

Historic Preservation Consultation Meeting
Nuclear Ship *SAVANNAH* National Historic Landmark
July 18, 2023, 2:30-4pm EDT
(Hybrid on-board NS *Savannah* and MS Teams)

Participants:

- Erhard W. Koehler, Manager, N.S. *Savannah* Programs, MARAD
- Chris Daniel, Program Analyst, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Jean Trefethen, Environmental Program Manager, NMSS, NRC
- John Kelly, Retired DOE, past president of ANS
- Gail Marcus, past president, ANS
- Matthew Schulte, Executive Director, Steamship Historical Society of America
- Jed Porter, Architect, NPS Region 1, North Atlantic - Appalachian
- Liz Casso, Preservation Officer, Project Review and Compliance, MHT; SHPO
- Bob Adams, President, NS Savannah Association
- Anne Jennings, Cultural Resource Specialist, Tidewater, Inc.
- Ed Tupin, Health Physics Society
- James Stemm, Curator, National Museum of Nuclear Science & History
- Wendy Coble, Acting Federal Preservation Officer, MARAD
- Kevin Tokarski, Associate Administrator for Strategic Sealift, MARAD
- Dan O'Rourke, ANL
- Dan Roberts, Curator, MARAD
- Soeuth "Caleb" Soeun, Decommissioning Program Manager, MARAD
- Alexis Clark, Historic Preservation Specialist, ACHP
- Ricardo Schiappacasse
- Michael Moan
- Silas York
- Arthur Cole

See Acronym List at the end of the document

Agenda:

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Minutes Review (March 21, 2023)
- III. Program Update
- IV. Status of PA Stipulations
 - a. PRG Charter
 - b. Revised preliminary schedule of future meetings and milestones
 - c. Disposition Alternatives Study
 - d. NOA / RFI
 - e. Working discussion of mitigation for scrapping (architectural salvage)
- V. Other Business / Adjourn
- VI. Next Meeting: September 19, 2023

Welcome and Introductions

Erhard opened the meeting and went around introducing the group. He, Bob Adams, Wendy Coble, Ed Tupin, and Caleb Souen were on the ship, the remainder of the participants joined via TEAMS or phone.

Minutes Review

The March 21, 2023 minutes were shared via e-mail prior to the meeting, as well as on the screen during the meeting, and there were no comments.

Program Update

Erhard provided an update on the decommissioning activities, noting that the bulk of the dismantlement has been completed, and most radioactive materials have been shipped to Clive, Utah. The next shipment will be transported to Clive in August. Last meeting Erhard noted that MARAD is looking at the possibility of keeping some coolant piping and they have taken samples to determine if it can be decontaminated and returned to the ship. He will keep the group posted on the outcome, and noted additional consultation with MHT may be necessary.

Erhard noted that he anticipates that the LTP will be entered into concurrence with MARAD next week, with the goal of getting their approval by the end of the fiscal year.

Erhard went through photos of the CV, particularly noting how much was able to be retained. This will allow the ship to have a greater interpretive value and would be the only place in the US where you could see a reactor in this condition. He also noted that the elements remaining would only need to be painted to return them to their historic appearance.

John Kelly asked if there is a list of the major components which remain, and Erhard indicated that this information will be included in the LTP (specifically chapter 3).

Programmatic Agreement Stipulations

PRG Charter

Erhard noted that we revised the charter because of ACHP comments. It was e-mailed to the group and aside from Chris Daniel, who had no further comments, no additional comments were received. There were two minor revisions since then which were reviewed. These included changing the timeframe for providing the agenda and draft deliverables from fifteen (15) days to one (1) week prior to the meeting. There were no concerns raised about any of the revisions. A question was raised regarding if the charter needed to be adopted by voting. Chris noted that in other groups like this, the federal agency (as the responsible agency) allows for a comment period, and if no comments, will proceed to finalize. It is anticipated that the PRG will function in a similar fashion, and MARAD will provide deliverables for review and comment but there will not be a group vote or consensus. The finalized charter will be e-mailed to the group, and Erhard also noted that there is a revision clause if it needs to be revisited in the future.

Schedule

Anne reviewed the preliminary schedule which includes the meeting schedule and timeframes for draft deliverables. A question was raised about what exactly the RFP will entail. Erhard noted that this may not be a typical RFP and will be driven by the information gathered during the NOA/RFI, but the goal is that the RFP would be looking for proposals for preservation of the ship. Erhard also noted that while MARAD is making an affirmative effort to preserve the ship, it is not a given that preservation will be the ultimate outcome.

A question was also raised about the timeline for the NOA/RFI. A draft is anticipated for review in September by the PRG, with 30 days for comments. The goal is to post this on the Federal Register, docket, and website in October. There will be a site visit at 60 days with responses requested at 90 days. The goal is to disseminate as widely as possible and Erhard noted that this is where it is important that we have members of the nuclear community on the PRG, as the NSS is both a significant element of America's maritime and nuclear heritage.

John Kelly asked if the LTP should be distributed to the PRG before NRC, and Erhard clarified it will be provided to both at the same time. It is anticipated this will happen in September, which puts termination by September 2025 at the earliest.

A question was asked if the schedule could be distributed. The schedule is still preliminary and will need to be finalized and vetted through MARAD, and once that happens it will be distributed. Kevin noted that it is an aggressive schedule which will require coordination within MARAD.

NOA/RFI

Erhard showed a draft on the screen, which still needs to go through MARAD review and will also be supplemented by technical information, which will include a photo survey. Erhard also noted that the NOA/RFI states that anyone who may be interested in conveyance of the ship through MARAD's standard donation process may initiate that process at any time.

Chris noted that he sees assisting with the distribution of the NOA/RFI and helping to find an entity capable of taking on the ship as a key role of the PRG. He also stressed that we should be flexible when considering the use of the ship, even if the use may not be the highest preservation of the ship. His concern was to not be so restrictive that no one would want to take the ship. Erhard clarified that the intention is not to limit how the ship can be used and is open minded as to how it can be used and conveyed.

John Kelly asked what regulations would be in play if the ship was conveyed. Erhard noted that somewhat depends on where the ship is going and how it is conveyed. He noted that compliance with TSCA will be required, which is one of the biggest hurdles, and that MARAD is working towards compliance agreements with EPA that are similar to those used on Naval vessels in the past. John Kelly asked if more information should be included in the NOA/RFI about these types of issues and suggested a Q&A period to ensure that entities who might be interested are aware of the various issues and potential obstacles to this process. Erhard noted that the NOA/RFI will not necessarily include all this info, but that it is an iterative process to start the dialog and build a body of info and expertise for MARAD to see what can be done. He agreed that we should have ample time in the schedule to allow

for questions, and that an introductory “bidders conference” sort of meeting is reasonable. MARAD will include that in the schedule.

Disposition Study

Erhard noted that he and Anne are working on this, and showed a flow chart that guides the study. He noted again that TSCA compliance is a key factor, and that without it, the ship would need to be gutted to remove all PCBs, which is not in keeping with historic preservation goals. He noted that the Navy and other agencies have successfully used compliance agreements with the EPA for TSCA. Erhard noted that the study will be relatively brief and will outline the pathways that may allow the ship to be preserved.

Mitigation: Architectural Salvage

Erhard briefly noted that we will also need to consider the possibility of architectural salvage if the ship is scrapped. There have been multiple expressions of interest in the control room, and he anticipates there will be other items to be salvaged. The Collections Management Plan will address this, and the PRG will need to discuss this further. Erhard noted that although the goal is to preserve the ship, we do need to be prepared for salvage in the event it isn't. Erhard also noted that even if it is preserved, there will likely be some items from the ship that will be removed to remain in federal control. Chris recommended looking at USACE in Baltimore for mitigation efforts at the Sturgis and SM-1 at Fort Belvoir, and possibly contacting the USACE for further information about these efforts. Erhard noted that we do have the Sturgis plan and we will review it. Gail Marcus asked if the plan will be prepared prior to a decision about the end-state of the ship. Erhard clarified that the draft is anticipated in November, and the purpose is to have something on paper to give initial considerations, and it can be revised as necessary.

Other Business

Anne noted that Michael Moan joined the meeting late, and Erhard asked him to introduce himself to the group, as he has a personal connection to the ship. His uncle was the ship's last skipper when the ship was taken out of service, and he and his family have always had a strong connection and interest in the ship.

Erhard noted that the next meeting will be September 19, 2023. The meeting will be via TEAMS only, with no in-person attendance, as he will be at a conference that week.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:00PM EDT.

Action Items:

- Anne to send finalized PRG charter
- Anne to send meeting minutes

Acronyms:

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ANL	Argonne National Lab (DOE)
ANS	American Nuclear Society

DOE	(US) Department of Energy
DOI	(US) Department of Interior
DOT	(US) Department of Transportation
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FPO	Federal Preservation Officer
FRN	Federal Register Notice
LTP	License Termination Plan
MARAD	Maritime Administration (DOT)
MHT	Maryland Historical Trust
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
NMSS	Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NRC)
NPS	National Park Service (DOI)
NRC	(US) Nuclear Regulatory Commission
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyls
PRG	Peer Review Group
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SI	Smithsonian Institution
TSCA	Toxic Substances Control Act