INL Site Environmental Management

CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting Minutes

April 27, 2016

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Wednesday, April 27, 2016, at the Hilton Garden Inn in Twin Falls, Idaho. An audio recording of the meeting was created and may be reviewed by calling CAB Support Staff at 208.557.7886.

Members Present
Herb Bohrer
Keith Branter
Brad Christensen
Marvin Fielding
Harry Griffith
Kristen Jensen
Talia Martin
Trilby McAffee
Betsy McBride
Cathy Roemer

Members Not Present
Bob Bodell
Bill Roberts

Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), Federal Coordinator, and Liaisons Present
Jack Zimmerman, DDFO, U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Jim Floerke for Tom Dieter, CWI
Susan Burke, State of Idaho
Daryl Koch, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

Others Present

Brad Bugger, DOE-ID
Amy Taylor, U.S. Senator Risch
Roy Bartholomay, USGS
Betsy Holmes, DOE-ID
Marc Jewett, Fluor Idaho
Baldwin Camin
Rebecca Casper, Mayor, Idaho Falls
Lee Heider
Samantha Marshall, U.S. Senator Crapo
Tami Thatcher
Lori Howell, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Stan Baldwin, Sho-Ban Tribe
Nolan Jensen, DOE-ID
Karen Bass, Staff
Andrea Gumm, Facilitator
Dennis Crane, Cassia County Commissioner
Shelly Shaffer, Butte County Clerk
Rose Bernal, Butte County Commissioner
Fred Hughes, Fluor Idaho
Ann Riedesel, Fluor Idaho
Preston Abbott
Lance Clow, Idaho State Representative
Erik Simpson, ICP
Kari Emoud, U.S. Senator Risch
Bob Muffley
Dan Sluhr
Jack Nelsen
Nicole Hernandez, DOE-ID
Jordan Davies, Staff

Opening Remarks

Facilitator Andrea Gumm started the meeting at 8:00 a.m. She reviewed the agenda and noted there would be two public comment periods – one at 10:55 a.m. and one at 2:30 p.m. She reminded attendees of the process for public comments during the meeting, time permitting, or via "question cards."

CAB Chair Herb Bohrer welcomed everyone to the meeting, and noted it is nice to meet in Twin Falls. He commented that the CAB aims to have availability of its activities outside the immediate area of the Site, and said he believes the clear and accurate information meeting attendees receive directly from DOE and other agencies is not likely obtained elsewhere.

Jack Zimmerman (DOE-ID) concurred with Herb's remarks. He recognized the value of holding the meeting in Twin Falls and said it is good to provide useful information around the state. He noted that CAB members and meeting attendees will see DOE is making significant progress on the cleanup projects. He acknowledged problems with the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU), and said some of the details, specific issues, and possible solutions will be covered throughout the day. He stated his appreciation for everyone's willingness to attend and said he looks forward to a good session.

Susan Burke (State of Idaho, DEQ) also commented that she appreciates the change of scenery and looks forward to the day's presentations. She noted the conclusion of the legislative session and said DEQ did well with its budget this year. Burke explained that DEQ is in the process of applying for the National Pollution Elimination System (NPES) permits. They are staffing the extensive program and putting the application together, an effort that could mean increased job opportunities.

Daryl Koch (DEQ) noted that over time they have renegotiated the milestone for retrieval of buried waste at RWMC from 2025 to 2020. They are at 96 percent now in exhuming the volume that was agreed to by the agencies and DOE and at about 76 percent of the acreage. They are proud of this CERCLA accomplishment.

Jim Floerke (CWI) introduced himself as vice president of the INTEC area and said he will be filling in for Tom Dieter. He commented that CWI is on track to accomplish one of its safest years since taking over the contract in 2005; they have had one injury in this fiscal year and just three in the past rolling 12 months. CWI has exhumed 4.12 of the 5.69 acres of targeted buried waste and has completed 7800 sludge drums and 12 of 120-125 large boxes at ARP. At INTEC, CWI continues its sodium treatment of remote-handled waste. Floerke noted that treatment of the spent nuclear fuel continues; CWI has taken the pools from 72 percent storage capacity to about 22 percent since 2005. He complimented CWI's employees for doing an outstanding job of maintaining focus during the transition. The workforce is about a month from completion of that transition, and CWI is focused on keeping people safe.

CAB Discussion of Recommendation Regarding Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Priorities

Bohrer commented that the Board has previously discussed DOE's Fiscal Year 2018 budget priorities and clarified that providing input on the budget priorities DOE-ID uses to formulate its budget requests is one of the specific charges from EM Headquarters. On March 10, a subcommittee of CAB members participated in a teleconference with Jack Zimmerman, who went over the 2017 budget and 2018 request and identified DOE-ID's priorities. CAB member Betsy McBride led the effort to draft a recommendation to DOE.

Bohrer called for a vote to approve the letter of recommendation regarding the 2018 budget request. The Board was unanimously in favor of the recommendation.

CAB member Betsy McBride reminded the group that the Board primarily operates under consensus as opposed to voting. Bohrer agreed and thanked McBride for her efforts in drafting the letter.

Bohrer discussed a letter of recommendation to DOE from the Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) Chairs regarding the establishment of Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs). Herb explained that SEPs represent an agreement between the state and DOE to use funds not for site cleanup, but other projects. Facilitator Andrea Gumm asked Bohrer if any action was required for this recommendation. Bohrer responded no.

Recent Public Involvement Activities

Jack Zimmerman reviewed recent public involvement activities. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

Zimmerman introduced Fred Hughes, Fluor Idaho Program Manager. Hughes will have an official place at the table at the next meeting, and will deliver a presentation on Fluor Idaho's approach to addressing cleanup after the transition. Fluor Idaho will officially take over cleanup activities on June 1. Zimmerman said he believes they have a good plan and approach to maintain the progress that CWI has made so far, and complete almost all activities for the major remediation efforts.

Betsy McBride noted the upcoming visit from the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) and asked if DOE is reaching out to the Idaho Attorney General. Zimmerman responded that most attendees will be staff-level, although Attorney General Wasden and his staff will be involved.

McBride asked if Deputy Assistant Secretary Mark Whitney met with environmental stakeholder groups during his visit in March. Zimmerman replied that Whitney met with local leaders and businesses, representatives from the Partnership for Science and Technology, Beatrice Brailsford of the Snake River Alliance, local community leaders including a Butte county commissioner, and emergency response leaders from local communities.

Idaho Cleanup Project Overview

Zimmerman provided a presentation on the status of cleanup at the INL site. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

Bohrer asked if the ORPS reportable occurrence in January 2016 at AMWTP regarding incorrect wiring resulting in a breaker trip was a new problem or an old one newly identified. Zimmerman said he was unsure and committed to following up with him after the break.

Bohrer stated that DOE has almost 800 waste shipments in the backlog and asked if it is possible, assuming WIPP reopens and Idaho begins shipping, to meet the 2018 milestone. Zimmerman responded no. He explained that WIPP, once open, will begin accepting shipments slowly and will not restore full operations until improved ventilation systems are in place. It may be two or three years before WIPP is back up to capacity.

CAB member Cathy Roemer asked how often the chemical compatibility requirements have changed since WIPP began operating. Zimmerman responded that, as far as he knows, this is the first time the waste acceptance criteria have changed substantially since WIPP opened. There is a potential impact of rework if they find something they cannot prove is absolutely safe, which will be quite difficult with super-compacted waste. The primary impact will be on analysis and additional costs associated with that analysis.

Bohrer asked Zimmerman when he anticipates finalization of the new criteria. Zimmerman responded that it depends on the Carlsbad Field Office and WIPP, as well as the state of New Mexico, which holds their permit. He commented that the 800 shipments currently in the backlog are certified to the existing waste acceptance criteria. As they finalize the new criteria, DOE will know better how to proceed. Zimmerman noted that the approach is by waste stream, not by drum. The analysis will be performed on the worst case drums within the waste stream to show they are acceptable, thereby enabling the entire waste stream to be certified.

McBride asked if the waste is all super-compacted, and if so, how DOE will uncompact it. Zimmerman responded that he hopes they do not have to figure out how to uncompact super-compacted waste. McBride then asked if each drum in a waste stream analysis has only one waste steam. Zimmerman confirmed that each drum contains only one waste stream.

CAB member Talia Martin asked if DOE-ID is working with the state of New Mexico to understand the analysis. Zimmerman responded that Carlsbad and New Mexico are currently the only parties involved in formulation of the new criteria. He noted the criteria they used previously were not necessarily unacceptable nor are they the cause of what happened at WIPP. They are being conservative in their reaction to the event that closed the plant.

Roemer asked what constitutes safe storage onsite. Zimmerman responded that waste is overpacked into a new container with high integrity, and stored in a permitted area until it can be treated.

McBride asked if the solvents in the pits were packaged or poured. Zimmerman replied that the solvents (rags, decon solution, etc.), primarily from Rocky Flats, were mixed together in the drums shipped to Idaho and then buried. He clarified that the liquid waste was not dumped out on the ground. McBride then asked if volatile organic compounds (VOCs) escape when the drums are opened. Zimmerman confirmed that some escape, but said a structure overtop contains them; ultimately they leave through the ventilation system. McBride asked how VOCs could get into the aquifer. Zimmerman explained that VOCs are in the ground. Liquid infiltration is one potential stream that can carry VOCs down to the aquifer. A pump and treat system is operating in that area to remove the volatile organics from the water. Ultimately, final disposal will include a cap over the area to prevent groundwater infiltration.

Nolan Jensen (DOE-ID) introduced himself as the team lead over CERCLA cleanup. He commented that most evidence indicates that organic vapors are the main factor causing groundwater contamination. As buried waste is resumed, many drums are no longer intact and as the drums degrade, organic vapors are released into the subsurface and eventually absorb into the aquifer.

Bohrer complimented the contractors who have worked on the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP), and DOE for managing it. The project has been well-executed, given the potential issues and hazards that existed there. He noted the significant progress made on a relatively conservative budget. Bohrer also complimented EPA and the State of Idaho, noting that obtaining their concurrence with this rational method of treatment was a real team effort – regulators, DOE and contractors have done a good job. Zimmerman agreed, and said the workforce is perhaps the most productive team he has seen in the DOE complex. An attribute of Idaho workers is an excellent work ethic and a commitment to perform work safely. Zimmerman noted that other sites tend to believe the process is overkill, as there are ARPs and gloveboxes in place to protect workers and the environment, and they think it costs too much to do it this way. In reality the opposite is true.

McBride noted that the Navy will continue to send spent fuel to Idaho and asked if it will go into wet storage on the Nuclear Energy (NE) side. She also asked if the 20 percent left in the pools at INTEC is Settlement Agreement spent fuel, and if the new Navy fuel will find a home there. Zimmerman responded that Navy

fuel will not be stored in the pool and that any Navy fuel currently stored there will be removed. The Navy has its own facilities – DOE is not involved.

Roemer asked Zimmerman to define the term "geologic repository." Zimmerman defined the term as using the earth as a confinement system.

Susan Burke (State of Idaho) asked Zimmerman to address recent reports that INL could be the recipient of 13,000 dump trucks of LLW greater than class C. Brad Bugger (DOE-ID) said he believes Burke is referring to an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on greater than Class C waste. The Department's preferred alternative is to dispose of that waste either at WIPP or at a commercial repository. Under NEPA, the Department is required to consider reasonable alternatives for disposal. Idaho was deemed one such reasonable alternative, but the likelihood of this waste coming to INL is very small.

Integrated Waste Treatment Unit Update

Zimmerman provided an update on the IWTU project. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

Bohrer asked if the super heater vessel is inside the shielded area. Zimmerman responded that it is not.

Bohrer asked what DOE is doing to minimize the loss of experience once Fluor Idaho takes over. Zimmerman responded that the transition is timely; it will be beneficial to welcome new perspectives to see if new solutions and different results arise. For the most part, the current CWI workforce will be staying on with Fluor Idaho. A few key positions at IWTU, such as the chief engineer and the project manager will likely leave. The knowledge of those departing is being captured. The transition period is 90 days, and Fluor Idaho has identified counterparts and a transition team, and is spending a lot of time reviewing lessons learned so they can build that information into their plan. The operating staff will remain in place.

Martin asked if sending the bark to labs for chemical and structural analysis yielded helpful results and if those results were available for the summit. Zimmerman confirmed they had the results before the summit. There have been a few different simulant runs, with different barks. The latest bark composition was slightly different than that which was produced in previous runs. The recommendation resulting from the summit involves injecting CO2 directly into the nozzles, which could shift the reaction to a faster rate, helping with the problem.

CAB member Brad Christensen asked where the waste will ultimately go once it is processed. Zimmerman replied that DOE is going through a process called "waste incidental to reprocessing" to make that final decision. While it does not have a high-level waste constituent, it is still very radioactive and is currently being managed like high-level waste. It is expected that the waste will be classified as transuranic waste, not high-level, after the issue is worked through the waste determination process. If this is the case, it will be disposed of at WIPP.

CAB member Trilby McAffee asked how, if the same simulant is used for all simulant runs, the chemical makeup of the bark changes. Zimmerman responded that there have been changes to the process and that these changes affect the bark. The intended product is successfully produced by the vessel, but an intermediate product, a secondary chemical reaction, is occurring which is not yet fully understood. DOE has resumed some pilot-scale testing at the Hazen facility in Colorado. In a controlled environment, the same conditions may be simulated and collection of a sample possible to determine the problem and identify a solution.

Roemer commented that IWTU is a major factor in DOE's inability to meet the Settlement Agreement. Zimmerman clarified that DOE has been out of compliance with the Settlement Agreement for four years and said most expenses are tied to salaries of the onsite staff and the cost of maintenance modifications. He committed to making this information available.

CAB member Keith Branter asked if DOE knows how many simulant runs can be made before the facility wears out. Zimmerman responded that he does not have a definitive answer, but noted that IWTU has not seen a lot of wear except for components that broke upon startup. After each simulant run, an extensive outage allows for inspection and data gathering which will offer a more accurate prediction.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Update

Brad Bugger (DOE-ID) provided an update on the WIPP Facility. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

McBride asked if DOE has considered above-ground interim storage at WIPP given the slow reopening related to ventilation and safe startup. Zimmerman replied that the above ground storage at WIPP is not intended to take total waste inventory from the complex.

Bohrer noted that the information in Bugger's presentation is consistent with that which DOE Headquarters provided at the EM SSAB Chairs Meeting, April 19 to 21 in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. DOE's only commitment at this time is to emplace the waste currently stored in the waste storage building by the end of 2016.

McBride asked if the stored waste will need to be analyzed. Zimmerman commented that as with all waste, it must be certified under the new criteria, a process expected to take two to four weeks. WIPP will only accept four shipments per week to start and will not be back to full capacity until all ventilation upgrades have been made, anywhere from two to three years.

CAB member Harry Griffith asked if the ventilation system upgrades address air quality or air mass movement. Zimmerman replied that that they are interrelated. WIPP is now a contaminated environment and the original ventilation system does not have the capacity to operate the equipment in the mine while it is in filtration mode. The upgrade will be in two phases: The first step will allow limited waste emplacement activities; the second step will restore full activity to the mine with completion of the final ventilation system, which will require a new shaft and redirected airflow.

McAfee asked if they will ship waste that does not meet the new criteria back to Idaho. Zimmerman responded that it has not yet been determined, but that he assumes it will return to its generator site for retreatment. He believes the probability that Idaho waste will not meet new criteria is small.

At this point there were technical problems with the audio recording of the meeting. The DEQ report, and the first few minutes of the U.S. Geological Survey Groundwater report were not recorded.

Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Report

Susan Burke (DEQ) provided a spoken presentation about the new Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) contract and described the history of regulation at the INL site. She did not have slides. Following are notes on her presentation:

Under the 1995 Settlement Agreement, transuranic waste is to be removed from Idaho by 2018. A three year running average of 2,000 cubic meters is to be removed. Liquid high-level waste was to be treated by December 31, 2012.

The Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) program addresses the treatment and storage of hazardous waste. DOE is required under RCRA to cease use of the tanks containing liquid high level waste at the INL for failure to have adequate secondary containment. A brief history of RCRA requirements for the liquid high-level waste tanks is as follows:

1989 EPA and DEQ conducted an inspection at the INL. EPA was the lead as Idaho was not yet authorized to implement RCRA.

1990 EPA issued a Notice of Non-compliance (NON) to DOE for lack of adequate secondary containment for piping and valve boxes at the tank farm.

1990 DEQ became authorized to implement RCRA.

1992 DOE, EPA, and DEQ entered into a Consent Order to settle the NON. DOE was required to cease use of the waste tanks by June 30, 2015.

1992 The Federal Facilities Compliance Act was signed into law, which led to DOE's development of a Site Treatment Plan for mixed waste to meet RCRA requirements.

1995 DOE, Idaho and the U.S. Navy signed a Settlement Agreement detailing the disposition of nuclear waste at the INL.

1998 The RCRA Consent Order was modified to align with the 1995 Settlement Agreement. DOE agreed to cease use of the waste tanks by December 31, 2012.

2013 DOE did not cease use of the waste tanks. The RCRA Consent Order was modified, extending the date to December 31, 2014.

2015 DOE did not cease use of the waste tanks. DEQ issued a Notice of Violation and assessed penalties. The RCRA Consent Order was again modified with a new compliance date of December 31, 2018. DOE paid $648,000 in penalties; $338,000 in cash to the state's hazardous waste emergency account, the remainder toward supplemental environmental projects. DOE has a compliance schedule under the Consent Order that requires it to begin treating high-level waste by September 30, 2016.

Under the 1995 Settlement Agreement, the sole remedy for failure to treat high-level waste and remove transuranic waste is the suspension of spent fuel shipments to Idaho. The agreement required DOE to designate the INL as the Department's lead lab for DOE spent fuel. This was done in October 1995. The agreement also states that DOE will make no shipments of commercial spent fuel to the INL. At the time of the Settlement Agreement, the INL was operated by DOE's division of Environmental Management (EM).

2002 Secretary of Energy, Spencer Abraham, established the INL as the nation's leading center for nuclear energy and research and reassigned it to DOE's Nuclear Energy (NE) division. It is the only NE lab. It was renamed the Idaho Nuclear Energy and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL).

2003 The landlord responsibilities for the INL were transferred from EM to NE.

2004 DOE was granted a waiver (signed by Governor Kempthorne and Attorney General Wasden) to bring six commercial spent nuclear fuel rods from the North Ann power plant to INL for examination. A condition of the waiver was to remove the rods by December 31, 2006. The rods actually left on July 30, 2006.

2005 INEEL merged with Argone-Labs West and became INL.

2011 A Memorandum of Agreement was signed by Idaho (Governor Otter and Attorney General Wasden) and DOE allowing for limited quantities of commercial spent fuel to be brought to the INL for research. Fuel comes under the overall cap of 55MTHM and must leave the state by 2035.

2011/ DOE did not bring commercial spent fuel to INL.
2012

2013 DOE was suspended from bringing spent fuel to INL for failure to meet the deadline to treat high-level waste.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Groundwater Report

Roy Bartholomay (USGS) provided a presentation about the U.S. Geological Survey Groundwater Report. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

McBride asked what prompted CWI to put in its own wells. Bartholomay responded that CWI's decision was based on its CERCLA monitoring program for WAG groups. McBride then asked why the contractors do not maintain all the wells and why records of decision are tied to others. Bartholomay replied that the USGS looks at wells regionally, examining the health of the entire aquifer while Site contractors focus more on specific facilities. USGS serves as an outside unbiased group of monitoring and there is very little overlap.

Public Comment

At 10:55 a.m. Gumm interrupted Bartholomay's presentation for the Public Comment Session scheduled to begin at that time.

Tami Thatcher of Idaho Falls expressed concern regarding titrium levels in the aquifer and noted that shallow monitoring conducted in the 1990s south of the INL may not have been accurate. She also commented that reports are missing for the years the two disposal wells at the test reactor area were in service. Thatcher asked Bartholomay when cleanup of carbon tet at RWMC began and why it is still increasing. At this point Gumm informed Thatcher that she had reached the five-minute limit on individual comments. Bartholomay asked if he should address Thatcher's question. Bohrer responded that he could if it was part of his presentation. Gumm agreed, and reminded meeting participants that CAB members, DOE, and other representatives are not obligated to respond to comments made during the public comment period.

Bartholomay resumed his presentation.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Groundwater Report, resumed

Christensen asked if sampled elements are seen in water elsewhere and if there is a base level of strontium, tritium, and chloride. Bartholomay responded that there are two different water types at the INL: Western and eastern. Background tritium levels from the western part should be about 43 picocuries/liter, whereas levels from the eastern portion are only about five picocuries/liter, a very low concentration.

Roemer asked Bartholomay to speak to time of travel from a USGS perspective. Bartholomay responded that based on six different studies, USGS believes water from INL will reach the Thousand Springs area between 50 and 700 years. Thatcher's reference to chlorine-36 during the public comment period was based on a doctoral thesis by one of USGS' scientists. His thesis is one of the six studies USGS references. The flow rate he published would be on the order of 100-150 years. That's in the 50-700 year range that USGS says water from the INL would be down in this area.

McBride asked if water is classified as either young or old. Bartholomay responded yes; the young fraction of water is the portion the public is concerned about as the older fraction has not been affected by tritrium, chlorofluorocarbons, nitrates, or other pollutants that present water quality concerns. There are several wells at INL that contain very old water, no young source, and no tritium. These wells probably have the best water quality in the world.

McBride then asked if Bartholomay had an answer to Tami Thatcher's carbon tet question, being that it is related to the topic at hand. Why is carbon tet spiking now? Bartholomay referred to the 2005-2012 data set, and said USGS tends to think that the trend is no trend now, versus the strong increasing trend evident in the data set. While some wells are seeing increasing trends, others are decreasing.

Zimmerman asked if it would be fair to say that the trend has gone from increasing to neutral since those engineering practices have been instituted, and if USGS should see a downward trend. Bartholomay responded that the RWMC production well is a good indicator of water in that area. He said USGS will publish a report on its understanding of hydrological conditions from 2012-2015. Following the report's completion, he will be able to address the trend for the last three years. He believes it is probably showing a downward trend now.

OCVZ Rebound Report/Results

Nolan Jensen (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about the OCVZ rebound report. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

Griffith commented on the $500,000 a year budget for maintenance, operations and staffing and asked about cost benefit, particularly as DOE continues to stay below regulatory hurdles. Jensen responded that the study will show there is not much rebound. They will continue monitoring to ensure that remains true and will work with DEQ and EPA. The cost benefit may not be there if concentrations remain that low, but they will continue operating the OCVZ until they perform the rebound study in three to five years.

Bohrer commented that he recalls photos showing drums floating in the disposal pits, one of the primary drivers for organics existing in the vadose zone. Now, there are flood control berms around the Subsurface Disposal Area to prevent flooding of the disposal pits. This was one of the drivers for getting organics through the disposed waste and into the vadose zone. Remediation efforts have been ongoing for some time. The cap will ensure what is left is not washed into the aquifer.

Nolan referenced Zimmerman's earlier comment that contaminants are typically driven by water. He commented that most of the contamination is very near the surface of the water table and, and while vapors are not controlled by the groundwater, DOE is finding them upgradient from RWMC as they expand. The hope is that they have finally peaked and that monitoring over the coming years will show a steady downward trend.

Thatcher asked if DOE is considering moving the material under Pad A rather than capping the area. Jensen responded that the feasibility study will consider several alternatives.

Annual Environmental Monitoring

Betsy Holmes (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about annual environmental monitoring. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

Bohrer asked how DOE communicates the availability of the annual environmental monitoring report to stakeholders. Holmes responded that the report is published by the Environmental Surveillance, Education and Research (ESER) contractor. They post the report on their website, distribute hard copies to all public reading rooms around the state, and distribute cds to interested stakeholders, including state and federal congressionals. In the past they have tried issuing news releases and holding public meetings at libraries, but did not get a lot of interest. They welcome ideas for better communicating the availability of the report.

CAB member Marvin Fielding asked what kind of waste streams are being land applied. Holmes responded sewage and industrial waste.

Tami Thatcher commented that airborne plutonium numbers were incorrect in the 2013 report and asked where those numbers came from. Holmes responded that DOE takes data from the EPA and the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Radionuclide Report. The errors Thatcher referenced were merely transcription errors and were not errors in the NESHAP report. The compliance report is accurate. DOE corrected this transcription error and issued an erratum for it.

Thatcher noted that the state does not require radiological monitoring data because it is a non-community well. She asked where the radiological data for INL drinking water is reported for each of the last 20 years. Holmes replied that DOE performs radiological monitoring and publishes that data in the ESER. Over time, there have been various types of reports and databases, and some of the older data is not available electronically. Hard copies that summarize the data are available and DOE has tried to make all of those reports accessible in its public reading room. Thatcher said that the data for all 12 wells is not available in the reports and asked Holmes to help her find it after the meeting. Holmes agreed to help.

Environmental Permitting

Nicole Hernandez (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about environmental permitting. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

CAB member Kristin Jensen commented on the 30 day notice that is required for a hearing and asked if they have 15 days to request the hearing. Hernandez said she believes so, and committed to sending a note to the CAB to confirm.

Bohrer asked Hernandez to elaborate on the public comments and attendance they have had for these public meetings. Hernandez responded that they typically do not get a lot of participation. No one attended the meeting in Arco regarding IWTU and the meetings in Idaho Falls are generally not well attended. Most comments during these meetings question the process and few written comments are received.

Roemer commented that Hernandez made mention of other methods of participation and asked what those are. Hernandez clarified that CAB members may participate individually and/or form sub-teams.

Bohrer asked if there is a RCRA performance test that must be performed prior to full operation of IWTU. Hernandez replied yes; a systems performance test is a condition of the permit and DEQ must agree.

Bohrer asked if that performance test was done with surrogate waste or actual waste. Hernandez replied actual waste. Bohrer then asked what the confidence level is that DOE will not have to shut the system down after it has been contaminated. Zimmerman replied that the confidence level on the air control system is fairly high. DOE does not anticipate the air monitoring permit to be a cause of shutting down the facility. Bohrer asked how long it will take the state to review that data and if DOE will continue processing during that time. Zimmerman responded that there is a period during which they may continue processing while the State is evaluating data. Hernandez commented that the public is notified 30 days prior to the scheduled system test. She noted that IWTU will likely go through one more permit change. DEQ representative Darrel Koch commented that it's a state permit, but EPA was involved along the line from Region 10. He asked Hernandez to explain the status of EPA's involvement. Hernandez responded that DOE has received comments from EPA on the IWTU permit and systems performance test through DEQ. They have been heavily involved in the project.

Recognition of outgoing CAB member Harry Griffith

Bohrer recognized CAB member Harry Griffith for his six-year participation on the CAB and thanked him for his effort and unique contributions. Zimmerman also thanked Griffith for his contributions, particularly his insightful comments that resulted in evolving improvement to the presentations.

EM SSAB Chairs report

Bohrer reported on the EM SSAB Chairs Meeting, which he and vice chair Keith Branter attended from April 19 to 21 in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

Bohrer commented that the chairs began working on two recommendations that will be in final draft form at the next meeting:

The first recommendation was proposed by the Portsmouth SSAB. Bohrer explained Portsmouth and Paducah were originally uranium enrichment facilities that were shut down. Located in small, somewhat economically challenged communities, these CABs are focusing on methods of maintaining some level of support from DOE to preserve jobs and transition away from having an operating DOE facility. Portsmouth proposed that the Chairs recommend that DOE consider a contractor's intention to support the community when rewarding contracts. Bohrer commented that DOE is unable to dictate how contractors spend their fee. The chairs agreed in principle that contractors should play a meaningful role in the local communities, and that DOE should support it, but cannot make it a requirement.

The second recommendation encourages DOE to continue its financial support of the SSABs. The chairs believe it is important that DOE-EM continue to obtain input from the CABs and DOE.

Herb also noted that the meeting included presentations from the programs. Mark Whitney provided three charges to the chairs:

1. Provide a recommendation for EM strategic communication and planning for cleanup.

2. Provide priorities and values for the next administration; communicate the importance of the EM SSAB's continued work.

3. Consider future re-utilization for DOE sites.

Mark Sanderling (DOE) gave the Chairs a briefing on WIPP. Reopening WIPP and bringing it back to full capacity will be a long process. As previously discussed, Idaho will not reach its 2018 milestone. The WIPP recovery process is deliberate, however, and they are reasonably confident that every site has enough storage space for its waste.

Bohrer encouraged CAB members to visit DOE's website and read at the EM Newsletter.

Public Comment

Thatcher commented that she is looking for radionuclide monitoring data as it was written down for each year. She has submitted a FOIA, and has not yet seen the drinking water data.

Thatcher questioned removal of the stipulation that DOE-ID would run the spent fuel program from the Settlement Agreement.

Thatcher asked when the future feasibility study will be complete for RWMC Pad A and stated her interest in the annual radiological data. She asked where the Americium is coming from, and if it is being released from the cleanup.

Finally, Thatcher questioned DOE's response to in-soil contamination at the RTC area. She commented that the actual waste there is higher than they acknowledge in NEPA.

Conclusion

Zimmerman concluded the meeting.

Herb Bohrer, Chair
Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board
HB/kb