INL Site Environmental Management

CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting Minutes

April 8, 2015

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Wednesday, April 8, 2015, at the Clarion Inn in Pocatello, Idaho. An audio recording of the meeting was created and may be reviewed by calling CAB Support Staff at 208-557-0843.

Members Present
Bob Bodell
Herb Bohrer
Keith Branter
Brad Christensen
Marvin Fielding
Kristin Jensen
Trilby McAffee
Betsy McBride
Willie Preacher
Cathy Roemer

Members Not Present
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
Tom Dieter, CWI
Susan Burke, State of Idaho
Daryl Koch, DEQ
Dennis Faulk, EPA

Others Present

Mark Brown, DOE
Thomas Dieter, ICP
Natalie Packer, ICP
Kerry Martin, ID DEQ
Mark Barth, ITG/AMWTP
Preston Abbott, Canberra
Bill Barker, AREVA
Chris Henvit, Naval Reactors
Erik Simpson, ICP
Howard Forsythe, ICP
Frank Webber, ICP
Lorie Cahn, ICP
Leslie Jones, PST
Shannon Brennan, DOE-ID
Rebecca Casper, City of Idaho Falls
Roger Turner
Mark Hutchison, NRF
Mike Hart
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Doug Pruitt, DOE-ID
Amy Lientz, INL
Nicole Hernandez, DOE-ID
Danielle, Miller, DOE-ID
Alex Termouri, DOE-EM
Tami Thatcher
Ethan Huffman, Representative Simpson
Amy Taylor, U.S. Senator Risch
Muriel Roberts, League of Women Voters
Roy Bartholomay, USGS
Nolan Jensen, DOE-ID
Nicole Badrov, DOE-ID

Action Items

CAB member Willie Preacher asked how many metric tons of spent fuel are at INL. Zimmerman responded that he will have to check the exact number, but it is in the range of thousands of metric tons.

Assigned to: Jack Zimmerman

Opening Remarks

Facilitator Bryant Kuechle started the meeting at 8:00 a.m. He reviewed the agenda and noted the public participation period. He also reminded attendees about the process for public questions either during the meeting if time permits or via "question cards."

CAB Chair Herb Bohrer welcomed everyone to the meeting. He commented that it seemed like it's been a while since the last meeting and that he is looking forward to hearing the updates.

Jack Zimmerman (DOE-ID) also welcomed everyone. He noted that they have had a good quarter on cleanup progress. He's looking forward to sharing the status updates. Due to some of the recent press, there has been a perception that progress overall is behind schedule, but that's not the case. In reality almost every area of the cleanup project is ahead of schedule with the exception of the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) project.

Dennis Faulk (EPA) noted that he missed the last meeting so he is looking forward to getting caught up.

Susan Burke (DEQ) commented that she is looking forward the meeting and the updates.

Daryl Koch (DEQ) noted that he missed the last two meetings, so he is looking forward to the briefings and getting to know the new CAB members.

Tom Dieter (CWI) commented that he missed the last few meetings as he's focused on IWTU, but he is happy to be back and provide updates. He noted CWI's excellent safety record. He also commented on their progress with IWTU. They ran about 62,000 gallons of simulant through the facility, and are about 60 to 65 percent complete with their modifications resulting from that simulant run. They will do another simulant run to verify the modifications will work. Across the other areas of the cleanup program, they are ahead of schedule. He noted that the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP) is ahead of schedule and addressing more acreage than originally planned. He noted the partnership between Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP) and Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP) – ICP is processing some sludge drums for AMWTP and some waste boxes that are better suited for ICP facilities. The Materials and Fuels Complex (MFC) has successfully completed the sodium treatment processing and are preparing that facility for D&D (MFC -766). At the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC), they are doing well with the spent fuel – they are ahead of schedule and under budget on that project. Also at MFC, they are successfully completing the sodium treatment of the remote-handled (RH) transuranic (TRU) waste. Dieter noted that they anticipate being able to meet the Settlement Agreement milestone. He noted how proud he is of the workforce and the excellent job they are doing. He noted that although he has worked all over the country and this is one of the best groups he's worked with.

Mark Barth (AMWTP) noted that he was attending for Dave Richardson. Barth is the AMWTP Vice President for Business Services. He commented that the partnership with CWI is working well. He reported that since ITG took over the AMWTP contract, they have shipped 13,200 cubic meters of waste out of Idaho. Since the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) shutdown, they are safely storing 500 shipments. Barth reported that they believe they have adequate space to continue to process and store waste in preparation of shipment for another two years. Barth also commented that, on behalf of the workforce, they really appreciate the CAB's recent letter endorsing a long-term mission for AMWTP.

Recent Public Involvement Activities

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

CAB member Betsy McBride asked about the upcoming Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) activity and if the CAB should be prepared to provide input. Zimmerman doesn't believe there is anything coming up that will require formal public comment periods. It is related to reconfiguration of RCRA storage areas so they can use the space in a more efficient manner. McBride encouraged DOE to seek CAB input.

CAB member Harry Griffith noted that the City of Hailey put an ordinance on their agenda protesting the commercial fuel shipments into the state. The INL sent a team to the meeting to address the issue. Griffith asked if the recent Idaho Public Television footage would be available to share with the Hailey councilmembers and the public in general. Zimmerman noted that it would be good to get more information out about the progress by the cleanup program. He also confirmed that they can get some footage that they can share.

ICP Progress

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

CAB member Marvin Fielding noted that Zimmerman reported that Waste Area Group (WAG) 2 is complete. However, he thought that WAG 2 is one of the areas affected by the land use discussion later in the agenda. He asked for clarification about how WAG 2 can be complete if there are still areas under consideration. Nolan Jensen (DOE-ID) noted that there are some new sites at WAG 2 but because they were discovered after the WAG 2 ROD was signed, they are included as part of the "new site process" included as part of WAG 10. Faulk noted that there is a site at WAG 2 that could be affected by the land use decision.

CAB member Willie Preacher asked how many metric tons of spent fuel are at INL. Zimmerman responded that he will have to check the exact number, but it is in the range of thousands of metric tons. He noted that the amount under consideration to be brought in for the nuclear energy research is a tiny fraction of what is currently at INL.

McBride asked if the Navy fuel also has to be out of the state by 2035. Burke responded that under the Settlement Agreement, yes, it also needs to be removed from the state. McBride asked for further clarification -- assuming there is a place for it to go, there will no longer be any spent fuel at the INL after 2035? Zimmerman noted that 2035 is when they have to *start* shipping. Burke noted that there is an agreement with the Navy that fuel can still be brought in past 2035 so they can continue to take care of their fleet. The Settlement Agreement includes an addendum that outlines the Navy fuel requirements.

Griffith asked if the AMWTP boxline is still being used. Zimmerman responded that yes it is and the issues have been corrected.

Bohrer asked how the problem boxline problem was found. Zimmerman responded that it was found during a test and the operator reported it for further investigation. Zimmerman noted that the issue was focused on the mechanics of the switch. He also noted that when they conduct an investigation it always includes a broader look including human performance issues. Bohrer asked if they had had problems with the rollup door before. Zimmerman confirmed that they had some previous issues with the doors before and that is part of why those doors are used only for equipment; personnel are not allowed to use these doors. Barth noted that rollup doors are becoming an area of growing concern throughout the DOE Complex. He noted that it may be attributed to aging of the doors.

Bohrer asked about AMWTP safety performance. He noted that in September AMWTP went above the goal. He questioned what has changed with the safety culture. Zimmerman noted that DOE is working with ITG to ensure high awareness of the job and surroundings. He noted a couple accidents earlier in the year related to slipping on ice. Bohrer noted that AMWTP has a history of an excellent safety culture and wants to see that maintained.

Bohrer asked about the argon repacking system in CPP-659 and if it is the same system as the one in CPP-666. He asked if they are meeting the commitments with the existing CPP-666 system, why spend the resources for another one? Zimmerman confirmed it is essentially the same type of system and that it is needed for more than processing RH-TRU waste; it will be used to support broader missions. It will also help with the RH low-level waste. Dieter noted that it helps mitigate risk and accelerate scope.

McBride asks what happens to the cadmium during the sodium distillation process. Zimmerman responded that as it comes off in a vapor, it cools and becomes a solid and collects in the condenser. McBride asked what happens then and if the cadmium has to be treated further. Zimmerman responded that it is ready for disposal at that point. Dieter noted that the sodium settles out in the bottom of the collection vessel and will be shipped to WIPP.

Griffith asked what will happen to the waste not processed through the new system (about one-third of the total waste stream). Zimmerman responded that the other waste will be processed through the more traditional treatment process in the argon atmosphere cells with remote manipulators and spritzed with water to react with the sodium. Griffith asked how the water is dealt with. Dieter commented that they segregate the sodium, breaking it down into smaller pieces. When it is then spritzed, it reacts and dissipates, reducing it to almost nothing. Griffith asked to clarify – the sodium vapor/gas is caught up in the filter. Dieter confirmed.

Griffith asked about WIPP and how they carefully look at the waste streams they accept. He asked if any of their findings and potential changes could impact current activities at ICP. Zimmerman responded that the WIPP release was limited to just one drum that was processed at Los Alamos that included organic material, very low pH, and high TRU content. That led to the reaction in the drum. None of the other waste streams have been called into question. We continue to move forward to certify this waste to current waste acceptance criteria. If WIPP identifies a significant risk in a current waste stream, we may have to revisit, but believe that that is a very low risk.

Griffith asked what "certified" means. Zimmerman responded that waste sent to WIPP must be certified – it must pass a series of checks and balances to ensure that all waste sent there meets their waste acceptance criteria. The process includes visual examination, assaying the waste, and ensuring there are no prohibited items (organic material, aerosol cans). Basically the process gives the final "stamp" that the waste meets all the criteria. Griffith asked about the change in certification figures from 2013 to now. Zimmerman noted that in 2013 they weren't tracking the metrics on "waste certified" because they were tracking waste shipped. However, because they are not able to ship at this time, they are tracking waste certified. Griffith noted that the contact-handled (CH)-TRU Processing chart seems to be misleading to have zeros entered in for pre-2014. Bohrer concurred that the chart is misleading and recommended that DOE should note that the waste shipped had already been certified so that should be captured.

CAB member Trilby McAfee asked if all waste sent to WIPP is certified, and if so, how did the problem barrel get to WIPP. Zimmerman responded that there are a lot of checks and balances in place, and that a lot of things had to go wrong for the occurrence to happen at WIPP. The bottom line is they had procedures and requirements to do things a certain way but those procedures and requirements were not followed, which allowed some incompatible materials to get to WIPP. The investigation has identified a couple other drums that may pose a problem, so WIPP is taking action to seal those areas.

McBride recommended adding a percentage completed measure to the CH-TRU Processing chart so they know what the significance is (e.g., is it half, is it more than half). McBride asked about the term "legacy" and if it is related to the Settlement Agreement. Zimmerman confirmed that is referring to Settlement Agreement waste – it refers to the historical 65,000 cubic meters. McBride asked if there are activities at the INL that are generating new waste that is outside the scope of the Settlement Agreement. Zimmerman said yes, there is new waste being generated (e.g., contaminated personal protective equipment). McBride asked if there are requirements for removing that newly generated waste. Zimmerman responded that there are RCRA requirements and internal DOE

requirements addressing that waste. Newly generated waste should not be stored for more than a year. Bohrer noted that this chart is focused on the historic or legacy AMWTP scope waste (65,000 cubic meters).

Branter asked what the end state is for CPP-666 and -659. Zimmerman responded that they are not scheduled for D&D at this time. They have ongoing missions for at least a few years.

McBride asked if processes to treat the sodium bearing waste exist in other countries. Zimmerman responded that there are processes but they would not likely be acceptable in this country. He gave the example of incineration, which is used widely elsewhere but not in the U.S. He commented that those processes are not viable in the U.S. regulatory environment.

Integrated Waste Treatment Unit Update

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

Griffith asked the duration of the simulant run. Zimmerman responded that it ran overall about 5 to 6 weeks. They processed over 60,000 gallons of simulant, and ran at an overall average of just below two gallons per minute.

Bohrer asked how they know the material is not going to blind the filters. Zimmerman responded that there is a back air pulse process that blows that material away from the filters. Bohrer asked if they were sure that the process is working even though the material appears to be stickier than originally expected. Zimmerman responded that there are also DP sensors across the filters which also help ensure there is no buildup on the filters. Dieter noted that they are confident in the filters. Their area of focus is on the material that is accumulating in the bottom of the vessel.

Griffith asked which of the six issues identified keep Zimmerman up at night. Zimmerman responded that the "bark formation issue" is absolutely their number one concern. They have brought in a number of top experts to help address the issue. He said the off gas filter issue is also a significant issue. He believes they have a viable solution for that issue but it is expensive and will take about six months to implement, so they are also evaluating some additional options.

Branter asked what the consequences would be regarding radioactive material if they encountered a ruptured disk during operations. Zimmerman responded that essentially all the radioactive material would be collected in the vessels. The ruptured disk system is downstream of the filters in the off gas system, which would prevent blowing out the HEPA filters and other components.

McBride asked if the new agreed upon compliance schedule affects the ability for DOE to bring in additional spent fuel without seeking a waiver from the attorney general. Zimmerman responded that a waiver is required if they are out of compliance with the original Settlement Agreement milestones, so a waiver is still required. The attorney general has indicated he will not consider the waiver at this time until DOE has made further progress on IWTU. Burke clarified the distinction between the RCRA consent order and the Settlement Agreement.

Bohrer noted that "we all agree that protection of the environment and human health are the priority" and noted that he appreciates that the State and DOE specifically stating that priority and including that statement. Zimmerman noted that the parties all agree that they don't want penalties to drive bad decisions.

CAB member Brad Christensen asked who makes the decision regarding selection of the resolution for the off gas filter issue. Zimmerman responded that the decision would be made jointly by DOE and CWI. There is a lot of engineering work that is still needed.

CPP-659 Contamination Event and Recovery

Mark Brown (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on the CPP-659 contamination event and recovery efforts. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: http://inlcab.energy.gov/.

Branter asked what the level of contamination was following the event. Brown responded that it was 10,000 dpm in the corridor. Branter asked if there was any beta gamma contamination. Brown responded that is was primarily alpha contamination.

McBride asked for clarification on the context – is this a lot of contamination or not. She also asked what else happens in an incident like this – is the county notified and is the building closed off. What goes on around an event like this? Brown noted that there are thresholds that indicate when they have to make formal notifications. This event did not make the threshold so was considered a non-reportable event. McBride asked if they measure outside the building to ensure no release of contamination. Brown responded that yes, they do monitor, as well as take samples throughout the building and the ventilation system and protective barriers. There was no spread beyond the protective barrier. Brown noted that the worker contamination is a known risk. He also noted that the worker responded as he should and was already leaving the area when the alarm sounded. McBride asked if the worker contamination goes against his allowable limit. Brown responded that yes it does, but he also noted that the amount was so small that it won't impact the employee's duties.

Preacher asked if they did a bioassay. Brown said yes, they followed the normal bioassay process.

Bohrer commented that there was a contamination during a glovebox event a few years ago. He asked if DOE was satisfied that all the lessons learned and corrective actions from that event were in place on the cleanup side. Bohrer asked if this event brought to light any weaknesses in implementation of the lessons learned and corrective actions. Brown responded that they share lessons learned extensively and routinely incorporate process improvements. Brown also noted that the worker has no concerns about the event. Furthermore, bioassays were offered to all the workers and they obtained worker buy-in before going back to work

Branter asked how many times similar incidents have happened at the New Waste Calcining Facility (NWCF, CPP-659). Brown responded that he's not aware of this event happening before. Branter responded that he believes it has happened before in similar areas. Brown committed to review similar events for lessons learned.

Bohrer noted that this looks like a classic failure of the Integrated Safety Management System. He questioned if there is a bigger issue regarding some level of complacency. He asked if this incident was more of a safety system breakdown than a specific error. Dieter responded that it could be a bit of complacency. He noted that 18 corrective actions were implemented but that human communication and human performance are also involved. He noted that they continue to focus on the human behavior part of it too. They noted they are committed to heightened awareness and they have put many controls in place.

Bohrer asked why it took seven weeks to restart operations. Brown responded that they completed extensive contamination surveys of the corridors. In addition, the investigation and corrective actions were very detailed. Dieter noted that they wanted to be able to have significant data to demonstrate to the workers that the environment is safe.

Preacher asked how often this process is completed. Brown responded that they load out packages from that cell at least once every two days. Every drum of RH TRU that goes into that facility goes through and every drum that comes out goes through that cell.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Update

Zimmerman provided an update on the WIPP recovery. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: http://inlcab.energy.gov/.

Bohrer commented about WIPP shipping priority. He noted that the CAB had issued a letter to DOE regarding the EM budget priorities and included an item encouraging DOE to give Idaho shipping priority so we can meet our agreements. Zimmerman noted that he appreciated that support.

McBride asked what this means in terms of Idaho, specifically regarding the waste we're storing. She questioned if we have combinations of materials possibly from early packaging that we should be concerned about for a potential for similar incidents in Idaho. She asked if there a possibility that we will have to repack barrels to meet new certification requirements? She also asked if future places will be reluctant to host repositories; what is the community perception? Zimmerman responded that most communities have a concern about any sort of waste storage. Recently the Secretary of Energy has adopted recommendations regarding consent-based siting. Zimmerman thinks consent-based siting will be used exclusively in the future. He believes that WIPP's community has been and continues to be very supportive of the facility. Regarding the waste in Idaho, Zimmerman noted that the material we have in Idaho is very different from the contents of the drum that was involved in the incident at WIPP. Furthermore, he noted that our procedures and processes prevent us from mixing waste in such a way that could result in having incompatible materials. He also commented that the Idaho team has a strong safety culture and workers are committed to following procedures.

McAfee asked about the records from Los Alamos and if there was only one drum with the components that were involved in the incident. Zimmerman responded that there are other drums – some that are already underground at WIPP and some that are in storage at Waste Control Specialists (WCS) in Texas. That is part of why they are closing Panel 6 at WIPP because there are several drums in that panel that have similar constituents. At WCS, they continue to monitor the suspected drums.

Test Area North Groundwater Update/In-situ Bioremediation

Nicole Badrov (DOE-ID) provided an update on TAN groundwater treatment and in-situ bioremediation. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: http://inlcab.energy.gov/.

Roemer asked which of the remedies is the most effective – bioremediation or pump and treat. Badrov responded that both have been very effective. She noted that they will be injecting into the two new wells and continue the rebound test.

McAfee asked how deep the injection well was. Badrov responded that it is 312 feet.

U.S. Geological Survey Groundwater Report Update

Roy Bartholomay (USGS) provided an overview of the latest USGS groundwater report. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: http://inlcab.energy.gov/.

Fielding asked what direction the groundwater flows at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC). Bartholomay responded that it generally flows from northeast to southwest in that area. He also noted that there are some significant sedimentary interbeds there. Fielding asked if that may be why carbon tetrachloride is increasing in Well 87. Bartholomay confirmed that that may be influencing it or it may be because of the cleanup activities in the immediate area.

Branter asked if the Organic Contamination in the Vadose Zone (OCVZ) wells are still working at RWMC. Frank Webber from CWI responded that yes, the OCVZ project is still operating. He noted that there are vapors going both ways – into the atmosphere and further into the ground. He also noted that at RWMC there is a massive interbed, which blocks things from reaching the aquifer. It's about 600 feet down to the aquifer.

Roemer asked if water movement is based mostly on computer modeling and how variations are factored in. She also asked what can we expect to see coming out at Thousands Springs and the Hagerman Valley. Bartholomay responded that water movement science is based on mathematical modeling. USGS has conducted a number of tracer studies in that area and water moves anywhere from two to 26 feet per day so water could get to Thousand Springs within 50 to 700 years.

Idaho Settlement Agreement Overview

Susan Burke (DEQ) provided an overview of the Idaho Settlement Agreement and gave an update on milestone completions to date. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: http://inlcab.energy.gov/.

Preacher asked if shipments of DOE spent fuel to Idaho can resume if the IWTU project gets back on track. Burke responded that yes, the shipments would be able to resume. Preacher asked if that includes foreign reactor (FRR) fuels as long as the Navy is in compliance with their requirements, then they can still receive Navy fuel.

Roemer asked what the Commercial Spent Nuclear Fuel Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is in relation to the Settlement Agreement. Burke responded that, at the time of the Settlement Agreement, there was a concern that Idaho would receive a lot of spent nuclear fuel – possibly even commercial fuel – that would just sit here awaiting a repository. The Settlement Agreement specifically states that INL cannot receive commercial spent fuel. However, under the agreement, Idaho can waive performance by the federal parties of any terms, conditions, and obligations contained in the Settlement Agreement. The MOA for commercial spent fuel was based on this waiver allowance for spent fuel to be shipped for testing and research (not for storage purposes).

McBride asked if it is possible to look at a future with dueling agreements. For instance, if there was interest by the state to be a consent based site for interim storage as described by the Blue Ribbon Commission, could that agreement be made and held separately from the Settlement Agreement? Burke responded that legal minds would have to make that determination. You could make arguments both ways, doesn't know what the state would decide. It would definitely be a legal matter.

Griffith asked what would happen with the high-level waste if there is no permanent repository after 2035; would it be able to stay where it is and would there be any penalties associated with that? Burke responded that the key is that it needs to be "road ready." Griffith asked if there is no repository, can it stay where it is indefinitely. And if it stays beyond 2035 are their fines and penalties involved? Zimmerman noted that the physical configuration would be a safe configuration. However, without a repository site, we don't know what the requirements are so there would be some risk with too much preliminary preparation for making it road ready. As far as penalties, the major penalty for not being in compliance is a restriction on bringing in spent fuel for research. Burke also noted that calcine is in safe storage in the bin sets, but it is not road ready. Griffith asked for confirmation that a future project is planned to process the calcine for transportation. Zimmerman confirmed. Burke commented that she is optimistic that they will find a location for the high level waste, possibly sooner than the spent fuel.

Preacher noted that consent agreements also are dependent on getting approval from the Tribes. Preacher questioned what would happen if the citizens of Idaho consented to have spent fuel allowed in but the Tribes said no. Burke commented that there are a lot of nuances in terms of if counties supersede cities, etc. And that would have to be sorted. Preacher also asked about a recent report that discussed the use of boreholes for waste storage. Burke responded that boreholes would not be a good idea to have in Idaho over our sole source aquifer.

Idaho CERCLA Oversight

Dennis Faulk (EPA) provided an overview of the Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the EPA's oversight role. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: http://inlcab.energy.gov/.

Daryl Koch (DEQ) provided an overview of DEQ's oversight role with CERCLA. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: http://inlcab.energy.gov/.

Griffith asked when a well is drilled and high concentrations are found, what precautions are taken to ensure it's not drilled through and taken further down. Bartholomay responded that it primarily based on geologists knowledge of the subsurface in that area.

McAfee asked how many injection wells were on the site. Koch responded that to his knowledge there were three – one at TAN, one at INTEC, and one at ATR. McAfee asked who monitors those wells. Koch noted that those wells are closed. He commented that at TAN they will drill two new wells to inject amendments for remediation. Trilby asked if there are any current injection wells (separate from the ones used in the remediation). Koch said no.

Faulk noted that the land use discussion has direct bearing on this site. Bodell asked for clarification about the area under consideration for the land use change. Koch noted that it is the whole area at TRA.

Public Comment

Tami Thatcher (Idaho Falls) commented that we know that the water in the aquifer moves about a foot per day from the northeast to the southwest. When you're measuring technetium and it decreases, it's because it moved downstream not because it decayed. Technetium is highly mobile. Cesium is measured the most because it's the easiest to measure. Thatcher stressed that long lived radionuclides are important. She finds the attitude about monitoring long-lived radionuclides interesting and doesn't understand the lack of attention.

Thatcher also commented on planned caps and noted that caps don't hold up long term.

Thatcher also commented regarding IWTU penalties and the caveat that the penalties don't accrue if the delay is due to a health and safety concerns. She questioned if there are any ground rules defining those concerns.

Beatrice Brailsford requested that at some point Faulk give a presentation about the five-year review plan and the process related to that.

EM Funding Breakdown

Zimmerman provided an overview of the Fiscal Year 2016 Congressional budget request. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: http://inlcab.energy.gov/.

Bohrer asked about the $34M difference from 2015 to 2016. Zimmerman noted that the budgets are planned two years advance. He then responded that the decrease was because IWTU was supposed to be complete by 2016 so the 2016 numbers didn't include funding for IWTU. Zimmerman plans to use carryover to cover the shortfall. Bohrer asked if Zimmerman believes that he has enough carry over to cover the gap. Zimmerman also noted he may have an opportunity to request additional funding to help close that gap. Bohrer commented that liquid waste stabilization was one of DOE's top priorities in the recent budget discussion, and yet that is the area that has taken the biggest hit. Bohrer asked if the request is adequate. Zimmerman reported that yes, it should be sufficient along with the carryover, barring some other unforseen risk. Bohrer asked what is being taken off the table if the

carryover is ued for closing that gap. Zimmerman responded that if the carryover was not needed for IWTU and closing that gap, he would accelerate other areas such as the Subsurace Disposal Area actions.

Borher opened to public questions. Thatcher asked how the IWTU extension plays into the new contracts. Zimmerman responded that it is an option in the new contract or DOE has the option to extend CWI's contract for IWTU.

Student Participation Committee Report

The committee deferred the discussion to after the upcoming SSAB Chairs meeting as this topic will be discussed there and the commtitee will have more to report after that meeting.

Land Use Committee Report

McBride gave a recap of the land use committee discussions and activities to date. She reviewed the previous draft recommendation to change the cleanup standard to industrial. However, the CAB members never reached consensus on that recommendation so a new committee was formed to revisit.

The commtitee ended up with a long list of what opponents and proponents might say about it. It is gathered into a format that can be shared with DOE. The committee requested additional information from DOE, but have not received that information. McBride noted that the CAB has still not reached consensus on this topic. She believes the CAB can provide DOE with a report that notes that the CAB includes diverse representatives with differing ideas about these options and was unable to reach consensus. Or the CAB can decide to keep debating the topic. McBride does not believe the CAB can reach consensus on this topic.

Bohrer thanked the subcommittee for their work. He believes the CAB needs to move on. He noted that the CAB couldn't reach consensus and he's not surprised by that on a topic this complex. Bohrer believes that the CAB is in agreement to change to industrial standards within the specifically identified areas. He believes the CAB is less in agreement when that is expanded to all areas within fencelines. Bohrer doesn't believe that further debate is beneficial and he doesn't believe the CAB should resort to a vote as they are a consent-based board. After getting the committee's report, Bohrer believes the CAB should bring the discussion to a close and he has drafted a letter to DOE noting that consensus was not achieved.

Koch commented that this proposal was just for a specific area (21 acres out of 120 acres) at TRA and adding two buildings at INTEC rather than all areas within the fenceline. Bohrer noted that we asked for clarification several times whether it was the specific areas identified at both complexes or the entire area within the fenceline and the feedback from DOE was that it is the entire area in the fenceline at those areas.

McBride noted that there has been a significant amout of confusion from the beginning on this regarding things like the specific areas under consideration, EPA's position, DEQ's position, and who is requesting public/CAB input? She further clarified that consensus was achieved for CAB support for changing the standard in the two specific areas, but that the CAB did not achieve consensus on the broader change. McBride believes that if there is a way to obtain broader public input on this topic, that would be beneficial. McBride believes that the information collected during this process will be beneficial to DOE.

Fielding commented that he understood that the default standard is the 10-foot residential standard. Bohrer responded that the current requirement is to cleanup to the residential standard. Koch commented that CERCLA is based on assumed land use. Most of the cleanup to residential standards have been outside of the main facilities because other than TAN, the facilities are still actively engaged for a long time in active missions.

Bohrer agreed to send the draft letter to the CAB for their concurrence to send to DOE.

Zimmerman concluded the meeting.

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