

# **Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EMSSAB) Chairs Meeting**

**Adam's Mark Hotel, Denver, Colorado**

**March 28–29, 2003**

## **Meeting Summary**

The EMSSAB Chairs met from March 28 to 29, 2003, at the Adam's Mark Hotel in Denver, Colorado. The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board hosted the meeting. Meeting participants included Chairs, Vice Chairs, Co-Chairs, and other EMSSAB members from across the country. Meeting observers included Department of Energy-Headquarters staff, site coordinators, and contractor support staff. Other attendees included EMSSAB administrators, facilitators, and support staff. A team led by Ken Korkia, Board/Staff Coordinator with the Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board, provided facilitation services. Assisting Mr. Korkia were Steve Kay of Roberts and Kay; Wendy Green Lowe of Jason Associates; Ted McAdam of Strategies for Success; Doug Sarno of The Perspectives Group; and Mike Schoener of MAS Consultants. A full record of the meeting, which includes all attachments referenced in this document, is available on request through the Center for Environmental Management Information (phone: 1-800-7-EM-DATA; email: [eminfo@cemi.org](mailto:eminfo@cemi.org)).

Some of the meeting attendees also participated in a tour of the Rocky Flats site and an opening reception at the Adam's Mark Hotel on March 27, 2003. The tour and reception are not addressed in this document.

## **Participants**

- Fernald Citizens Advisory Board (CAB): Pam Dunn; Tom Wagner
- Hanford Advisory Board: Ken Bracken; Todd Martin
- Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) CAB: David Kipping; Monte Wilson
- Nevada Test Site (NTS) Community Advisory Board: Kaye Allisen-Medlin; Frank Overbey
- Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board (NNMCAB): Jim Brannon; Don Jordan
- Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB): Dave Mosby; Norman Mulvenon
- Paducah CAB: Merryman Kemp; Linda Long; Doug Raper; Bill Tanner
- Rocky Flats CAB: Shirley Garcia; Earl Gunia; Victor Holm
- Savannah River Site (SRS) CAB: Jean Sulc; Wade Waters
- Department of Energy (DOE): Roger Butler; Sandra Waisley

*A complete list of meeting participants is included as Attachment 1.*

## **Friday, March 28, 2003**

The meeting opened with introductions, an agenda review, and welcoming remarks by Victor Holm, Chair of the Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board. *The agenda for the meeting is included as Attachment 2.*

### **Roundtable Presentations**

One outcome of the January EMSSAB conference on transuranic (TRU) waste was an interest in learning more about possible transfers of all types of waste between different sites within the DOE complex. Each SSAB had a chance to share what had been learned from the individual field offices. Much information was presented, but some felt it difficult to discern which decisions had already been made, which were pending proposals, and which were simply ideas at a rudimentary stage of development. Although Chairs meetings have not typically produced formal recommendations, it was suggested that the Chairs should draft a resolution asking DOE to provide a complex-wide waste disposal map clearly identifying all waste streams throughout the complex, especially those for which there is no current disposal path. The facilitators offered to draft such a resolution for the Chairs to consider on Saturday morning. In addition, waste disposition was identified as a possible future workshop topic. At the very least, a presentation at an upcoming chairs meeting might be a good way for DOE to share this information with all of the SSABs. *Copies of individual site presentations are included as Attachment 3.*

### **DOE-Environmental Management 2003/2004 Budget**

Roger Butler, DOE's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Budget, presented the Chairs with an update on the Environmental Management (EM) budget. Congress passed much of DOE's \$7 billion request for the EM program. Still, cleanup programs in the current year have been negatively impacted to the tune of roughly \$220 million due to: 1) a security shortfall stemming from the threat of terrorism (\$60 million); 2) general reductions the EM program must absorb in the current year (\$118 million); and 3) an across-the-board rescission (\$45 million). Moreover, Congress has yet to disposition the supplemental request for the Iraq War. One possibility is that Congress could impose a "tax" on all domestic programs, in which case EM would have to absorb its share the burden.

In a move designed not only to simplify the budget accounts, but also to make the field offices more accountable to headquarters, DOE has restructured the Fiscal Year (FY) 2004 budget so that cleanup expenditures can be easily

distinguished from those earmarked for support activities. A key budget objective for EM is to devote as many resources as possible to on-the-ground cleanup. In the proposed FY 2004 budget, 86 percent of EM spending goes toward actual cleanup.

Mr. Butler also shed light on EM budget planning horizon. Over the next four years, EM plans to request amounts that are elevated above present spending levels. The underlying premise is to accelerate cleanup work and thereby reduce the long-term mortgage costs. The incremental increases will peak in FY 2005; after that EM budget levels will start to decline. By FY 2008 and beyond, EM spending is projected to level out at roughly \$5 billion.

During the question and answer session that followed Mr. Butler's prepared remarks, several of the Chairs and board members raised concerns about budget cuts aimed at the EMSSAB program. Within the last month, some of the SSABs were notified of sharp budget cuts effective in the current fiscal year, with no advance warning. In some instances, board operations may have to be curtailed as a result. Some suggested that it would be shortsighted to reduce citizen involvement at a time when so many important decisions are yet to be made. Mr. Butler said that it is not the intention of DOE-Headquarters to impede the work of the SSABs, but rather to hold spending for the SSAB program as a whole at the FY 2002 levels.

The Chairs agreed to further discuss SSAB funding in the Saturday morning session. *A copy of Mr. Butler's presentation is included as Attachment 4.*

### **Legacy Management Presentations and Discussion**

David Geiser, Project Manager with the Office of Long-Term Stewardship, gave a presentation on a Cleanup Program driven by Risk-based End States. Mr. Geiser said the project is designed to define what the Department of Energy complex looks like in the future.

Mr. Geiser said there are about 20 core sites – national laboratories, National Nuclear Security Administration facilities, and geological repositories – that have ongoing missions and will continue operating. There are about 100 or so sites, including those in the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP), uranium mill tailings sites, and closure sites, which will be closed and returned to the public domain. He said the department is trying to find out what those sites will look like when they are made acceptable for some other use, whether the land is used for industrial areas, county parks, wildlife refuges, commercial business zones or restricted open space. DOE will not need these sites. His office is trying to find the most consistent approach to deciding what the end states of these sites should be.

In answer to a question, Mr. Geiser said a risk-based end state is one in which future users of the site are adequately protected against exposure to residual hazards. In other words, risks are based on the intended future uses of the site. He said cleaning sites to unrestricted use would bankrupt the federal government.

He said the department believes there are three key barriers to the success of the project: corporate vision, groundwater strategy, and cultural change. The corporate vision involves deciding where the department wants to be in the future – what kinds of missions it will have and what kinds of properties it will need to fulfill the missions. He said they also need a strategy to manage groundwater at DOE sites. That does not mean that one groundwater strategy will be used for all sites, but that a groundwater strategy for each site needs to be developed. *A copy of Mr. Geiser's presentation is included as Attachment 5.*

Donna Bergman-Tabbert, Manager of DOE's Grand Junction Office, discussed the Grand Junction (Colorado) Office's Long-Term Stewardship (LTS) Program. The LTS program at Grand Junction was established in 1988. The office will become a part of the Office of Legacy Management, now being formed at DOE to supervise stewardship activities.

The Grand Junction office is responsible for LTS activities at 33 sites, including those under the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act (UMTRCA), D&D (entombed reactors), the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP), and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. The office will also have oversight of stewardship activities at Rocky Flats, although Ms. Bergman-Tabbert said there would be DOE personnel at Rocky Flats after closure. She gave a brief outline of what is included in a long-term stewardship plan and examples of stewardship activities at DOE sites, as well as stewardship management strategies.

She said one of the challenges of long-term stewardship is records and data management because there is such a large volume of information to be catalogued and managed. Another challenge is that as a result of staff reductions at these sites, there is a loss of institutional knowledge. Other challenges include overcoming skepticism and achieving consensus among disparate groups, identifying third-party rights and activities, achieving enforceable institutional controls, and providing information access to stakeholders. *A copy of Ms. Bergman-Tabbert's presentation is included as Attachment 6.*

Dan Collette, Technical Services Manager for S.M. Stoller, a contractor for the Grand Junction Office, gave a presentation on the web site developed for long-term stewardship, known as the Long-Term Surveillance and Maintenance Program web site ([www.gjo.doe.gov/programs/ltsm](http://www.gjo.doe.gov/programs/ltsm)). The web site is designed to grow as documents are created for long-term stewardship. It consists of a

database that lists a core collection of documents for each site managed by the Grand Junction Office.

The site can be accessed by going to [www.gjo.doe.gov](http://www.gjo.doe.gov) and clicking on "Projects and Programs," then clicking on Long-Term Surveillance and Maintenance Program, then on "LTS Records," then on "Stewardship Sites." There you can click on either the symbol on the map or the name of the DOE site you want to view. There you can access a "Records Query," "Interactive Mapping," or an "Environmental Data Query," among other things. Mr. Collette said data is available on the web a day after it is received.

For instance, at the Weldon Spring, Missouri, site you can access the Weldon Spring Remedial Action Project Web Site and the draft Long-Term Stewardship Plan. Clicking on "Records Query" at the bottom of the page will bring up a web page on long-term stewardship records. Clicking on "LTS GJO Records Search," will bring up a query page. Under Site, select "Weldon Spring, MO" or another site you are interested in. Then click on "Search." This will bring up a list of documents available for the site. The document can be requested or viewed, depending on the option available.

At a site's web page, there is also a button for "Interactive Mapping." This is the Geospatial Environmental Mapping System (GEMS). GEMS provides dynamic mapping and environmental monitoring data display for sites in the LTSM Program managed by the Grand Junction Office. GEMS can be used to see a map of a site, photographs, water quality and water level data, existing wells, fences, roads, the site boundary, streams and ditches, and water bodies, among other things.

Mike Owen introduced himself as the new head of the Office of Legacy Management, which will oversee long-term stewardship and worker transition at DOE. The office will have its own budget line, which increases the visibility and the power of the office. He said the office is expected to be staffed and ready by October 1. Mr. Owen said the office will work closely with site field offices on long-term stewardship issues.

### **Transuranic (TRU) Waste Workshop Recommendations**

Sponsored by NNM CAB, a workshop on TRU waste was held the end of January 2003 in Carlsbad, New Mexico. Issues discussed included characterization, transportation, disposition, and regulatory issues. The group participating in the workshop produced 13 recommendations to DOE. NNM CAB also prepared a draft cover letter to transmit the recommendations. The letter and recommendations were sent to each of the SSABs, which were then asked to present the recommendations to their individual boards for review and approval. There were some concerns expressed about this set of recommendations. Two boards indicated they would not be able to support the recommendations,

Hanford and Rocky Flats. A third board, Fernald, indicated it would be willing to sign its approval of the recommendations only if there is complete consensus among all the other boards. The Paducah Citizens Advisory Board also expressed some concerns; however, the Board has not yet acted on the recommendations. Paducah's board does not make decisions by consensus, and the recommendation may pass by a majority vote. Paducah will meet again on April 17 and will make a decision at that time. Board members from both Hanford and Rocky Flats encouraged the other boards to sign the letter without their inclusion. After discussion, the participants agreed to remove the signature lines for Fernald, Hanford, and Rocky Flats from the cover letter. A revised letter will be brought back to the participants for approval and signature during the second day of the meeting. An addition will also be made to the cover letter noting that all the boards did not approve this set of recommendations.

### **Public Comment Period**

Richard Gale, a member of the Northern New Mexico CAB, commented on accelerated programs and decreasing budgets. He mentioned that normally in an accelerated budget, the funds are increased rather than decreased. Mr. Gale stated that he feels it is the equivalent of speeding up a production line, because if you don't put more money into it, you get a defective product. He also feels that if the boards are unable to perform their duties, there will be a long-term impact on DOE. He wanted DOE-Headquarters to be aware of what they are asking the boards to do, which is to increase output with decreased resources.

### **Day 1 Wrap-Up**

The first day of the meeting concluded with a review of the day and discussion of agenda modifications for the second day. The Chairs decided to begin a half-hour early to allow more discussion time with Sandra Waisley and Roger Butler.

## **Saturday, March 29, 2003**

### **Discussion with Sandra Waisley and Roger Butler**

The chairs agreed to add this discussion to the agenda as a follow-up to Friday's presentation by Roger Butler.

Sandra Waisley is the new EMSSAB Designated Federal Officer and recently appointed Acting Director of DOE's Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability. She began the discussion by giving a brief history of her background. Ms. Waisley noted that public participation is important; she said EM takes public participation seriously and strongly supports the boards and their accomplishments. She said supporting the boards to the fullest extent possible is

the right thing to do because the boards have assisted DOE in reaching decisions that are smart, defensible, and supported in their communities.

Ms. Waisley said that over the past several months, EM conducted a non-labor resources review. Field offices and others were surveyed to determine if the boards are value-added and what resources and services they provide. The review showed that some boards retained a substantial carryover even though they continued to request increased funding. She mentioned she also had similar problems with other groups besides the SSABs. Ultimately, EM relied on information from the field offices to make funding recommendations to Jessie Roberson. The general recommendation was to keep 2003 funding at the same level of new budget authority that was provided to the boards in 2002. Guidance letters on the level of funding to provide the boards were sent to the field offices in mid-March. Ms. Waisley also communicated the need for the boards to be able to provide documentation of their successes to assist DOE in evaluating the effectiveness of the SSABs.

Roger Butler reiterated EM's support for the SSABs. He said that Ms. Roberson has a high opinion of the boards and the product they deliver. Mr. Butler said that every element of non-labor programs – including every activity at each site outside the prime contractor – was subject to substantial review. In addition, DOE-Headquarters was subject to a similar review. These reviews showed many activities both at the field office level and at Headquarters that do not support the core EM mission. Decisions were made to cut some of these activities and redirect the funding to cleanup activities. Some activities were also redirected back to the federal work force. Mr. Butler said that oftentimes there was a generous application of new funds to some activities with little regard for the value received by the federal government. In addition, many programs had large uncoded balances. Mr. Butler said that carryover amounts are expected to be used rather than continuing to give money to what may appear to be a trust fund.

The other consideration, Mr. Butler said, is what occurred in Congress this year. When Congress targets DOE with a \$222 million cut in funding, he said it is important to consider how to fund cleanup rather than other activities. He stated that EM did agree to fund FY 2003 SSAB activities at the FY 2002 new budget authority and it is not their intention to put the SSABs out of business. He said that Ms. Roberson is looking at ways to maximize efficiencies. He encouraged the boards to review their business practices and work toward efficiency. Mr. Butler did note one exception: Rocky Flats. He said the site manager made a decision regarding funding for that board and that EM supports the site manager's decision.

Board members then provided comments and concerns to both Ms. Waisley and Mr. Butler:

- Citizen participation is an essential part of the cleanup activities; it cannot be successful without a serious and meaningful way to involve citizens.
- Fernald is concerned about receiving a 50 percent cut in its budget for FY 2004. The site is only two years away from closure and the board has forecast that its activities will be more intense in those last years.
- There was no dialogue with boards about what was being planned and no opportunity given to discuss plans for the future.
- Intersite activities are important because many successful workshops have been held in the past.
- It would be helpful to have EM provide guidance about what information is needed regarding performance of the boards.
- Concerned about conducting a review without including board comment. The boards were not given an opportunity to participate in the review process, which demonstrates a severe deficiency in the process.
- Jessie Roberson had previously indicated support for intersite workshops but EM has zeroed out the account used to fund meetings; seems to be an inconsistency.
- Rocky Flats CAB did not receive notice of the budget cuts until it was already halfway into the fiscal year. The cuts will result in a 25 percent decrease in funds this year, which means many variable costs will have to be cut, such as public outreach and independent review.

Because of the interrelated issues surrounding funding of the boards and how they will function together as an entity, the participants then moved to the next agenda item.

### **Discussion of EMSSAB Future**

Participants discussed the future of the EMSSAB and how it conducts business as a group. One member noted that the boards provide a service to DOE by providing communication with the public. Another member stated that it might be preferable to adopt a routine business model and practices for bringing up new business and products when the Chairs meet. Other participants felt it important to stick to a consensus model rather than using a parliamentary approach to doing business. It was suggested that on a future conference call, the Chairs should discuss ways to make it easier to bring issues before the EMSSAB. One consideration is to make sure each board has information about issues that might arise in advance, so those issues could be brought to their individual boards with adequate notice. A suggestion was also made to change the format for doing business in order to enable the group to act more quickly, such as the letter to DOE (referenced below) concerning intersite waste transfer.

All the participants agreed it is important to continue meetings of the EMSSAB Chairs, and most preferred holding a semi-annual meeting. One member stated that meeting twice a year is important because issues arise quickly and this is the only forum to identify commonalities and to receive feedback. One site suggested

it may be preferable to meet once a year, but perhaps extend the length of the meeting by a day or more to accommodate the number of issues to be addressed. Another suggestion was made to combine the issue workshops with annual chairs meetings. After discussion, the group decided that it preferred to meet twice a year. The Paducah CAB offered to host the next Chairs meeting and suggested the last weekend of September (September 25-27, 2003). A final confirmation will be made during the next Chair's conference call.

The group considers it important for DOE to play a role strategically with planning the content of workshops and to provide guidance on what topics are part of the overall strategy for the Environmental Management office. DOE was asked to clearly outline goals and objectives for the EMSSAB and clarify the process under which the Board should function.

### **Approval of Letter to DOE Concerning Intersite Waste Transfer**

Following the presentations made by each SSAB regarding intersite waste shipments during Friday's meeting, Jim Brannon, Chair of the NNM CAB, recommended the EMSSAB send a letter to DOE requesting more information on its proposed plans and strategies related to waste and materials transfer. A draft letter was presented to the participants on Saturday morning for their review and approval. The letter was approved. Victor Holm, Chair of the Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board, will send the letter to Jessie Roberson on behalf of the EMSSAB. *A copy of the letter is included as Attachment 7.*

### **Approval of TRU Waste Workshop Recommendations**

As a follow-up to Friday's discussion of the TRU Waste Workshop recommendations, a revised letter was presented to the EMSSAB Chairs for their review and approval. The revised cover letter includes signatures only for those SSABs approving the recommendation: INEEL, NTS, NNM CAB, Oak Ridge, and Savannah River. A separate letter was also created that includes a signature for the Paducah CAB in the event it also approves the recommendations. The NNM CAB will send the letter and recommendations once it hears from Paducah about its final vote. *A copy of the draft letter without signatures and the approved recommendations is included as Attachment 8.*

### **Roundtable Discussion for Boards to Share Comments and Successes**

#### Comments:

- NNM CAB: Would like to see the Chairs and Vice Chairs empowered by their local boards to offer and approve recommendations that speak directly to national, cross-cutting issues.
- SRS CAB: SSABs are important, and community and stakeholder input will remain important even as sites move toward closure. It is important for

- the boards to continue as a viable part of the process and extremely important for DOE-Headquarters to support the boards. DOE should consider the donated time that members provide as consultants to be a valuable resource.
- SRS CAB: Would like DOE-Headquarters to provide SSABs with a draft template of what type of information is required to analyze goals and objectives for the boards.
  - Rocky Flats CAB: SSABs should also have input into the Office of Legacy Management, so the boards can provide input to the new office in both the short and long-term.
  - Rocky Flats CAB: As you get closer to closure, public concern often increases rather than decreases.
  - Paducah CAB: Concerned about having DOE presence moved from Paducah to another area. What affects will that mean in terms of communication, trust, and oversight?
  - NNMCAB: Concerned about how DOE-Headquarters links performance measures and contracts to what is occurring at each sites; need to ensure there is no conflict or competition over resources and funding.
  - NNMCAB: Office of Legacy Management policy setting for long-term stewardship: how will that work for sites with an ongoing mission?
  - Oak Ridge SSAB: One reason the boards have been successful is because they are fairly autonomous. Important to maintain some level of independence and flexibility so the boards are not just seen as entities that rubber-stamp DOE decisions.
  - Hanford Advisory Board: Important for DOE to more clearly explain accelerated action plans, especially in terms of waste transfers. Boards need to know what is planned – discuss at next Chairs meeting.
  - INEEL CAB: Concerned about board relationships with their respective sites rather than relationship to DOE-Headquarters.

Comments and concerns expressed by participants have been recorded as possible agenda topics to be addressed at a future Chairs meeting.

#### Successes:

During the course of this roundtable discussion, DOE raised a question about each site's experience with members of tribal governments. Following are comments raised during that discussion.

- INEEL CAB: Has a tribal member on the board.
- NTS CAB: Currently has open spot for a tribal member.
- Paducah CAB: A tribal member regularly attends meetings but was turned down by DOE for membership.
- SRS CAB: No tribal members on the board.
- Hanford Advisory Board: Two sovereign nations have members on the board; another tribe has an ex-officio member.

- NNMCAB: Board has added a new representational category for special constituencies and was able to get a chief executive officer from one of the Pueblos to join. A concern with tribal participation is the potential risk to sovereign status and the potential to interfere in government-to-government negotiations.
- Oak Ridge SSAB: Two Cherokees are on the board, although they weren't recruited to fulfill a specific representational category.

Meeting participants then returned to a discussion of each individual site's success stories.

- NTS Community Advisory Board: A core group of board members worked closely with DOE on the study of ground and groundwater contamination at the site. The board will present a recommendation on the location of a siting well to determine when and if contamination moves offsite. This will provide an early warning system for affected communities. Also, The board has put together a "road show" to visit communities, discuss board activities and talk about NTS issues.
- NNMCAB: First, the board noted its success in sponsoring the recent TRU Waste Workshop. Second, the board has often struggled to find volunteers for membership but now has more volunteers than open member positions.
- INEEL CAB: The board has had early involvement in the process for tank closure and continues an open and ongoing dialogue. In addition, the board has been able to provide early input on local site planning for long-term stewardship. Also, DOE's high-level waste team solicited the board on how to implement a public involvement process for EIS review. The process was designed, in large part, by the board.
- SRS CAB: The board provides leadership in communicating with area citizens. However, some forthcoming actions affecting the community will come from the National Nuclear Security Agency (NNSA) and the board is prohibited from working directly on NNSA activities. The board has worked closely with the public to provide reassurance that future actions will take the community's needs and concerns into account.
- Oak Ridge SSAB: The board recently began participating in groundwater strategy meetings with regulators, which has been a success because the board is involved early in the process.
- Hanford Advisory Board: The board created an ad-hoc task force to work on issues related to accelerated action plans and participated in negotiations toward a new performance management plan. Some language proposed by the board was used verbatim in DOE's new document. Because the board as a whole approved the proposed changes and individual constituencies agreed, there was no need to hold formal public hearings.
- Rocky Flats CAB: Major modifications to the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement were proposed. The board spent several months reviewing

proposed changes and submitted more than 40 individual recommendations. Because of active community and public involvement with DOE and its regulators, only one public hearing was necessary.

### **Public Comment Period**

Richard Gale, a member of the Northern New Mexico CAB and chairs of its Waste Management Committee, offered a few more success stories for the NNM CAB. Mr. Gale said the NNM CAB has worked with DOE regarding the timing of shipments of waste between Los Alamos and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. By working with DOE and regulators, the board was able to help resolve issues and re-establish shipping schedules, which saved around \$5 million. Second, he noted that after the fire at Los Alamos, the board worked with DOE on a revised schedule for shipping barrels that posed a hazard to the community. Third, the board also worked with DOE to establish a new system for managing physical roadblocks that are required whenever a hazardous shipment leaves Los Alamos.

Rachel Samuel, DOE-Headquarters, thanked everyone for their participation and said she enjoyed meeting the participants and observing the Chairs in action. Ms. Samuel suggested that each SSAB member remember to properly identify and spell out acronyms in all written documents to help those who may not be familiar with the terms used.

Ted McAdam, facilitator, remarked that he has never seen the EMSSAB Chairs work together better than it has in the past two days: listening, encouraging, and supporting each other.

### **Meeting Wrap-Up**

Ted McAdam closed the meeting by conducting a brief meeting evaluation, reviewing outcomes and expectations. Overall, the participants agreed the meeting was a success in terms of planning, logistics, topics discussed, and productivity. Participants were pleased with the participation of both Sandra Waisley and Roger Butler. However, they expressed a need for future presenters to provide copies of their presentations to the group.