IDaho Governor and Attorney General announce cleanup and research agreement

On November 7, Governor Brad Little and Attorney General Lawrence Wasden announced an agreement with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to rectify failures of fulfilling the state’s 1995 Idaho Settlement Agreement (ISA). The new agreement also included a directive that will restart research on commercial spent nuclear fuel at Idaho National Laboratory (INL).

The nuclear cleanup and research agreement allows INL a one-time waiver to receive 25 commercial spent nuclear fuel rods (approximately 100 pounds of heavy metal) from the Byron Nuclear Generating Station in Illinois.

Prior to this occurring, DOE must:
- Successfully treat sodium bearing liquid high-level waste at INL by transforming it into a solid state; and
- Allocate at least 55% of all future transuranic waste (TRU) shipments to New Mexico’s Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) facility to shipments originating at INL, while also giving Idaho priority when additional shipments become available.

(Continued on page 2)
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At present, 31,500 cubic meters of TRU waste has been shipped out of Idaho to WIPP.

Remedying the 2014 stalled WIPP shipments is a vital piece of the ISA. Mayor Rebecca Casper of Idaho Falls notes that, “It is highly appropriate that there continues to be a focus in the agreement on IWTU (Integrated Waste Treatment Unit). Processing the remaining liquid waste and then shipping it to WIPP is not only necessary to fulfill the terms of the ISA, it is also just a vital step in Idaho’s clean-up success story.”

According to a fact sheet released by the offices of the Governor and Attorney General, the agreement also provides that there will be a removal of at least an additional 300 pounds of special nuclear material from Idaho by the end of 2021. There will also be a push to treat additional spent nuclear fuel, at the rate of 165 pounds per year on a three-year average through 2028, resulting in Sodium Bonded EBR II Driver Fuel Pins being converted to a safer, solid state.

ECA TO HOST ANNUAL MEETING IN WASHINGTON, DC

On January 30-31, 2020, ECA will host an annual meeting at the Liaison Washington Capitol Hill in Washington, DC.

Sessions during this two-day meeting will focus on DOE Offices of Environmental Management, Nuclear Energy, and the National Nuclear Security Administration. Meeting attendees will have the unique opportunity to hear from DOE officials, key Members of Congress and Congressional staff, and other DC insiders.

Space is limited and will fill quickly – register on Evenbrite here or register by typing in Energyca.org/events.

Hotel Information
Liaison Washington Capitol Hill
415 New Jersey Ave NW
Washington, DC 20001

ECA has reserved a limited room block at the rate of $184.00 per night. This rate is available until Friday, January 3, 2020 or until the block is full. We encourage you to book your room as soon as possible. To make your reservation, please call the hotel directly at 1-888-214-7555 and mention the code “ECA2020.”

Registration Fees
$395 for ECA members/government
$495 for private sector

Interested in becoming a SPONSOR?

Contact ECA Program Manager MacKenzie Kerr at (202) 828-2410 or MacKenzieK@energyca.org
CR expected through December 20; annual defense bill still being negotiated

Congress is expected to vote on another continuing resolution (CR) that will carry over Fiscal Year 2019 funding levels until December 20. The federal government is currently operating under a CR, which was passed at the end of the fiscal year on September 30.

The House passed all of its appropriations bills this summer, while the Senate still has not acted on many of its bills. In October, the Senate passed a package of spending bills for the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and Transportation. However, a package that contained funding for energy and defense has stalled.

House and Senate negotiators are still working out differences between the chambers’ versions of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). Legislators on the conference committee have stated the main issue preventing a final agreement is whether the bill should authorize funding for the construction of a wall on the southern border.

Last month Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK) introduced a “skinny” NDAA bill, which contains non-controversial elements of the annual defense bill. The bill excludes legislative issues that have not been resolved, such as certain nuclear modernization efforts.

It is unclear how funding for defense environmental cleanup would be impacted, as the released bill text does not yet include detailed funding levels for each site. A Senate Armed Services Committee aide told CQ Roll Call that the missing funding tables will be added if the Senate decides to move forward with the Inhofe bill. The funding tables should not be expected to be released soon, however, as the Senate indefinitely postponed action on the skinny NDAA bill, and House Armed Services Chairman Adam Smith (D-WA) has ruled it out as a backup plan for the original comprehensive bill.

Senate holds Brouillette confirmation hearing

After many weeks of speculation on whether Secretary Rick Perry would leave his position, a definitive answer was provided as Secretary Perry plans to leave the Department of Energy on December 1, 2019. President Trump nominated Deputy Secretary of Energy Dan Brouillette to replace Secretary Perry. Brouillette was previously confirmed to the number two position at DOE in a bipartisan 79-17 vote in the Senate in August 2017.

During his hearing, Brouillette was asked about specific DOE programs, such as ARPA-E and Yucca Mountain. Regarding funding for ARPA-E, Brouillette responded, “Now that I find myself on the executive branch, the commitments I can give to you are that I will fight for these programs within our department because I think they’re important.”

Regarding the Yucca Mountain repository, Brouillette told Senator Catherine Cortez Masto (D-NV), “At the moment, I can give you the assurance that in the near term as Secretary, until the Congress makes a decision on Yucca Mountain, nothing will happen at the Department of Energy.”

Congressional retirements in 2020 will impact DOE sites

The composition of Congress and its committees will look noticeably different after the 2020 elections. As of today, 21 members of Congress have announced their retirements, and a handful of others will be leaving their current positions to run for another office. Of those retiring, 16 are Republicans and 5 are Democrats. At least 4 of those legislators retiring currently represent a DOE site.

While the number of upcoming retirements does not approach the number seen in 2018 yet (55 total), it is worth noting that the 117th Congress will not have many of the current officials who represent DOE sites across the complex, in key to committee leadership positions including the Ranking Member of the House Armed Services Committee and the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Energy and Water Development Subcommittee.
Tennessee

Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-TN) will not run for a fourth term. As Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Energy and Water Development Subcommittee and a member of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Sen. Alexander currently represents Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Y-12 National Security Complex, and East Tennessee Technology Park.

Texas

Rep. Mac Thornberry (R-TX) is the top Republican (Ranking Member) on the House Armed Services Committee, which oversees funding authorizations for DOE and NNSA in the annual defense bill. Rep. Thornberry, who announced his retirement in October, represents a district that contains the Pantex Plant.

New Mexico

Sen. Tom Udall (D-NM) announced that he will not run for a third term. Sen. Udall represents Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), and Sandia National Laboratories, and has played a key role on the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Rep. Ben Ray Lujan (D-NM), Assistant House Speaker, is not retiring but has announced plans to run for the Senate seat vacated by Sen. Udall. Rep. Lujan currently represents LANL, sits on the House Energy and Commerce Committee, and co-chairs the House Nuclear Cleanup Caucus.

Other Important Legislative and Committee Retirements

Rep. John Shimkus (R-IL) will not seek another term in 2020. Rep. Shimkus has been one of the most vocal supporters of the proposed repository at Yucca Mountain and has introduced the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act in recent sessions of Congress. He is currently the top Republican on the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, which oversees nuclear waste policy.

Rep. Nita Lowey (D-NY) will retire after serving 16 terms in Congress. While her district does not represent a DOE/NNSA site, her retirement creates a vacancy for one of the most powerful positions in Congress—Chair of the House Appropriations Committee. So far, Reps. Marcy Kaptur (D-OH)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Energy Budget &amp; Appropriations Highlights*</th>
<th>FY 2019 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2020 Request</th>
<th>FY 2020 House Bill</th>
<th>FY 2020 Senate Bill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</strong></td>
<td>35,685,317</td>
<td>31,702,529</td>
<td>37,087,431</td>
<td>39,031,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Environmental Cleanup</td>
<td>6,024,000</td>
<td>5,506,501</td>
<td>5,993,650</td>
<td>6,226,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanford/Richland</td>
<td>865,171</td>
<td>628,820</td>
<td>845,702</td>
<td>900,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of River Protection</td>
<td>1,573,000</td>
<td>1,392,460</td>
<td>1,555,000</td>
<td>1,616,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho National Laboratory</td>
<td>433,200</td>
<td>334,854</td>
<td>423,500</td>
<td>373,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>1,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separations Process Research Unit</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada NNSA Sites</td>
<td>60,136</td>
<td>60,737</td>
<td>60,737</td>
<td>60,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandia National Laboratory</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>2,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos National Laboratory</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>195,462</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge Reservation</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>292,781</td>
<td>367,672</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah River Site</td>
<td>1,387,657</td>
<td>1,463,132</td>
<td>1,429,890</td>
<td>1,469,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Isolation Pilot Plant</td>
<td>396,907</td>
<td>391,642</td>
<td>396,907</td>
<td>396,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>247,480</td>
<td>308,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Demonstration Project</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,215</td>
<td>75,215</td>
<td>75,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaseous Diffusion Plants</td>
<td>101,304</td>
<td>103,073</td>
<td>103,073</td>
<td>113,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Sites</td>
<td>131,456</td>
<td>66,692</td>
<td>127,212</td>
<td>127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uranium Enrichment Decontamination &amp;</td>
<td>841,129</td>
<td>715,112</td>
<td>873,479</td>
<td>906,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>109,439</td>
<td>195,693</td>
<td>195,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paducah</td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td>207,215</td>
<td>207,215</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>408,099</td>
<td>355,661</td>
<td>418,295</td>
<td>418,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legacy Management</strong></td>
<td>158,877</td>
<td>303,029</td>
<td>162,029</td>
<td>162,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Nuclear Security Administration</td>
<td>15,228,618</td>
<td>16,485,000</td>
<td>15,894,281</td>
<td>16,910,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Activities</td>
<td>11,100,000</td>
<td>12,408,603</td>
<td>11,760,800</td>
<td>12,742,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</td>
<td>1,930,000</td>
<td>1,993,302</td>
<td>2,079,930</td>
<td>2,085,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Reactors</td>
<td>1,788,618</td>
<td>1,648,396</td>
<td>1,628,551</td>
<td>1,648,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nuclear Energy</strong></td>
<td>1,326,090</td>
<td>824,000</td>
<td>1,317,808</td>
<td>1,517,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td>6,585,000</td>
<td>5,545,972</td>
<td>6,870,000</td>
<td>7,215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yucca Mountain and Interim Storage</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Waste Disposal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These figures are compiled from different sources: the Office of Management and Budget, Congressional Appropriations Committee reports, DOE budget justifications, and various press releases. There are some discrepancies in how each source calculates government spending.

*Note: These figures are compiled from different sources: the Office of Management and Budget, the congressional appropriations committee reports, and press releases. There are some variation.
GAO Reports

**GAO urges risk-informed cleanup decisions by DOE**

One of the most important issues to ECA is managing the various opinions of risk, and with the question of risk comes the need for risk communication, as discussed in our report, *The Politics of Cleanup.* A central commonality among a vast number of the disputes at DOE facilities over the past 10 years, particularly disputes resulting in congressional intervention, concerned differing notions of risk.

For environmental cleanup to proceed, the agency charged with cleaning up the site and the agencies regulating the cleanup must agree on numerous issues regarding risk — e.g., what risk level is achievable and politically acceptable, and what level of cleanup will ensure the agreed-to risk meets regulatory requirements. For cleanup to garner the support of the local governments and other community members surrounding the site, the parties must agree on technical risks as well as perceptions of risk — e.g., will the community accept the given risk and can the risk that results from contamination being left at the facility support the future use?

ECA believes discussions, which need to take place throughout the process, must include the question of technical risk and perceptions of risk, recognizing perceptions of risks posed do not always align with the technical risk. ECA has recommended the following steps to facilitate these discussions, which can work in tandem with GAO's framework:

- Create trust between the parties or the information/data will not be accepted;
- Hold regular technical meetings;
- Provide pre-decisional drafts of cleanup documents to the community;
- Provide local governments and other members of the community with broad access to federal site personnel;
- Hold regular meetings between the federal facilities manager and community members; and
- Educate new parties as they become involved.


In its framework for making risk-informed cleanup decisions, one of GAO’s recommended phases includes engaging stakeholders. GAO noted, “...the goals of engaging stakeholder groups representing members of the public in a risk-informed cleanup decision should be to incorporate their viewpoints and to seek their acceptance of the decision-making process as transparent and legitimate, rather than to obtain their concurrence with the final decision.”

Risk communication is an issue that is vitally important for the parties to understand, especially those parties charged with implementing and regulating the cleanup.

**What GAO Found**

“To assist agencies, such as DOE, in identifying and implementing the essential elements of risk-informed decision-making, GAO synthesized key concepts from relevant literature and input from experts who participated in GAO’s meeting convened by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (National Academies). GAO subsequently developed a framework to be relevant to multiple types of cleanup decisions, from selecting a cleanup approach at a single site to prioritizing cleanup activities across sites. According to literature, entities implementing the framework should ensure that their decision-making process is participatory, logical, transparent, and traceable, and that it uses current scientific knowledge to produce technically credible results. The framework consists of four broad phases: (1) designing the decision-making process, (2) analyzing different options, (3) deciding which option is preferred, and (4) implementing and evaluating the preferred option. Each phase consists of several steps, such as identifying stakeholders, developing an analysis plan, and validating the analysis...”

**GAO report recommends DOE should update PILT order**

PILT is a critical issue for ECA communities. This October GAO released its review of the Department of Energy’s (DOE) Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program...
and Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) have expressed interest in filling the chair position in 2021.

It is also important to highlight retiring members who do not represent DOE/NNSA sites in their districts but who sit on the committees with jurisdiction over funding and policy for the sites. From the House Appropriations Committee, Reps. Will Hurd (R-TX), Martha Roby (R-AL), and Jose Serrano (D-NY) will not seek new terms.

From the House Energy and Commerce Committee, Reps. Pete Olson (R-TX), Susan Brooks (R-IN), Bill Flores (R-TX), and Dave Loebsack (D-IA) plan to retire.

Finally, from the House Armed Services Committee, Reps. Rob Bishop (R-UT), Mike Conaway (R-TX), Paul Mitchell (R-MI), and Susan Davis (D-CA) will retire.

Since 2000, an average of 29 members of Congress retire during presidential election years. Therefore, it is possible that there will be a few additional retirements announced in the coming months.

All members of the House are up for re-election in 2020. Around one-third of the Senate is up for re-election, including several Senators who represent DOE sites: Sens. Jim Risch (R-ID), Lindsey Graham (R-SC), Mitch McConnell (R-KY), and John Cornyn (R-TX).

With several vacancies opening in districts and states that represent DOE sites, and even more vacancies on important committees with relevant jurisdiction, ECA will continue its role in engaging and educating federal lawmakers about local communities’ priorities.

---

**Major Contracts and Awards**

**EM releases RFI for Moab UMTRA Project, Remedial Action Contract**

On November 4, DOE issued a Request for Information (RFI) for the Moab UMTRA Project, Remedial Action Contract (RAC).

The scope of the contract includes “the maintenance of facilities, grounds, and railroad structures at the Moab Site and the Crescent Junction disposal cell, necessary to continue relocation of the mill tailings and associated wastes.” This RFI solicits feedback from interested parties on the Draft Performance Work Statement and potential contracting alternatives/terms. Additional information is available here.

---

**RFI released for Nationwide Low-Level and Mixed Low-Level Waste Treatment Services**

On November 12, DOE released a Request for Information (RFI) for the Nationwide Low-Level and Mixed Low-Level Waste Treatment Services.

EM is in the acquisition planning process for the potential award of the contract to perform Nationwide Waste Treatment Services. The RFI seeks feedback regarding “options for innovative approaches for the performance of the major elements of scope as well as insight into potential contracting alternatives.” Additional information is available here.
(Continued from page 6)

GAO Reports

(PILT) – the first such review since 1994. The new report, “Revisions to DOE Order Could Provide Better Assurance That Payments Meet Goals” was provided to the chairs and ranking members of the House and Senate Energy Appropriations committees and outlined recommendations that, if implemented, could better address inequities and provide assurance that payments meet PILT goals.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 authorized DOE to make payments in lieu of taxes that would have otherwise been payable to communities if properties acquired by DOE or its predecessor agencies had remained subject to state or local taxes.

In the report, GAO recommends that the Secretary of Energy should direct DOE’s Office of the Chief Financial Officer to revise DOE’s PILT order to:

1. Maintain documentation of key determinants of PILT payments for each community to help ensure payments are consistent with the agreed-upon bases of PILT payments and goals.

2. Require DOE site offices to review key determinants of PILT payments in communities’ PILT invoices for accuracy and consistency with the agreed upon bases of PILT payments and goals, and for DOE headquarters to document its review and validation of site office determinations.

3. Revise DOE’s PILT order to provide additional guidance on how communities should calculate their payment requests for PILT invoices.

GAO reports that communities around 12 DOE sites currently or recently received PILT as of 2017. These communities use PILT payments for public goods and services such as emergency response, roads and schools. However, the report finds, there have been many revisions to DOE PILT orders over time. Modifications to eligibility requirements, criteria, evaluation, and how payments are to be calculated have introduced considerable variability in payments across sites, making it difficult for local governments to develop annual budgets and for DOE to ensure PILT goals are being met.

As Oak Ridge City Manager, Mark Watson stated: “The report illustrates the diversity of sites across the DOE Complex, and we must also bear in mind that property value assessments are governed by the laws of each state. The Oak Ridge site is particularly complex, with several DOE missions and the entire site located in our city limits. We continue to work productively with our site office to improve the process, as our community does not view the PILT as discretionary, it is funding upon which we rely to provide excellent schools and other services expected of a DOE host community.” Ron Woody, County Executive of neighboring Roane County, added, “Our community’s river system currently has environmental postings due to DOE’s legacy waste. We appreciate the GAO reporting - we must address the existence of both positive and negative impacts, as well as the specials burdens borne by some DOE host communities.”

David Reeploeg, Vice President of Federal Programs at TRIDEC, the economic development organization serving communities around DOE’s Hanford site, explained, “If there were no federal government presence, the Hanford Site would in all likelihood be used for growing high-value crops such as apples, cherries, and wine grapes today. Local jurisdictions would then be receiving property taxes on that valuable land, so it’s only right that PILT funding is used to make them whole. These funds support local schools, hospitals, veterans programs, roads and much more in the Tri-City community, and we sincerely appreciate our congressional delegation’s steadfast support for this program. We understand the desire for consistency across the DOE complex, and believe that Benton County’s current program could be a good model for other sites. Moving forward, we hope there will be an open line of communication between DOE and host communities regarding DOE’s response to the GAO report.”

GAO reports DOE indicated it will “undertake a comprehensive assessment of the PILT program, its objectives, and the manner in which DOE accomplishes PILT’s objectives.” DOE also stated “it will convene a working group to identify high-level options for PILT and recommend appropriate changes, if necessary, to DOE leadership.” See the full report.

(Continued on page 9)
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GAO finds improvements in NNSA budget estimates, has recommendations to enhance completeness

Congress directed the President, DOD, and DOE to develop a nuclear weapons sustainment plan for fiscal years 2013 through 2023. GAO is required to review each annual report and evaluate the agencies’ budget estimates and methodologies used. In their joint report, DOD/DOE show that sustainment and modernization efforts are expected to cost hundreds of billions of dollars over the next 10 years.

On November 7, GAO released an evaluation of DOD/DOE’s Fiscal Year 2019 report and found that their cost estimates were “generally consistent with their internal funding and modernization plans.” GAO noted, however, that DOE “did not include a full 10 years of budget data in the joint report as it had in most previous years.”
**INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS**

**Audit of Implementation of Employee Concerns Programs (ECP) at Selected Office of Environmental Management (EM) Sites**

The DOE Office of Inspector General (IG) conducted an audit to ensure that employee concerns related to environment, safety, health, and management of Department programs are addressed in an independent, timely, and objective manner. The Department’s ECP is engineered to produce free and open communication without fear of punishment. The IG found that SRNS’s and Fluor Idaho’s ECPs adequately handled the concerns officially filed by employees. Concerns were tracked to closure, as evident in the sufficient documentation by the ECPs files. The audit was limited to two EM contractor operation; however, any actions taken should be disseminated throughout the entire EM complex.

**Inspection Report of Management of Controlled Substances at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)**

Los Alamos, under Federal laws and regulations, conducts research involving controlled substances. This inspection report was generated to determine if officials at LANL managed controlled substances in accordance with the appropriate laws and regulations. During the investigation, it was found that “Los Alamos possessed mislabeled procurement records, inaccurate inventories, and retained controlled substance inventories well beyond the conclusion of experiments. [We] determined that Los Alamos did not have appropriate institutional processes, procedures, or controls in place to monitor, track, account for, and dispose of controlled substances.” Los Alamos responded to the IG concerns with corrective actions, including a new institutional policy. With Los Alamos moving forward with this new institutional policy, the IG “did not make any formal recommendations” but does suggest an “initial evaluation of the policy’s effectiveness.”

**A NEW MODEL FOR IMPROVING INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESILIENCE IN ENERGY COMMUNITIES – FOLLOWING DOD’S LEAD**

Success at DOE and NNSA sites across the nuclear complex is achieved best when surrounding local communities work in partnership together to facilitate the DOE/NNSA mission and the communities’ goals. DOE’s involvement with state, local, and tribal governments could take one step further and become even more effective by following the Department of Defense’s (DOD) newest program pursuant to which DOD invests with the community in infrastructure to advance its mission.

By improving the areas “outside the fence,” there are several mutual benefits to DOE sites and to those who live nearby. Such investments by DOE into the communities would help workforce recruitment, improve facility resilience, ensure safety, improve operational efficiency, and potentially create cost savings long-term.

Lawmakers have already recognized that these benefits exist for military installations, as Congress authorized DCIP in 2018.

The program allows DOD to make direct grants to state and local governments to “address deficiencies in community infrastructure supportive of a military installation, if the Secretary determines that such assistance will enhance the military value, resilience, or military family quality of life at such military installation.”

(Continued on page 11)
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The House and Senate Armed Services Committees even noted “the importance of the communities that surround and support U.S. military installations and believe that this program can be of tremendous benefit to both the surrounding community and respective installations.”

The communities contribute at least 30 percent of the funding for any project (unless in a rural area). Congress identified specific projects that qualify for funding: “any transportation project; school, hospital, police, fire, emergency response, or other community support facility; or water, wastewater, telecommunications, electric, gas, or other utility infrastructure project that is located off of a military installation and owned by a State or local government.”

There are at least 200 defense community infrastructure projects identified as potential recipients of DCIP grants. They span various types of infrastructure: a joint-use water treatment plant at the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center; repair of access roads at Tyndall Air Force Base; construction of a new STEM-based high school next to Whiteman Air Force Base; and improvements to the microgrid for the Virginia National Guard.

Local communities are often relied upon to foot the bill for infrastructure and municipal services that benefit the DOE sites. For example, Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) officials have announced plans for new construction projects to accommodate the lab’s increased role in plutonium pit production. Some of that construction, such as the road improvements, would be the responsibility of the state or local governments, according to LANL director Tom Mason. This shared infrastructure, which benefits laboratory operations and the employees who commute from surrounding areas, exemplifies the same relationship that Congress recognized between military installations and their communities.

Community infrastructure extends beyond what usually comes to mind, such as roads and utilities. Schools and housing are becoming more important than ever at a time when DOE and NNSA are attempting to recruit a new generation of employees into the workforce. Incentivizing the brightest prospective workers and their families to accept jobs at a DOE site means investing into the community to make their quality of life as attractive as possible.

Establishing this type of program for energy communities is especially viable given recent developments in the federal budget. The recent budget deal that raises federal spending limits now provides Congress with more flexibility in national security funding, as domestic and defense spending is set to increase more than $320 billion over the next two fiscal years.

Communities are the lifeblood of DOE sites and national laboratories—from the workers to the local services. Congress should take this opportunity to prioritize the authorization and funding of an energy community infrastructure program.

15 MAJOR EM CONTRACTS EXPIRING IN 2020

 Communities surrounding DOE sites are impacted in many ways whenever DOE begins a new contracting process. The approach to—and ultimate success of—these contracts is vital to the overall nuclear security and nuclear waste cleanup mission in the United States, the health and viability of the communities that host these sites, the strength of the future workforce, and the sustainability of businesses—both small and large—that take on these unique tasks. Contracts provide a basis for community members and Congress to gauge cleanup progress, which in turn can increase trust and confidence in the cleanup.

ECA communities at all of DOE’s sites continue to ask the Office of Environmental Management (EM) for regular briefings on the timing of the contracts. Each contract delay impacts the community and adds uncertainty for the workers, local governments and their budgets, and small businesses who may serve as subcontractors. ECA
15 major EM contracts expiring in 2020

has advocated for contracts to include community engagement requirements, emphasize longer-term contracts (five years versus three years with two one-year options), and include community cleanup priorities clearly in the contract scope.

ECA appreciates the opportunity to discuss these principles with EM, which has been holding regular community meetings for each procurement at the same time DOE meets with interested bidders.

Last year DOE released a modified End State Contracting Model (ESCM) in hopes of better defining “discrete scopes of work for site closure or end states” and providing for “more realistic, reliable pricing and appropriate incentive structures.”

At this year’s National Cleanup Workshop, EM Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Todd Shrader discussed with industry leaders and local government officials the Department’s plan to continue pursuing and implementing end state contracting. DOE will apply the new model to several upcoming procurements.

EM currently has 31 major contracts that are active. Of those contracts, 15 of them are expiring in 2020:

- Environmental Program Services in Nevada (expiring 1/31/2020)
- Security Services at Savannah River Site (expiring 2/7/2020)
- West Valley Demonstration Project Interim End State (completion contract, expiring 3/9/2020)
- NRC Licensed Facilities Management Contract in Idaho (expiring 3/31/2020)
- Decontamination & Decommissioning Project for the East Tennessee Technology Park (expiring 7/31/2020)
- Hanford 222-S Laboratory Analysis and Testing Services (expiring 9/20/2020)
- Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Management and Operating Contract (expiring 9/30/2020)
- Tank Operations Contract at Hanford (expiring 9/30/2020)

- Paducah Infrastructure Services (expiring 9/30/2020)
- Hanford Site Central Plateau Remediation (expiring 9/30/2020)
- Design, Construction and Commissioning of the Salt Waste Processing Facility at Savannah River Site (completion contract, expiring 9/30/2020)
- Savannah River Liquid Waste Program (expiring 9/30/2020)
- Management and Operation (M&O) of the Savannah River Site (expiring 9/30/2020)
- Transuranic Waste Processing at Oak Ridge (expiring 10/26/2020)
- Carlsbad Technical Assistance Contract (expiring 12/3/2020)

There are 14 contracts currently being competed for procurement by EM, including cleanup at Oak Ridge Reservation, Hanford, and Idaho. DOE has made available a listing of major procurement actions, which is based on information from DOE’s Acquisition Forecast.

DOE has missed some of its anticipated award deadlines, leading to a number of recently announced contract extensions. Mission Support Alliance’s site-wide services contract at Hanford was extended for six months; the M&O contract held by Savannah River Nuclear Solutions was extended through September 2020; and the Central Plateau remediation contract at Hanford was extended through September 2020.

At the 2019 National Cleanup Workshop, a DOE representative acknowledged the delays and said they are due in part to DOE’s desire to ensure the contracts are set up correctly, which means evaluating the technological needs, the workforce and leadership, and the structure of the contract.

According to DOE, anticipated evaluations or awards to be completed in March-May 2020 include the cleanup contract at Oak Ridge Reservation; Nationwide Deactivation, Decommissioning & Removal (DD&R); and the Idaho Cleanup Project contract.

For more information about ECA’s work on contracting, read our report, Changing Course: The Case for Sensible DOE Acquisition Reform.
A CONVERSATION WITH IKE WHITE

On November 13, Ike White, Senior Advisor for Environmental Management (EM) to the Under Secretary of Science, spoke at a special event for the House Nuclear Cleanup Caucus. The event opened with remarks from Rep. Chuck Fleischmann, the Chairman of the Nuclear Cleanup Caucus. Rep. Fleischmann expressing the support that EM has within the House and Senate and recognizing that the cleanup of legacy waste is a federal obligation.

Also in attendance were Rep. Joe Wilson from South Carolina and Rep. Bill Foster of Illinois.

During a facilitated question and answer session, Mr. White commented on the accomplishments, challenges, and future of the EM program. When asked about the main takeaways from his site visits, Mr. White responded that he was pleased to see real progress at all the sites. In particular he noted how at Oak Ridge small businesses were celebrated, and Hanford was able to follow through on a cleanup goal while staying on budget and on schedule.

Regarding challenges, Mr. White was adamant about the difficulty posed by tank waste, stating it will be a priority over the next 18-24 months. Another challenge he noted, continuing to execute, as well as to demonstrate to Congress that investments are yielding success.

When discussing the future of EM and legacy waste, Mr. White said there must be a push to come up with innovative ways of doing business. He further explained he wants to see technology be taken advantage of in order to accelerate cleanup, making it a worthwhile investment and something that will be further researched.

In his closing remarks, Mr. White again emphasized that investment made in cleanup does accomplish the end goals, that real progress is being made and organizations, local governments, small businesses, and federal managers will all make sure that continues.

Yucca Mountain proponents and opponents are preparing for a fresh fight in the 115th Congress, but the politics of today are still greatly colored by the long history of the proposed repository. The book, Waste of a Mountain, tells the story of the 70-year-long effort to dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain. The book, written by Michael Voegele and Donald Vieth, details the history of government action in the effort to locate and develop a site for the permanent disposition of the waste. The book is available on the Pahrump Valley Museum’s website here.
SAVE the DATE

September 16-18, 2020
Hilton Alexandria Mark Center
ECA Annual Meeting – Looking Towards 2020
January 30-31, 2020
Liaison Washington Capital Hill
415 New Jersey Ave NW
Washington, DC

ECA members will have a board meeting from 8:30 to noon on Thursday January 30th prior to the start of the meeting

**THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm - 1:15pm</td>
<td>Welcome Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15pm - 1:45pm</td>
<td>Understanding EM Priorities and the Year Ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45pm - 2:30pm</td>
<td>DOE/NNSA – What to Expect in an Election Year Roundtable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30pm - 2:45 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45pm - 3:45pm</td>
<td>Panel: A View from the Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:45pm - 4:30pm</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: DOE/NNSA Contracting 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00pm - 7:00pm</td>
<td>Welcome Reception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00am - 8:30am</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30am - 9:00am</td>
<td>NE Goals for 2020 – SMRs and Nuclear Energy Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am - 9:30am</td>
<td>NNSA Goals and Priorities 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00am - 10:30 am</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30am - Noon</td>
<td>Role of Sender and Receiver Sites and Needs for 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm - 1:15pm</td>
<td>Lunch speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 - 3:30pm</td>
<td>Panel: Role of Private Sector &amp; Identifying Successful Public-Private Economic Development Partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For registration, visit www.energyca.org/events
2020 Upcoming Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 30-31, 2020</td>
<td><strong>ECA Annual Meeting</strong>, Washington, DC; Email ECA Program Manager MacKenzie Kerr at <a href="mailto:mackenziek@energyca.org">mackenziek@energyca.org</a> for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16-18, 2020</td>
<td><strong>National Cleanup Workshop</strong>, Alexandria, VA; Visit <a href="https://www.cleanupworkshop.com">https://www.cleanupworkshop.com</a> or email ECA Program Director Dylan Kama at <a href="mailto:dylank@energyca.org">dylank@energyca.org</a> for more information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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