Though much of the waste has been removed, the remainder was scheduled to be transferred to a Texas facility by June 30th. The latest shipments have been postponed due to concerns about the chemical stability of the mixtures in the containers. One of the drums from LANL is suspected of being responsible for the incident at the WIPP underground repository to cause the radiation release. A reaction occurred in at least one drum at LANL, generating enough heat to crack the lid. NMED stated that it would aggressively push DOE to complete the transfer as soon as operations can be resumed safely.

DOE IG AUDIT REPORT: COST AND SCHEDULE OF THE MIXED OXIDE FUEL FABRICATION FACILITY AT THE SAVANNAH RIVER SITE

Overview

The Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement was signed by the United States and Russia in 2000, demanding that each country dispose of at least 34 metric tons of surplus weapons-grade plutonium by converting it into mixed oxide fuel. Mixed oxide fuel can then be used to power commercial nuclear reactors. The Department of Energy contracted with MOX Services in 1999 to construct the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility (MOX Facility) at the Savannah River Site to carry out this program.

Thus far, MOX Services and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) have failed to control costs and maintain on schedule for the MOX Facility construction. NNSA conducted a construction project review in March 2012 and concluded the probability was very low that the MOX Facility would be completed according to the approved baseline. MOX Services prepared a baseline change proposal at the request of the NNSA with updated project completion, cost, and schedule projections. The revised baseline estimates that total project costs would reach $7.7 billion and the project would not be completed until November 2019. The originally approved baseline in 2007 anticipated a total project cost of $4.8 billion and a scheduled completion date of September 2016. Through October 2013, about $4 billion had been spent on the MOX Facility project and estimates showed that the project was 60 percent complete.

DOE Audit Results

DOE published its results of an audit to determine whether the NNSA was managing the design and construction of the project in an efficient and effective manner. The audit identified the key reasons for the project’s cost growth and schedule delays, namely significantly underestimated levels of effort required to install various construction commodity items. For instance, the baseline change proposal increased the estimates of efforts for installing piping by 26 percent, installing valves by 30 percent, installing duct work by 300 percent, and installing cables by 151 percent.
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ECA will host a peer exchange in July to facilitate discussion of nuclear energy strategies, policies and technologies that are priorities. Discussions will address the role of local governments in creating momentum around key issues and supporting new nuclear energy development. Additional details are provided below.

When:
Wednesday, July 30, 2014 (full day Nevada National Security Site tour)
Thursday, July 31, 2014 (full day Plenary Session)
Friday, August 1, 2014 (morning Roundtable Discussion)

Who:
ECA members, local governments, DOE, state officials, invited nuclear energy industry representatives, and other invited participants

Cost:
The registration fee for ECA members and government/public sector participants is $150.00. The registration fee invited for private sector invited participants is $275.00.

Why:
The current political and economic environment present challenges to the development of small modular reactors (SMRs), new nuclear plant licensing, the longevity of existing nuclear power plants, and the development of waste storage facilities. The purpose of the meeting is to consider the role of nuclear energy as part of the US energy portfolio in the future, and the opportunities local communities have to support policies for nuclear energy expansion and nuclear waste management. In addition, the meeting will allow local officials to coordinate with stakeholders at the state, regional, industry and federal level on how to spark action on these issues.

Meeting sessions will consider:

- The outlook for nuclear power generation in the near-term, as part of a future “all-of-the-above” energy strategy, and the long-term costs and impacts of nuclear reactor shutdowns.
- The development of small modular reactors (SMRs), opportunities for energy communities interested in supporting their deployment, and whether SMRs have multiple applications that can benefit local communities.
- DOE’s Office of Nuclear Energy’s R&D on advanced reactor, fuel cycle and nuclear waste management technologies.
- The potential for public/private partnerships to provide waste management alternatives, move the consent-based siting process forward, maintain the nuclear workforce, and support new nuclear development.
- How to develop effective outreach and education programs on nuclear energy, how to prioritize the issues, and the opportunities to share information at the local, state and federal level.

For more information on the meeting and registration, please contact Kara Colton at kara.colton@energyca.org.
Additionally, the audit identified premature baseline approval as the primary cause for such substantial cost overruns. In particular, the GAO concluded that cost and schedule baselines should not be established until design work is 90 percent complete. However, a 90 percent design review policy was not conducted on the complete MOX Facility design and its various components prior to establishing baseline figures. In an effort to assuage concerns of inefficiency, the NNSA expressed to Congress that it would require the facility designs be at least 90 percent complete prior to approving baselines in the future.

DOE remains concerned as to whether the estimated cost and completion dates for the project can be achieved. NNSA continues to move forward with the MOX Facility with a significantly reduced budget however. DOE’s FY 2014 budget request reduced funding for the project by about $117 million from the FY 2013 level. The Department further plans to reduce funding for the MOX Facility in its FY 2015 budget request, announcing that it plans to place the project into a cold standby status while evaluating other more cost efficient plutonium disposition options.

A further ongoing project consideration includes the addition of a 1.5 metric ton-per-year plutonium metal oxidation capacity to the MOX Facility which would use existing assets at Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Savannah River Site. This addition is estimated to increase project costs by $262 million with a completion date of June 2023. Though the conceptual design for the metal oxidation component is 80 percent complete, no formal decision has been rendered to move forward with the addition.

**Recommendations**

Although DOE is examining alternative plutonium disposition measures, the MOX Facility project continues to receive substantial funding, including about $442 million in FY 2014, which was $82 million more than DOE originally requested. In an effort to mitigate the risk of unrestricted cost growth on this project, DOE makes the following recommendations to the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security:

- Direct MOX Services to develop a new baseline change proposal that incorporates the results of the alternative plutonium disposition strategies.
- Request approval of a new MOX Facility project baseline only after all assumptions have been reviewed for reasonableness, the baseline change proposal is independently reviewed, and all necessary corrective actions are taken; and
- Apply the 90 percent design complete review policy to the plutonium metal oxidation capability if this capability is ultimate added to the MOX Facility.

Please see the full report [here](#).
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**ECA Considers WIPP Impacts**

Communities have not changed their minds, but they are watching carefully how DOE manages the issue, how DOE communicates with the local government and state, how DOE investigates the cause, and how DOE ultimately remedies the situation.

All of the local host communities – those currently storing waste and those that may potentially host nuclear waste facilities in the future – are looking for certainty and confidence.

See DOE’s Enforcement Notice of Intent to Investigate Nuclear Waste Partnership, LLC [here](#).

The City of Carlsbad and DOE will co-host its next bi-monthly meeting featuring updates on WIPP recovery activities on July 10th. Live streaming of the weekly meetings can be seen [here](#).

See also DOE’s WIPP Recovery Website [here](#).
DOE Leadership Changes

Deputy Secretary of Energy Daniel Poneman to leave DOE this Fall

After serving for five years as the Deputy Secretary and for a short time as Acting Secretary, Daniel Poneman announced this month that he plans to leave DOE this fall. Secretary Moniz praised Poneman in an email announcing the departure saying: “He has also been instrumental in the Department’s response to crises from negotiations with Iran in 2009, to Fukushima, to Hurricane Sandy, and in developing our emergency response capability. We worked closely over the last year and made significant progress on departmental reorganization and on the energy and nuclear security challenges that are central to President Obama’s agenda.”

Monica Regalbuto Named Environmental Management Associate Principal Deputy Secretary

Dr. Monica Regalbuto has been named Associate Principal Deputy Secretary for the Department of Energy’s Office of Environmental Management. Dr. Regalbuto began work in this new capacity on June 16, while awaiting confirmation of her nomination to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management. Dr. Regalbuto’s expertise will be used to lead mission units within the Office of Environmental Management. She was previously the Deputy Associate Secretary for Fuel Cycle Technologies with the Office of Nuclear Energy. In May, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on her nomination. On June 19, the Senate Armed Services Committee held a hearing for her nomination.

DOE Appoints New Idaho Cleanup Manager

The Department of Energy has selected Jack Zimmerman as its new cleanup chief for the Idaho site. Zimmerman is the federal project director for DOE’s two depleted uranium hexafluoride conversion plants, and is set to begin in his new capacity as DOE Idaho Operation Office’s Deputy Manager for the Idaho Cleanup Project in July. His predecessor, Jim Cooper, is retiring from federal service at the end of July. Zimmerman brings more than 25 years of experience in nuclear operations, and project and environmental management. Most recently, Zimmerman served as a program manager at the DOE’s Portsmouth Paducah Project Office in Kentucky. As Deputy Manager for the Idaho Cleanup Project, Zimmerman will oversee the environmental cleanup and waste management mission at DOE’s Idaho desert site. Zimmerman previously worked at the Miamisburg Closure Project and the DUF6 Conversion Project.

To sign up for the ECA email server please visit our website: www.energyca.org
PRESIDENT TO REAPPOINT NWTRB MEMBERS; NWTRB TO HOST MEETING ON DOE PLANS FOR MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL OF DOE’S SNF AND HLW IN AUGUST

President Obama recently announced his intention to reappoint the five members of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NWTRB) whose terms expired in April 2014. They will each be reappointed to serve four-year terms.

- Rodney Ewing (Chairman)
- Sue Clark
- Linda Nozick
- Kenneth Peddicord
- Paul Turinsky

The NWTRB is comprised of 11 Board members appointed by the President from a list of nominees submitted by the National Academy of Sciences. It is an independent agency of the U.S. Federal Government created in the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987. The NWTRB’s sole purpose is to perform independent scientific and technical peer review of DOE’s program for managing and disposing of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel.

The NWTRB has also announced it will meet in Idaho Falls, ID, on Wednesday, August 6, 2014, to review DOE plans for the packaging, transportation, and disposal of DOE spent nuclear fuel (SNF) and high-level waste (HLW). Discussions will address topics including:

- Extended storage of SNF at DOE sites;
- Treatment of DOE SNF in preparation for offsite transportation and disposal;
- Research and development related to dry-cask storage of high burnup SNF;
- Aging management of SNF storage facilities; and
- Transportation of damaged SNF.

For more information about the meeting – including how to register and a detailed agenda - please see the NWTRB website here.

Reservations must be made by July 6, 2014 to receive the meeting rate.

NWTRB Press Release on Reappointment of Board Members can be found here.

NWTRB Press Release on August Meeting to Discuss DOE’s SNF and HLW Management and Disposal in Idaho Falls can be found here.

GAO REPORT - ADVANCED REACTOR RESEARCH: DOE SUPPORTS MULTIPLE TECHNOLOGIES, BUT ACTIONS NEEDED TO ENSURE A PROTOTYPE IS BUILT

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on June 23, “Advanced Reactor Research: DOE Supports Multiple Technologies, but Actions Needed to Ensure a Prototype Is Built.” The study was conducted in response to a request from the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development asking GAO to review DOE’s Office of Nuclear Energy’s (DOE-NE) research and development (R&D) efforts.

The objectives of the report were to (1) describe NE’s approach to advanced reactor R&D and (2) examine how NE plans and prioritizes its advanced reactor R&D activities, including deploying an advanced reactor prototype.

DOE-NE’s advanced reactor R&D focuses mainly on three reactor technologies: high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, sodium-cooled fast reactors, and fluoride-salt-cooled high-temperature reactors. In addition, DOE fund research on other advanced reactor technologies while collaborating with
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EPA released the final version of its “Groundwater Remedy Completion Strategy: Moving Forward with the End in Mind”

Overview

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released its final version of “Groundwater Remedy Completion Strategy: Moving Forward with the End in Mind.” This guidance is designed to focus resources on the necessary information and decisions to effectively complete groundwater remedies for the protection of the environment and human health. The document consists of a recommended “groundwater remedy completion strategy” for evaluating Superfund groundwater remedy performance and facilitating achievement of remedial action objectives (RAO) and associated cleanup levels. A “groundwater remedy completion strategy” is a recommended site-specific course of action and decision-making to achieve groundwater RAOs using a conceptual site model, performance metrics, and data derived from site-specific evaluations. EPA recommends that a completion strategy be developed for all CERCLA Fund, potentially responsible party (PRP), and federal facility-lead groundwater remedies. This guidance does not alter or supersede existing CERCLA guidance, but rather intends to promote a consistent national approach for implementing groundwater remedies to completion. The recommendations therein do no impose legally binding requirements on EPA, states, tribes, or the regulated community.

Highlights

The recommended steps for developing and implementing site-specific groundwater completion strategy include: (1) Understanding the Site Conditions; (2) Designing Site-Specific Remedy Evaluations; (3) Developing Performance Metrics and Collecting Monitoring Data; (4) Conducting Remedy Evaluations; and (5) Making Management Decisions.

An accurate and updated conceptual site model (“CSM”) is critical to understanding the site conditions and an important foundation for the

(Continued on page 14)
DOE HOSTS FORUM ON REUSE OF FORMER DOE LAND FOR DEVELOPMENT

**ECA Participates in meeting led by Mayor Dick Church, Miamisburg, OH**

The revitalization of former Department of Energy land across the country was focus of a two-day event in early June at the ex-Mound Laboratory site, a 306-acre Miamisburg business park that has been a model for cleaning up, community acquisition and reuse.

The newly named Mound Business Park—formerly known as the Mound Advanced Technology Center co-hosted the Mound Reindustrialization workshop with the DOE Office of Legacy Management.

“We’ve had some success at the Mound for redevelopment and we have some challenges, so we thought this was an ideal location to engage in this topic,” said Gwen Gooten, Mound site manager for the DOE’s office of legacy management.

Since 2010, when the site was declared clean and ready for commercial and industrial re-use after a $1billion-plus environmental cleanup, the business park has attracted 11 businesses and more than 250 jobs.

The workshop included a series of forums focusing on work being done at and around the business park that could apply to the redevelopment of other former federal site and discussions from sites around the country. Notable sessions included Tridec and DOE Hanford identifying the successful redevelopment efforts over the history of the site, the Asset Revitalization Program work, how the Mound site can be used as a model, testimonials from a current Mound tenant and a discussion on the Mound Connector, a $13.3 million plan to widen and improve roads and intersections near the business park to give it better access to interstate 75.

ECA Executive Director Seth Kirshenberg highlighted the Mound facility as model for other communities. He stressed that Mayor Church and others in the community developed their goals for the site and even though DOE told them continuously that certain things would not occur — they kept their focus, advocated for changes to law and policy and accomplished their goals. At certain points, the community along with DOE leaders who also wanted change started to work together to develop joint programs and plans to push the naysayers aside and complete the cleanup and reuse of the facility. All communities should follow the lead and not let “no” be the default response.

Seth Kirshenberg’s presentation is located here.

---

**ECA MEMBER LANE ALLGOOD TO RETIRE**

Lane Allgood, longstanding ECA member and Executive Director of the Partnership for Science and Technology (PST) in Idaho Falls, announced he will retire on July 1, 2014. Lane has been an active nuclear advocate in Idaho and Washington, DC, and an active has been active in the development and coordination of many ECA meetings, policies and projects.

Allgood has been the Executive Director of PST since its inception in 2006. He previously worked in public affairs at Idaho National Laboratory and North Wind Group.

ECA thanks Lane for all of his hard work and wishes him well. ECA looks forward to working with his successor, Leslie Huddleston, the former regional director for Idaho Senator Mike Crapo.
NUSCALE AND DOE COMPLETE SMR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

In May, NuScale Power announced that it had finalized a cooperative agreement with the Department of Energy (DOE) as an awardee under the program for “Cost-Shared Development of Innovative Small Modular Reactor Designs.” NuScale was selected as the sole awardee of the DOE round two funding in December of 2013.

The agreement calls for NuScale to receive up to $217M in matching funds over a five year period. The company will use the funds to perform the engineering and testing needed to proceed through the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Design Certification Process. NuScale expects to submit the application for design certification in the second half of 2016. This will allow NuScale to meet a commercial operation date of 2023 for its first planned project, in Idaho, with partners Energy NorthWest and Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems.

“Small modular reactors represent a new generation of safe, reliable, low-carbon nuclear energy technology and provide a strong opportunity for America to lead this emerging global industry”, said Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, when announcing NuScale’s selection last December. “The Energy Department is committed to strengthening nuclear energy’s continuing important role in America’s low carbon future, and new technologies like small modular reactors will help ensure our continued leadership in the safe, secure and efficient use of nuclear power worldwide.”

See the NuScale press release here.

GAO REPORT: NNSA REPORT TO CONGRESS ON POTENTIAL EFFICIENCIES DOES NOT INCLUDE KEY INFORMATION

This month, The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on their review of the National Nuclear Security Administration’s (NNSA) compliance with mandates to evaluate operational efficiency and cost reduction. The NNSA prepared a report as required by the FY12 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) which described, but did not assess, the role of nuclear security complex sites. However, the NDAA mandated the NNSA to assess opportunities for creating efficiencies at nuclear security complex sites, and how efficiencies would contribute to cost savings and strengthen safety and security. The GAO reviewed the NNSA report to evaluate whether they adequately assessed the role of nuclear security sites.

The GAO found that the NNSA report merely described activities, such as certifying annually that the nuclear weapons stockpile is safe, secure and reliable, as opposed to assessing the role of nuclear security complex sites in supporting safe, secure, and reliable nuclear deterrent or nuclear nonproliferation efforts in the nation. NNSA responded that a prior 2008 report contained an assessment of the role of the nuclear security complex and that this assessment remains valid and does not require a present update. While NNSA officials acknowledged that a new assessment is warranted in the future if circumstances change, the GAO concluded that the NNSA failed to cite the 2008 report as support for its assessment.

(Continued on page 14)
The NNSA’s report to Congress identified seven opportunities, though it failed to assess how the efficiencies could contribute to cost savings or strengthen safety and security. The seven opportunities for efficiencies the NNSA identified are: 1) establishing the Office of Acquisition and Project Management in 2011; 2) establishing the Office of Infrastructure and Operations in fiscal year 2013; 3) consolidating the management and operating contracts for Y-12 Natural Security Complex and the Pantex Plant; 4) efficiencies in the nuclear weapons research and development portfolio, such as refurbishing facilities to reduce downtime between experiments; 5) improving the planning process for High Energy Density activities; 6) reducing the size of the Kansas City Plant; and 7) achieving projected benefits from the new Uranium Processing Facility. Based on prior reviews, the GAO found that three of the efficiency initiatives – consolidating the Y-12 and Pantex, constructing a new uranium processing facility at the Y-12 National Security Complex, and moving Kansas City operations to a smaller leased facility – face challenges which could impact the NNSA’s ability to achieve cost savings if left unaddressed. Because the NNSA failed to assess how each of these initiatives could result in cost savings, the GAO concluded that it is unclear whether any of these initiatives are actual efficiencies. Therefore, Congress does not have the critical information it needs to make budgetary and policy decisions to balance long-term spending and nuclear security goals.

The GAO recommends that the NNSA establish a methodology for estimating the savings derived from potential efficiencies and track savings from such initiatives for future reporting. Detailed information includes how savings from each operational improvement will be achieved, the basis of any assumptions included in the savings estimate, and verification or validation of the accuracy of savings calculations. While the NNSA disagrees that the Act requires them to link efficiencies to cost savings, the GAO contends that its recommendation is valid. Without such detail, Congress is unable to make sound decisions and balance competing objectives. Full Report can be found here.

(Continued from page 11)

EPA Released the Final Version of its “Groundwater Remedy Completion Strategy: Moving Forward with the End in Mind”

Information acquired by asking the right site-specific remedy evaluation questions will also inform remedy operation and implementation. Such questions include, but are not limited to:

- Is the source remediation progressing as intended?
- Are the treatment units functioning as intended?
- Is the plume shrinking as anticipated?
- Do contaminants of concern ("COC") concentration trends indicate that RAO’s and cleanup levels are likely to be met in the expected timeframe discussed in the record of decision?

Site-specific performance metrics and an adequate monitoring program will generate information to inform the remedy evaluations. Metrics may informing current and future cleanup actions.
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EPA Released the Final Version of its “Groundwater Remedy Completion Strategy: Moving Forward with the End in Mind”

Management decisions should then be made based on the remedy evaluations.

The guidance recommends that the site-specific completion strategy be developed as early as possible in the Superfund process. The strategy can be developed in many forms, including as a written report, a flow chart, or a computer-based tool. Development of the strategy as a component of the remedy design phase will lay a strong foundation for effective remedy implementation. It is important to remember that this process is dynamic and the strategy should be re-evaluated and updated as often as necessary.

Read the complete strategy here.

ECA Report Now Available:
A Community Handbook on Nuclear Energy:
Understanding Nuclear Energy and Alternatives for the Future


Written from the perspective of local governments, the Handbook considers the myriad issues related to nuclear energy production and nuclear waste management. It presents concepts, terminology, as well as the benefits and challenges that local government should understand as they consider hosting nuclear facilities. The updated version also includes discussion of efforts over the last two years to prioritize and address nuclear waste management, including:

- The final report and recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future.
- Proposals for a consent-based siting process.

To request hardcopies; please contact Sharon Worley at Sharon.worley@energyca.org.

The report is also available for download on ECA’s website: www.energyca.org
GAO REPORT: ENHANCED TRANSPARENCY COULD CLARIFY COSTS, MARKET IMPACT, RISK, AND LEGAL AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT FUTURE URANIUM TRANSACTIONS

Overview

The GAO reviewed recent transactions between the DOE and USEC, Inc., the only company that uses U.S.-developed technology to enrich uranium. International agreements require the U.S. to use uranium enriched with domestic technology to meet its security needs. In May 2013, USEC ceased enrichment operations, and in March 2014, the company filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. DOE announced it would assume managerial control for continued development of the next generation technology in April 2014.

The GAO report examines: (1) uranium transactions between USEC and DOE in 2012 and 2013; (2) legal concerns regarding those transactions; (3) other issues raised by the transactions; and (4) DOE’s assessment of the transactions’ impact on the domestic uranium market.

Key Findings

In 2012 and 2013, the DOE undertook four uranium transactions involving USEC, Inc., which served to provide the company with operating cash. DOE understood these transactions to be beneficial in two primary ways: (1) by ensuring the availability of domestic low-enriched uranium (LEU) for production of tritium – a key radioactive isotope to enhance the power of nuclear weapons; and (2) by supporting USEC’s development of next-generation enrichment technology. Three of the four transactions consisted of transferring ownership of depleted uranium tails. DOE accepted ownership of two tails, as well as the liability for disposal costs, in exchange for other benefits. In a separate transaction, DOE transferred ownership of tails to a third-party to be re-enriched by USEC. The fourth transaction involved transferring uranium material other than tails.

Legal concerns were identified with all four transactions. The GAO believes that DOE did not have authority to transfer to tails to a third-party for re-enrichment due to restrictions in the USEC Privatization Act. DOE disagreed with this assessment, stating that it was authorized to conduct the third-party transaction under the Atomic Energy Act. Assuming that DOE was correct in asserting its authority under the Atomic Energy Act, GAO found that the transaction did not meet the Act’s requirement to charge a price for the tails because it transferred them without charging any price at all. In a separate transaction, GAO found that DOE failed to obtain a presidential determination that the uranium material was no longer necessary for national security needs, as required by the USEC Privatization Act.

GAO identified other issues concerning DOE’s methods for valuing tails and whether the agency received reasonable compensation from its largest transaction. DOE was unable to complete assessment of the tails valuation because it did not have guidance for determining the value of tails when they are treated as an asset in a transaction. The development of consistent guidance is necessary to ensure that the government receives valuable consideration for tails transferred in such transactions.

Recommendations

GAO made six recommendations to DOE to improve the transparency of its uranium transactions. DOE generally disagreed with GAO’s assessment and recommendations. These recommendations include: (1) reviewing the accuracy of transaction documents and procure independent reviews as necessary; (2) publicly identifying the legal authority DOE relies upon for each uranium transactions; (3) developing guidance for valuing depleted uranium tails in various transactions; (4) mitigating risks for each uranium transaction according to federal internal control standards; (5) conducting rigorous internal assessments; and (6) seeking industry input on the amount of DOE sales or transfers the market can absorb annually.

The full report can be found here.
The other bill that energy communities watch closely is the National Defense Authorization Bill. The House passed its version and the Senate has held up voting on the full bill even though the Armed Services committee has voted it out of committee. This bill has passed for 53 years in a row. We expect the bill to pass after the November elections – but depending on the outcome of the elections, the bill may be delayed to the new Congress (after January 2015).

As we focus on FY 15 appropriations bills moving through Congress, all of the sites are now focused on developing their FY 16 budgets. The development of the FY 16 budget is a critical piece to the final budget package that is submitted by the President to Congress in January 2015.

Senate Energy & Water Subcommittee Markup FY 2015

This month the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development approved its FY 2015 bill. The bill includes $28.35 billion for DOE, an increase of $1.09 billion above FY 14 and $64 million less than the President’s budget request. The full Senate Appropriations Committee has not yet provided details on the Energy and Water bill, but some highlights are listed below:

NNSA Highlights:

- NNSA is funded at $11.89 billion, which is $684 million more than in FY 14 and $232 million less than the request.
- Nuclear Nonproliferation: The bill recommends $1.978 billion, which is $24 million above the fiscal year 2014 level and $423 million above the budget request, for nonproliferation activities that reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism.
- Nuclear Weapons: The bill recommends $8.315 billion, which is $534 million above the fiscal year 2014 level and the same as the budget request, for nuclear weapons activities. This amount will advance life extension programs for the B61 gravity bomb and the W76 submarine-launched warhead, invest in the science, technology and engineering needed to maintain a safe and secure stockpile without underground nuclear weapons testing and upgrade or replace aging infrastructure, especially for uranium and plutonium activities.

EM Highlights:

EM is funded at $5.942 billion, an increase of $111 million above the FY 14 funding level and $320 million more than the budget request. EM funding includes $323 million for recovery efforts at the WIPP.

Other highlights:

The bill contains a provision to manage spent nuclear fuel rods from commercial nuclear reactors at the more than 70 sites across the U.S. This pilot program will establish one or more interim storage sites to consolidate 65,000 metric tons so spent nuclear fuel. This effort will increase the public’s confidence to manage nuclear waste safely, and to reduce the government’s financial liability.

A separate provision would require the NRC to establish minimum security standards for radiological sources at medical and industrial facilities. Recent investigations found that these sources are vulnerable to theft and current regulations are not sufficient to protect the public against radiological terrorism.

House Appropriations Committee Approves FY 2015 Energy and Water Bill

The full House Appropriations Committee approved the FY 2015 Energy and Water Development bill by bipartisan voice vote on June 18. The bill totals $34 billion – which represents a reduction of $50 million from the FY 2014 enacted level and an increase of $327 million above the President’s request. Funding includes:

Office of Nuclear Energy: $899 million

Includes: $484 million for Nuclear Energy Research and Development

(Continued on page 18)
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$54 million for SMR Licensing Technical Support

Office of Science: $5.071 Billion

Office of Legacy Management: $171 Million

Nuclear Waste Disposal: $150 million

To continue the Department of Energy’s statutorily required activities for the Yucca Mountain license application. The committee noted that although some of the recommendations within the Administration’s Strategy for the Management and Disposal of Used Nuclear Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste may have merit, Congress has neither formally considered nor approved them.

NNSA – The bill provides a total of $11.4 billion for DOE’s nuclear weapons security programs, including Weapons Activities, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, and Naval Reactors. This is a $154.6 million increase from the FY 2014 level. This includes:

- $8.2 billion for Weapons Activities – $423.2 million above the FY 2014 enacted level;
- $1.2 billion for Naval Nuclear Reactors – $120.3 million above the FY 2014 enacted level; and
- $1.5 billion for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation – $398.8 million below the FY 2014 enacted level and the same as the President’s request.
- Funding for MOX may be made available only for construction and program support activities

Environmental Management- The bill designates $5.6 billion for environmental management activities, which is $202 million less than the FY 2014 level and $6.7 million above the budget request. $4.8 billion for defense environmental cleanup to safely clean sites contaminated by previous nuclear weapons production, as well as additional funding for various other non-defense related nuclear sites.

Non-defense Environmental Cleanup: $241 million.

WIPP – the bill provides funding for WIPP from funds made available for pension plan payments in excess of legal requirements, up to $90 million under “Weapons Activities” and up to $30 million under “Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.”

Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund: $586 million

This includes funding for the cleanup of gaseous diffusion plants at Portsmouth, Paducah and the East Tennessee Technology Park in Oak Ridge.

### Site by site cleanup funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>FY15 House Appropriations</th>
<th>FY 15 Request</th>
<th>FY 14 Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanford Site</td>
<td>$2.085 B</td>
<td>$2.083B</td>
<td>$2.151B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho National Laboratory</td>
<td>$380 M</td>
<td>$367 M</td>
<td>$387 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos</td>
<td>$180 M</td>
<td>$169 M</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge</td>
<td>$212 M</td>
<td>$206 M</td>
<td>$215 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Site</td>
<td>$1.104 B</td>
<td>$1.150 B</td>
<td>$1.134 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada National Security Site</td>
<td>$64 Million</td>
<td>$64 M</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Isolation Pilot Plant</td>
<td>$236 Million</td>
<td>$216 M</td>
<td>$216 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on page 19)
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**D.C. Update**

The Committee Report Language addresses several areas of concern. The Committee discusses concerns about DOE’s Project Management, including ability to complete major construction projects and ability to develop realistic project budgets. The Committee also discusses the lack of a “coherent energy policy” for the country. It discusses support for including nuclear energy as part of an “all of the above” strategy. The committee expresses concern about the Administration’s proposal to reduce research funding for nuclear energy and the “Administration’s willful disregard of the federal government’s legal responsibilities regarding Yucca Mountain.” The committee is concerned about increasing liability due to the government’s failure to take responsibility for civilian spent nuclear fuel.

**House NDAA Update**

The House Armed Services Committee published its report to accompany the FY 15 NDAA appropriations bill. The House version of the NDAA includes the language to establish a Manhattan Project National Historical Park. The committee identified several items of special interest, two of which specifically concern nuclear deterrent and strategy.

**Comptroller General Review of Nuclear Weapons Council**

Recognizing the imperative role of the Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC), established by the NDAA for FY 1987, the committee directs the U.S. Comptroller General to prepare and submit a report assessing the evolution of the NWC’s role to nuclear weapons strategy. Currently, the NWC is responsible for coordinating DOD and DOE policies, schedules and budgets for developing and modernizing nuclear weapons, delivery systems, and infrastructure. Due April 1, 2015, the report must contain a comprehensive assessment of the Council’s effectiveness in fulfilling its role and responsibilities.

**Briefing on Plutonium Strategy**

Armed Services Committee member John Garamendi (CA-3) offered an amendment to the House NDAA directing the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Security Council to provide a briefing on plutonium strategy to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. A revised strategy would aim to achieve a pit production capacity of 50 to 80 plutonium pits per year in 2027 as compared to a strategy that reaches this goal by 2031. The briefing is scheduled to take place on September 15, 2014.

**Hanford Site Land Conveyance**

Section 2848 of the NDAA requires the Secretary of Energy to convey two parcels of land to the Community Reuse Organization of the Hanford Site in Washington. The parcels consist of 1,341 and 300 acres of the Hanford Reservation. This land conveyance should be completed by December 31, 2014. The Secretary and Community Reuse Organization are authorized to adjust the boundaries of the parcels upon their agreement. The Organization will pay the estimated fair market value of the realty as determined by the Secretary of Energy. However, the Secretary has discretion to convey the land for less than fair market value if the Organization agrees to use the net proceeds from any sale or lease of the property received within seven years to support economic development efforts of the Hanford Site.

**House NDAA Amendments**

The FY 2015 NDAA legislation (H.R. 4435) passed the House, and was received in the Senate on June 5. The Senate bill (S. 2410) was placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders, where it currently remains.

Several amendments have been made to the House FY 2015 NDAA (H.R. 4435) since the April/May Bulletin. Rep. Doc Hastings (WA-4) offered an amendment to Sec. 3143, which increases the budget for environmental cleanup by $20 million. This increase was offset by a reduction of $20
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million to weapons activities for inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign. The amendment was agreed upon by voice vote. Rep. Hastings also proposed an amendment adding Sec. 2867 which requires the Environmental Management Office to provide public access to the summit at Rattlesnake Mountain on Hanford Reach National Monument. This access is intended for educational, recreational, historical, scientific, and cultural activities. Furthermore, the summit must be accessible by motorized, pedestrian, and non-motorized transportation modes. The Secretary of Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the Secretary of Energy, State of Washington and other local government agencies to facilitate development and maintenance of the access road.

FY 2015 Topline Accounts Funding Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY15 Request</th>
<th>FY15 HASC Authorized</th>
<th>FY15 SASC Authorized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defense Environmental Cleanup</td>
<td>$5.33B</td>
<td>$4.87B (decrease is due to elimination of $463M Uranium enrichment D&amp;D fund contribution)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Activities</td>
<td>$8.31B</td>
<td>$8.46B</td>
<td>$8.3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</td>
<td>$1.55B</td>
<td>$1.56B</td>
<td>$1.9B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Legacy Management</td>
<td>$171.98M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>$158.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 2015 Defense Environmental Cleanup Site Funding Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY15 Request</th>
<th>FY15 HASC Authorized</th>
<th>FY15 SASC Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanford</td>
<td>$848.071M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho National Laboratory</td>
<td>$367.203M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory</td>
<td>$1.366M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada NNSA Site</td>
<td>$64.851M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandi National Laboratories</td>
<td>$2.801M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos National Laboratory</td>
<td>$196.017M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>$224.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge Reservation</td>
<td>$206.883M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of River Protection</td>
<td>$1.235B</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Site</td>
<td>$1.1501B</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>$1.2 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Isolation Pilot Plant</td>
<td>$216.08M</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, Rep. Hastings proposed an amendment to Sec. 3117, which adds a new section to the legislation regarding the disposition of weapons-usable plutonium. This amendment prevents further studies that involve bringing weapons-usable plutonium into the State of Washington for disposition at a time when the federal government isn't meeting its existing defense nuclear waste cleanup commitments to the State. The federal government’s existing commitments arise under the Tri-Party Agreement and the 2010 Consent Decree between the Secretary of Energy and State of Washington.

Senate Armed Services FY 2015 NDAA Markup and Committee Report

Defense Environmental Cleanup (Sec. 3102)

The Senate Armed Services Committee recommends authorizing $4.9 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities at DOE. The committee report also noted that its budget request of $463 million for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund will be redistributed. As in fiscal years 2013 and 2014, the committee does not expect Congress to reauthorize provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2002, which are necessary for the $463 million to be allocated to its original purpose.

Savannah River Site

The committee authorized $1.2 billion for cleanup activities at the Savannah River Site, recognizing the critical milestone to finalize treatment of the waste by 2028 under a consent order with the State of South Carolina. The budget request is intended to accelerate cleanup efforts and meet established tank stabilization goals. Delays in constructing the Salt Waste Processing Facility, a critical component in separating high-level from low-level waste, threaten to derail the cleanup schedule. The increased funding is offered to accelerate implementation of the Salt Water Processing Facility.

Hanford Site

The committee authorized the requested budget amount of $848.1 million for the Hanford Site. This funding level excludes the waste treatment and immobilization plant. The committee recommends $690 million for the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and $545 million for tank farm activities. This funding is offered to expedite the treatment of low-level waste streams, particularly at sites such as Hanford where the waste composition in tanks is non-uniform. DOE is directed to inform the committee of the costs associated with pre-treatment of low-level waste. Recognizing that the completion cost of this project has risen from $5.8 billion to $12.3 billion, the committee directs DOE to ensure that it remains well-informed of decisions concerning low-level waste treatment and whether another pre-treatment plant is needed to treat high-level waste.

Idaho National Laboratory

The budget request of $367.2 million was authorized for the Idaho Waste Cleanup. The purpose of this funding is to continue the removal of transuranic and other buried waste for shipment to the WIPP, and continue sodium bearing waste treatment operations.

Los Alamos

To continue removing transuranic waste at Los Alamos National Laboratory for shipment to the WIPP, the committee authorized $224.6 million. This funding level is also earmarked for monitoring groundwater contamination and designing a system to treat hexavalent chromium groundwater contamination at the site.

Oak Ridge

The committee authorized the budget request of $206.9 million for the Oak Ridge Reservation.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)

The committee authorized a budget allocation of $216 million for WIPP. The GAO is also directed to review operations at the plant, specifically concerning safety assurance systems. The GAO is
(Continued from page 21)
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directed to compare the findings of its review to best practices for program management and safety standards for DOE and similar agencies. The GAO will hold an interim briefing by November 30, 2014, and the final report and briefing is due March 31, 2015.

**National Nuclear Security Administration (Sec. 3101)**

**Site Stewardship and Nuclear Operations**

The committee authorized $2 billion for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities Operation. The Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) project is designed to replace the combined Y-12 plant buildings. The projected cost of this 650,000 square foot facility has risen from $11,000 to $14,000 per square foot, and the design alone took 10 years and almost $1 billion. To distribute the cost over time, the facility development will occur with the construction of a small series of buildings. To ensure adequate cost control, the committee directs the GAO to monitor this project and provide periodic updates and management recommendations to Congress. The committee expressed its belief that the proposal to replace lithium production capabilities at the Y-12 facility beginning in FY 2017 should be advanced to FY 2016. The committee further expressed its concern about the deferral of the CMR Replacement project and a long-term strategy for plutonium sustainment.

**Fissile Materials Disposition Program**

The committee authorized $456.1 million for fissile materials disposition, representing an increase of $145 million for construction of the MOX fabrication facility.

**Implementation of Phase 1 of Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project (Sec. 3113)**

The committee recommends a provision requiring technologies and replacements in building 9212 at the Y-12 plant have a technology readiness level of 7 when implemented in the new buildings.

**NNSA Administrative Mandates**

The committee recommends a provision (Sec. 3115) that would require the Administrator of the NNSA respond within 90 days to the findings of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise (Advisory Panel). The Administrator must submit his response to the congressional defense committees. The committee also recommends a provision (Sec. 3116) requiring the Administrator of the NNSA to include in the FY 2016 budget request a specific uranium sustainment budget line. This budget line should be for technology development (past technology readiness level 5) so that facility-directed R&D can focus on projects concerning technology readiness level 4 and below. As it stands, facilities such as Y-12, must develop most uranium technologies on plant directed R&D.

**Bulletin Ideas?**

Would you like to have stories featured in the next Bulletin?

Send your ideas and photos to Allison@energyca.org
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Legend:
- **House and Senate in Session**
- **Senate in Session Only**
- **House in Session Only**
- **Federal Holiday**

Please Note: Congressional schedule is subject to change
### 2014 Calendar of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 29-August 30</td>
<td>ECA Peer Exchange: Next Steps for Nuclear Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1 – Sept 1</td>
<td>House Recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 4 – Sept 1</td>
<td>Senate Recess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>End of FY 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>Beginning of FY 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10-23</td>
<td>Exchange Monitor Decisionmaker’s Forum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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