



INL Site Environmental Management

C I T I Z E N S A D V I S O R Y B O A R D

Meeting Minutes

February 12, 2014

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Wednesday, February 12, 2014, at the Residence Inn by Marriott in Idaho 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, Chair
Harry Griffith, Vice Chair
Nicki Karst
Bob Bodell
Harrison Gerstlauer
Kristen Jensen
Betsy McBride
Bill Roberts
Tami Henvit

Members Not Present

Betsy McBride
Teri Tyler

Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), Federal Coordinator, and Liaisons Present

Jim Cooper, DDFO, U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Kerri Martin, State of Idaho
Hoss Brown, Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP)
Daryl Koch, State of Idaho
Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Others Present

Bob Holmes	Susie Barna
Frank Webber	Mark Barth
Kevin Daniels	Scott Raish
Shannon A. Brennan	Chris Henvit
Bruce LaRue	Beatrice Brailsford
Pete Johansen	Natalie Packer
Jennifer Cate	Danielle Miller
Erin Bogner	Curtis Roth
Erik Simpson	Brandt Meagher
Mark Dadrina	John Tanner
Maria Williams	Leslie Huddleston
Mark Hutchison	Tami Thatcher
Mike Hart	Greg Bass
Nicole Brooks	Lori McNamara, Support Services
Ethan Huffman	Bryant Kuechle, Support Services Facilitator
Kelly Galloway	Ann Riedesel, Support Services
Valerie Kimbro	

Action Items

Assigned to: Jim Cooper

Tami Henvit noted that she had heard stories about a sludge layer on the top of the aquifer. Cooper and Bohrer noted that they have never heard of that. Cooper committed that an answer to that will be included as part of the upcoming groundwater presentation.

Assigned to: Jim Cooper

Kristen Jensen asked if the CPAR system is a federally mandated system. Cooper responded that yes it is a mandated system based on the Federal Acquisition Regulations. Cooper will look at what information can be shared in response to Bohrer's concern.

Response:

Jim Cooper provided additional information (via email on February 20, 2014) for accessing information related to contractor performance:

1. Quarterly fee status for Idaho's EM contracts can be found at: <http://energy.gov/em/em-contractor-fee-payments> (current through 1st QTR FY14)
2. DOE-Idaho Operation Summary <http://www.id.energy.gov/NEWS/OperationsSummarys.htm> (provides a summary progress report for each Idaho contract)
3. DOE-Idaho Quarterly Fee Determination Summary - <http://www.id.energy.gov/doeid/ICPContract/ICPContractOtherDocs.htm> (This needs to be updated to include FY13 quarterly fee summaries.)

Opening Remarks

Facilitator Bryant Kuechle opened the meeting. He reviewed the CAB policy for public comments and noted a few clarifications and changes. The official public comment or participation period is the 15-minute period published on the agenda. Any member of the public that would like to comment is asked to sign up at the registration table prior to the published time on the agenda. Prior to making comments, commenters should state their name and city of residence. Questions may be accepted from the public following the conclusion of the presentation at the discretion of the CAB Chair. If there is not enough time for questions at that time, question cards are now available for members of the public to complete. The cards are available at the registration table. The CAB support staff and DOE will do their best to obtain answers to the questions. All questions must pertain to agenda topics discussed during the CAB meeting.

CAB Vice Chair Harry Griffith opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. He noted that work is underway on the Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs meeting in April.

Jim Cooper (DOE-ID) noted that his travels to work with DOE in Washington D.C., along with support from the CAB and Congressional representatives, resulted in the Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP) receiving a \$22M plus up for funding for 2014. Without the additional funding, some priority work would have been shut down later this year. It's exciting times. Things are looking positive for the cleanup work in Idaho. Cooper encouraged the CAB to continue to participate in the process and expressed his appreciation for their input.

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noted that he had toured the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP) the day before and things are going quite well there. EPA is happy to see the increased funding for cleanup at the site. Faulk was hoping to see a discussion regarding cleanup levels and land use assumptions on the agenda, but noted it was included only in the work session. In the Superfund Cleanup process, setting assumptions for future land use is one of the major public policy decisions. In Idaho in the early 1990s, the focus was to return the site to an unrestricted status by 2095, so that is what most of the Records of Decision (RODs) state. EPA has been approached by DOE to potentially change some of those assumptions. However, considering where we are in the cleanup process, it's probably inconsequential. If we were at the start of the cleanup process, it would be very different.

Kerry Martin (State of Idaho) noted that the state is happy with the restart of ARP and there is good progress. They are also happy to hear that the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP) boxline restarted. They are hopeful that there is more budget stability and that things will keep moving forward.

Daryl Koch (State of Idaho) added that DOE has completed Waste Area Group (WAG) 10-04 (ordnance) before the 2020 deadline.

Hoss Brown (ICP) noted the safety record of CWI. They are on track to have the best year ever. They are preparing for a VPP recertification audit at the end of March. The Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) personnel have been working tirelessly to fix everything and are testing the systems. ARP-5 continues to go very well, with approximately 8,400 new drums out of the facility. To date, 3.19 acres have been exhumed. They also are continuing to exhume in ARP 8. ICP is also starting two sodium treatment projects – the sodium distillation system and a mock up for MFC-766. Brown noted that CWI personnel are working hard, their morale is very good, and he is very proud of them.

Recent Public Involvement Activities

Jim Cooper reviewed recent Public Involvement activities. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Cooper reviewed the three open questions from the last meeting:

1. Beatrice Brailsford asked if there is an anticipated bottleneck in meeting the 2023 deadline. The 2023 milestone is associated with getting all the spent fuel out of wet storage and into dry storage. Cooper noted that the additional funding helps move things forward. He doesn't anticipate any bottlenecks and believes they may beat the milestone by 1½ to 2 years.
2. Daryl Koch discussed the state's interest in the proposal to clean up to industrial standards rather than residential standards. Cooper noted that Dennis' opening remarks were related to this. Industrial levels provide a little more flexibility; residential levels are much more restrictive. DOE was asked to involve the CAB in the discussion. DOE prepared a white paper with input from the regulators for the CAB. We'll discuss it in more detail during the work session.
3. Roger Turner asked if there were any plans for more characterization on the bin sets in preparation for the treatment plan. Cooper responded that they do not have any plans to retrieve calcine and conduct further characterization. They have extremely detailed processing data and records from the calcining process that were used to characterize the waste. They will validate the documentation during the near-term years on the project.

Griffith asked what the Washington Department of Ecology is. Faulk responded that it is the Washington State agency equivalent to the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. He noted that they are interested in transuranic waste processing. In Washington they have a significant backlog of transuranic waste and are looking at the possibility of shipping their backlog to Idaho for processing once the Idaho waste has been processed. Cooper noted that DOE-ID is working with DOE-HQ and other sites to identify new waste streams that may be brought to Idaho for processing at AMWTP. We believe we can do it much cheaper than other sites and have significant volume reduction via the supercompactor. No other site has this capability.

Cooper also reviewed the recent fire event at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). All of the employees were safely evacuated from the mine and evaluated at the local hospital for smoke inhalation. All were released the same day. A formal investigation of the fire is being conducted. That investigation will take several weeks and will identify any corrective actions that should be taken. The impact to operations here in Idaho: last week we lost 6 shipments out of a planned 10 and this week we had planned 10 shipments, so we've lost a total of 16 shipments to date. This equates to 83 m³ of waste that should have been shipped, but that has been delayed. One fortunate thing about the timing of the event: it was just 2 weeks before a scheduled WIPP "maintenance shutdown" February 17 through March 10 when no shipments are planned. They are hoping that the investigation will be complete and that WIPP will be allowed to complete the planned maintenance, which is in a different area from where the fire occurred. Once WIPP comes back on line, we will meet with the WIPP managers to see if we can increase our shipment rate to WIPP. We met with them last month and were able to increase our shipment rate from a planned 8 shipments to 10 shipments per week. We hope that once they are back on line, they will allow us to increase our rate to 12 shipments per week.

Karst asked if this was the first incident at WIPP. Cooper responded that he was unaware of any other incident like a fire at WIPP. He noted that they have an extremely good record. They are taking this event very seriously and are looking proactively to the investigation results.

Griffith asked how many trucks WIPP has like the one involved in the fire. Cooper responded that he doesn't know the exact number but he believes it is at least five.

ICP Progress

Cooper 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/>.

Griffith asked about the commitment to ship two shipments of remote-handled transuranic (RH-TRU) to WIPP in January and whether it was shipped according to plan or impacted by the incident at WIPP. Cooper responded that the two shipments were sent as planned. All other RH-TRU shipments have been suspended until September while they build a backlog of RH-TRU shipments. In the meantime, WIPP is working with Argonne East to complete their RH-TRU shipment campaigns through the summer.

Griffith then asked about the 18 shipments from Los Alamos and what the timing is for it. Cooper said that it fits in with the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP) process. Once received, we have 6 months to characterize the waste and another 6 months to process the waste and repackage it before it has to be shipped offsite. We have received offsite waste from seven other sites already and have always processed it and shipped it out of the state in less than a year. Griffith also asked, from a Los Alamos perspective, when do they consider their action with the waste complete – when they ship it to Idaho or when it is finally sent to WIPP? Cooper responded that they “get the checkmark” when it leaves their facility (i.e., when it is sent to Idaho). Once processed in Idaho, it will be shipped directly to WIPP. It will not ever go back to Los Alamos. Cooper also noted that the reason we took the waste is that it requires our remote capabilities that our unique to AMWTP.

Bill Roberts asked when they plan to grout the remaining high level waste tanks. Cooper responded that grouting the tanks will follow the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) closure of the tanks, which includes removing the sediment/sludge in the bottom of the tanks and the cleaning of the tanks. Cooper noted that the sediment/sludge removed from the tanks will be processed through IWTU.

Questions were then accepted from members of the public present at the meeting. Beatrice Brailsford asked about the personal protective equipment workers were wearing in one of the presentation photos. Cooper noted that it was a photograph at the tank farm, which is a contaminated area. The workers were installing isolation valves so they wore the suits to protect them in the area.

Integrated Waste Treatment Unit Status

Curtis Roth provided an update on the IWTU. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Griffith asked how the “opportunities for improvement” get addressed. Roth responded all of the opportunities are reviewed and worked in parallel with the project startup.

Karst asked who is on the “readiness assessment” team. Roth responded that the team is made up of all DOE personnel from around the Complex who are subject matter experts with significant experience with startup and operation. Karst also asked how long it takes to cool the facility down to do the work in outages and how long does it take to get back up to temperature. Roth responded it takes about 2 weeks to cool down and about 5 to 6 days to heat up.

Griffith asked if there are any target dates for the project. Cooper noted that DOE is cautious about listing specific dates. Because of the uniqueness of the facility there are day-to-day unknowns. Cooper is optimistic that they will be able to start putting simulant through in the May timeframe but beyond that he is hesitant to give interim dates. However, he is confident that they will still be able to meet the December milestone.

CERCLA Groundwater

Nolan Jensen provided a presentation on the CERCLA Groundwater focus at the INL. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcam.energy.gov/>.

Cooper asked about the timeframe is for the recharge test. Nolan responded that it is 2 years. They have to make a recommendation this Fall on whether to continue.

Bohrer asked what water sources are still being injected into the groundwater at INL. Jensen said he doesn't believe there is anything injected with the exception of clean water. Stormwater goes into lined ponds.

Henvit assumed that the 2095 date was based on migration pattern data. Is that the case? Jensen responded that it was more of a policy decision. At the time for this site, the policy was that DOE would maintain control for 100 years (which equated to 2095). Henvit noted that aquifer levels are declining and wondered if that has any effect on migration patterns. Jensen said it does some have impact, especially seasonally. They continue to monitor it and factor it in. As levels go down, they may have to adjust their monitoring equipment to reach lower in the aquifer.

Kuch noted his surprise when he first arrived at how little contamination is present in the aquifer, especially compared with other sites like Hanford.

Gerstlauer asked if the vapor vacuum extraction system had ever been shut down to assess what happens to levels. Jensen responded that the system is kept running all the time. They have not shut it down and conducted a rebound test.

Bohrer opened the meeting to questions from the public.

John Tanner (Idaho Falls) noted that cesium and strontium cling to the soil, which holds it in place. He then asked what was happening to the chromium in Waste Area Group 2. Jensen responded that they have reached drinking water standards there.

Tami Thatcher (Bonneville County) asked about groundwater flows and commented that it can move faster in some cases. She asked what the rate is that water is percolating through the ground to the aquifer. She feels that perched water is not considered groundwater and therefore not given the attention that groundwater is. Jensen noted that the perched water is the focus because that is where the contamination is. The remedial investigation looked at what the options are and tried to determine if the perched water is seeping to the aquifer at a rate that could elevate the aquifer levels to above drinking water standards. It was determined that if infiltration was eliminated, the perched water would maintain in place and therefore the aquifer would continue to be protected.

Gerstlauer asked the distance is to Thousand Springs? Jensen responded that he believes it is about 80 miles.

Tami Thatcher asked about tests that show fast moving tracers (a matter of days). Jensen noted that he is not aware of any studies that show anything moving quickly. Koch recommended that Thatcher meet with DEQ and/or USGS to discuss these studies. He also noted that the focus is on levels above MCLs.

Beatrice Brailsford (Pocatello) commented on the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) Percolation Pond permit renewal. She noted that Idaho DEQ shortened the renewal period from 10 years to 5 years because of they were concerned that the percolation pond might be having an impact on the perched water.

Brailsford also asked whatever happened with the Technetium 99 at INTEC. Kerry Martin noted that it came from the injection well and it is part of the fission process and not unexpected. Jensen noted that they continue to monitor it.

Bohrer noted that public interest in groundwater is high and that it is important to continue to follow this topic. Bill Roberts concurred, stating that without a doubt the groundwater and aquifer are the top concern for most people and that he appreciated Nolan's presentation.

Cooper noted that DOE would put groundwater presentations on the CAB schedule more often to routinely keep the CAB updated on groundwater.

DOE Contractor Incentive and Ratings Process (CPAR)

Maria Mitchell-Williams and Jennifer Cate provided a presentation about the DOE Contractor Incentive and Ratings Process (CPAR). The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website:
<http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Faulk asked what was meant by "provisional." Cate noted that it is used when work has been completed but the full project is not yet complete.

Bohrer asked, as a taxpayer and citizen, where would I go and what would I find if I wanted to see how DOE rates its contractor. Mitchell-Williams responded that there is fee information and a high level summary of the contractor's performance on the EM website. Bohrer expressed concern that this information is for official use only and the public can't see it. He believes the public has a right to know some substantive information about how DOE thinks their contractors are doing their job. Henvit surmised that there is probably a lot of proprietary information included that companies wouldn't want shared and that may be one of the reasons the information isn't available publicly. Mitchell-Williams confirmed that is part of the reason. Bohrer believes that there can be proprietary information but that general information about how DOE thinks a contractor is performing should be public information. Cooper responded that general information about contractor performance is available but that there are also some sensitivity with sharing information that could influence general perception of a company. The EM website notes general summary of performance and fee paid. Bohrer noted that if that information is available, it would be good to include in the new CAB newsletter.

Gerstlauer asked if the safety incentive awards program is still in place. Mitchell-Williams noted that the safety incentive program is really tied to the incentive fee earned. Cooper noted that the contract was set up this way because they believe it helps encourage safe performance of the work, which is the most successful way to operate. Cooper commended the site contractors (CWI and Idaho Treatment Group [ITG]) for their safety performance. Brown reviewed briefly the ICP safety award program. He stressed that "if we continue to be safe, we continue to work."

Griffith asked if a contractor could pull their own information from the system. Mitchell-Williams noted that the contractor could request their information.

Mike Hart (public) asked if all of the ICP 1 payments have been made and closed out? He noted that being paid in a timely manner is important, especially for small businesses. Mitchell-Williams noted that the final fee determination for ICP 1 has been issued and they are now focused on ICP 2.

Brailsford asked how the CPAR reporting relates to performance evaluation reports. She is familiar with the letters that DOE sends to their contractors. What's available besides the website? Mitchell-Williams noted that on occasion they issue conditional payments. The letters are available through Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests.

Faulk noted that every time fee is decided, it shows up in the newspaper in the Tri-Cities (Hanford). Mitchell-Williams noted that really doesn't happen here. Koch noted that most contractor ratings and fee are discussed in the *Weapons Complex Monitor*.

Public Comment

Mike Hart (Idaho Falls), President of the Partnership for Science and Technology, noted that one of his main focuses is the IWTU startup. Mike's concern is that DOE should not fixate on deadlines. Deadlines help move us forward but sometimes can get people so focused on the deadline they miss other important things. The focus on an arbitrary deadline could have a lot of negative consequences. Hart noted that treating the waste safely is the most important thing, not the deadline. Hart doesn't believe that being deadline driven focuses on the right things and could compromise safety or performance in the long-run. Cooper expressed his appreciation for Hart's comment and responded that the team meets daily to stay focused on solving problems as they arise. Cooper also commended the regulators throughout the process for their frequent reminders that safety is the priority. The original Settlement Agreement date was December 2012 but it has now been pushed out 2 years. However, they still maintain a day-to-day focus on safety. Hoss echoed Cooper's comments. He noted that it is important to have a goal to work towards, but that they are keeping safety at the forefront. Bohrer added that the CAB has received updates on IWTU at every meeting and that the startup following the event was driven more by the activities and not a deadline.

Tami Thatcher (Bonneville County) noted that various agencies get involved with dose reconstruction at INL. When a former radiation worker gets cancer later they can submit a claim for compensation. An Occupational Safety Bulletin from 2007 noted that INL was not responsive in providing dose records in many cases. Why does it take so long for the information and why was some of the information incorrect. Cooper agreed to provide that topic at one of the future CAB meetings. Cooper stressed that that there is not a single individual that would not be provided their information if requested, however, he noted that information may not be publicly accessible due to privacy concerns.

Land Use Planning at the INL

Greg Bass presented an update on land use planning at INL. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Bohrer asked if there are opportunities or mechanisms for public involvement with the Comprehensive Land Use and Environmental Stewardship (CLUES) report. Bass responded that in the comprehensive land use planning process, there is an opportunity for public comment. Members of the public can request to be added to distribution and comment during the review process. Bohrer asked Bass to add the CAB (via North Wind) to the distribution list. Bohrer asked if they typically get public input. Bass responded "not really."

Bohrer inquired who the final authority is for locating a power line on INL. Bass responded that if the power line crosses the INL, then INL will weigh in for a variety of reasons. Bohrer asked if there were any proposals for power lines that cross the INL. Bass reported that no, there are no current plans/proposals.

Preacher would like to see in future presentations the occupation of the Shoshone Bannock Tribes and the areas that they use. Preacher also asked if the Tribes were included in having access to the hunting areas on the site. Pence responded that anyone with a valid hunting license can hunt in the designated areas. He also noted that it is a very small area. Pence also added that the DOE Tribal Program Manager is also part of the Land Use Committee to ensure Tribal issues are considered. Preacher asked if Pence gives Tribal input on the Land Use Committee. Pence said yes as he is the DOE Tribal Project Manager and is there to represent the interests of the Tribes.

Karst asked about the in town facilities. She asked if all the “gray buildings on the slide” are in use by DOE. Bass responded that yes, they are leased facilities. She asked which facilities are DOE-owned. Bass noted that there are only two in town: the Idaho Research Center and the Radiological Environmental Sciences Laboratory. Karst inquired about how DOE decides whether to lease or own. Bass responded that the cost-benefit analysis is extremely important to making that decision. Getting a multi-million dollar building built is a slow process waiting for appropriations. Often private companies can get us in a building or even build a building faster and more efficiently.

Gerstlauer asked if the test range buildings are still present at ATR. Bass responded that yes, they are. Gerstlauer also asked if DOE still has the transmitting station on Howe Peak. Bass said it’s still operational and is located on Forest Service land, so DOE has an agreement with the Forest Service for access.

Brailsford asked who managed Land Use Planning at INL. Bass responded that it is under DOE-NE. Brailsford had asked if the CLUES document was an EM document. Bass noted that in the 1990s it was probably an EM document, but since 2005 it has been NE. Brailsford asked for clarification regarding whether it was DOE-NE or DOE-EM’s “intention to grow the INL” (Slide 17). Bass responded that it is DOE-NE’s intent.

FY-2014 and 2015 Mission

Jim Cooper gave a presentation on the ICP FY 2014 and 2015 mission and vision. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Griffith asked if broader use of AMWTP is being discussed with others. Cooper noted that regulators and Congressional representatives have all toured AMWTP and all agree it is a great asset and we should seek ongoing missions for the facility.

Gerstlauer asked if the project at EBR-II includes the reactor building and removing the dome. Cooper confirmed that it does. He’d love for it to happen by 2015, but is not sure if that will happen.

Karst asked about the WIPP shipments and what constitutes a “shipment.” Cooper responded that it is trucks. It is an accelerated rate because we are focused on meeting the deadline.

Griffith asked what limits the shipments to 12 per week to WIPP. Cooper responded that WIPP can only take a total of 17 per week from all the sites. So it becomes a competition with other sites in order to increase our shipments. Griffith asked what creates the limitation. Cooper noted it is tied to funding. It would take extra funding to increase the number of shipments. Cooper believes that there may be some additional funding; however, the recent fire may take up some of the new funding. CAB members noted that they may want to discuss making a recommendation to DOE to increase funding so WIPP could take additional shipments. Martin noted that there is ultimately a limit due to space and other constraints.

Bohrer asked what a reasonable number of shipments would be. According to Cooper, 10 shipments per week would allow us to meet our Settlement Agreement milestone. However, weather impacts, vehicle impacts, holidays, etc. can affect that schedule. Planning for 12 per week will allow us to realistically hit the average of 10 per week. Faulk also noted that there are containers from ARP that could be shipped as well. Cooper noted that the program is an expensive endeavor – it costs about \$2.4M per month. So the sooner we can complete it, the more money becomes available for other cleanup activities. Faulk also noted that the faster Idaho gets its waste shipped, the faster other sites (e.g., Hanford) can get their shipping done. A faster completion of the AMWTP shipments will also let the ARP waste be shipped out sooner.

Bohrer noted that the letter/recommendation might be better from the Hanford CAB because faster shipping on our part would enable them to get their shipping underway sooner. He also noted that a cross-cutting EM SSAB recommendation might be the best route.

Henvit asked if there are fines associated with missing the milestones. Cooper responded that there are fines associated with the regulatory milestones. Paying any fines impacts money available for other cleanup.

CAB Work Session

Cleanup Standards at INL

CAB members were sent a copy of a cleanup standards white paper the previous week. Bohrer noted that at the last meeting there was a discussion that future use decisions are under consideration. Therefore, the CAB wanted to explore this topic further. Bohrer asked if this is something that DOE would like the CAB to review and make a recommendation or does it matter.

Nolan Jensen noted that this is one of the fundamental decisions regarding cleanup decisions. Most of the cleanup decisions have been made at INL so this won't impact those decisions. However, there are still occasional new sites (primarily soil contamination sites) that come up now. This decision would impact those new decisions. Jensen reviewed the difference between the residential use and industrial use, and the need for a more consistent application of the cleanup standard. Nolan commented that it would be good for the CAB to review this and weigh in on it as part of the public input process.

Henvit restated the difference between restricted and unrestricted use. Unrestricted use means that there would be no controls left in place and the area would be opened up to the general public. Restricted use would require cleanup to an industrial standard with ongoing controls. The area could be used for things such as an industrial park with long-term controls in place.

Bob Bodell asked if groundwater monitoring differs for unrestricted and restricted. Jensen responded that groundwater monitoring will still occur, however the extent of monitoring may be less for residential. Jensen stressed that the key difference between the two levels is the extent of the remediation activity.

Cooper made a couple of clarifications. First, what they are really looking at is: "are we looking at remediation work that compliments residential use at the site (which would require cleanup down 12 feet) or industrial use (which would only need cleanup down to 4 feet), especially noting that the site is going to be there for an extremely long time." He also noted that this applies to small cleanup sites such as a small soil contamination area, not the major sites. Jensen also stressed that this decision will apply going forward (not looking past).

Preacher noted that the Tribes have used that area long before INL was there. There are sacred sites and cultural sites there. Would this potential change impact their ability continue to have access to those sites? Jensen noted that the areas they are considering are all within existing fenced/restricted areas, so there would be no change to the Tribes' access.

Henvit asked if the standard was changed to industrial, and eventually the site became an industrial park, would there still be risk to future land users. Jensen noted that information would be maintained and that part of the controls in place for industrial use would require any future users review that information for future changes and make decisions based on that information (e.g., they may decide to conduct further cleanup of the area and proceed with their plans, or they may adjust their plans to stay within the current boundaries).

Bodell asked what areas are being looked at for this. Jensen responded that they are currently looking at INTEC and the ATR Complex now. However, he added that the concept could be applied more broadly.

Henvit asked what the size of the area inside the fence is in the area where they are looking now. Cooper responded that it is a total of 285 acres at INTEC and TRA/ATR is a little over 100 acres.

Gerstlauer inquired about the cleanup at CPP 633. According to Cooper, they cleaned that area to industrial standards. Contaminants were left in the facility and the cells were grouted to stabilize and then left in place with a concrete cap over the top.

Preacher asked about areas like the BORAX reactor where things were D&D'd in place. Jensen noted the institutional controls that are in place, such as signage and fencing.

Bohrer asked the CAB if this was something they want to take this on and make a recommendation to DOE on this. Henvit motioned that the CAB make a recommendation to DOE. Board agreed.

Pence asked Jensen and Cooper what the timeframe was for this. Jensen said it would be helpful to have within the next 6 months. Bohrer asked for a subcommittee to be formed and have a draft for review by the full CAB at the April meeting.

Preacher asked if this decision was specific to INL or coming from Headquarters. Jensen responded that it is local effort working with our three agencies – DOE, EPA, and DEQ. Karst asked who would have final approval on it. Jensen said it would be concurrence by all three agencies.

Pence asked who the letter should be directed to. Cooper recommended that the letter should be sent to all three parties: DOE-ID, DEQ, and EPA.

The Committee members will be: Tami Henvit, Bob Bodell, and Harrison Gerstlauer. Nolan agreed to be available as a subject matter expert for the group.

Preacher works with other tribes who are going through similar issues. He wondered if the issue should be elevated to DOE-HQ. Jensen believes it is fairly specific for each site.

CAB Round Robin

At the last meeting, the CAB agreed to reintroduce the round robin at the end of CAB meetings. Each CAB member took a few minutes to share their thoughts about the meeting:

Griffith commented that he had learned more in this meeting than last meeting. He liked having agendas with new topics. He noted one area for improvement: he would like to see a more graphic representation of “where are we in progress.”

Bodell said that the 2-year look ahead was really helpful. He would like to hear more information about rumors about breaking up the contracts into multiple ones. Cooper responded that DOE is just entering into the procurement strategy for post-2015. The Industry Day was held in December and attended by a large number of contractors. DOE asked contractors for their input on how they would like to see the work combined/broken up. DOE received more than 30 responses from the Industry Day. DOE is going through the responses. Cooper noted that they do have an emphasis on “direct to DOE” small businesses at the site. Idaho is on the bottom of the list with respect to the small business goal (less than 1% of funding) for DOE. However, between ITG and CWI, more than \$50M is dedicated to small business but DOE can't take credit for that because it is not direct to DOE. An approach for the procurement has not been decided yet. Once we have a clearer path, we'll present it to the CAB.

Gerstlauer noted that it was an educational day. He said the groundwater presentation was really interesting and he felt that there were some good questions and comments from the public. He also liked the 2-year look ahead.

Bohrer gave a brief summary of the EM SSAB meeting in Portsmouth in Ohio in October. He thought it was a really good meeting with interesting discussions. Hanford is hosting the Spring EM Chairs meeting and Idaho is hosting the one in October.

Roberts would like to see some sort of a graphic that demonstrates how far along we are on projects. He liked the history parts of today's presentations. If we had time at a meeting, it would be interesting and helpful (but not essential) to hear a history of INL. The groundwater presentation was really helpful. He noted that he's still confused about the land use/cleanup standards and what we're doing there.

Bohrer noted that groundwater status doesn't change very fast, so more frequent updates on groundwater may not have new information. We don't want to lose sight of the significance of it, but we don't need to spend a lot of time on it since it doesn't change. If something changes, then the CAB should be updated. Cooper noted that a question from the public was raised that should be answered. There is also more detail about what's being done and why that can be provided. Cooper recommended a more detailed presentation, possibly at the Fall CAB meeting, and that they will provide updates on it more frequently.

Preacher liked the presentation by Bass. He asked about DOE funding. Cooper responded that it is very positive. ICP got a plus up of \$20M and are looking at where to place that funding (AMWTP, RWMC ARP, IWTU). Preacher noted that Cooper and Ric Craun gave an update recently to the Tribe. He said it was well received and he would like to schedule another one.

Bohrer presented a "Certificate of Achievement" signed by Dave Huizenga to Preacher from the EM SSAB Chairs meeting in recognition of his service as CAB Chair.

Henvit liked the update on IWTU and appreciated the due diligence and attention to the project to make it a success. She appreciated the groundwater presentation. She noted that she had heard stories about a sludge layer on the top of the aquifer. Cooper and Bohrer noted that they have never heard of that. Cooper committed that an answer to that will be included as part of the upcoming groundwater presentation.

Karst thanked Cooper for an excellent summary of work that is in progress and that is coming up. She recommended that it would be a good presentation to include at the start of each year. She would have liked to have seen an update on the budget. Cooper said that there are still some issues and uncertainties due to ongoing concern over potential sequestration and other unknowns. But, Cooper committed to providing more budget updates.

Kristen Jensen commented that the groundwater topic was the most significant topic. That's the topic that CAB members are asked about the most. She believes we should do a better job about educating the public about groundwater. The fact that IWTU is the first of its kind is significant and she believes it should be showcased more. It's a big deal. She commented that it was good to hear about the \$20M plus up. K. Jensen said she found the white paper surprising that this topic is still under consideration. She asked if the CPAR system is a federally mandated system. Cooper responded that yes it is a mandated system based on the Federal Acquisition Regulations. Cooper will look at what information can be shared in response to Bohrer's concern.

EM SSAB Fall Chairs Meeting

Kuechle noted that the CAB will be hosting the Fall EM SSAB Chairs meeting in October. That is a 3-day commitment. He asked if the CAB wanted to hold their October meeting in conjunction with the or at a separate time.

Preacher asked if there would be a cost savings to combine. There probably wouldn't be a large cost savings as not all the CAB members have to attend the EM SSAB Chairs Meeting (only the Chair and the Vice Chair). Preacher asked if CAB members can make public comment during the EM SSAB meeting. They can during the public comment portion of the meetings. Preacher noted that the EMAB meeting will be in Richland. DOE will confirm the meetings (EMAB and EM SSAB Chairs) do not conflict.

Griffith noted that for the chair and vice chair it's a big time commitment. He also noted that the EM SSAB chairs meeting is really interesting. He believes it make sense to combine the meetings but maybe consider the retreat at another time.

Bohrer commented that if you combine the meetings, it is a lot of work for the staff and could detract from our regular meeting. It would also make it an all week commitment.

Pence commented that given the constraints on the budget, meetings in farther away locations (e.g., Coeur d'Alene) will likely not happen.

The CAB members agreed to move the scheduled October CAB meeting (with retreat) to November 5 and 6.

2014 Work Plan

Kuechle noted that with all the topics requested by the CAB and condensing the schedule to four meetings per year, we have more topics than can be covered in the existing meetings. Does that CAB want to eliminate some topics or add more time?

Griffith asked if some of the topics (e.g., cask design) could be covered on the bus on the tour.

Cooper commented that if the CAB is interested in additional time/days, DOE would strive to provide it, but it would need to be in Idaho Falls.

K. Jensen commented that she likes the idea of adding a second day. She would prefer more presentations and after the first day she's geared up and ready for a second day.

Griffith commented that he likes the idea of starting earlier. He recommended starting the afternoon or evening before.

Cooper proposed the option of a working lunch; could do the work session (or part of) during the lunch hour.

The group agreed an extra day would be good. They asked the support team to try to make the agenda work and add an extra day or half day as necessary.

Public Involvement Subcommittee Report

K. Jensen provided an update on the Public Involvement Subcommittee. The committee met to come up with a plan for implementing a new CAB newsletter. The subcommittee came up with an electronic newsletter that will be distributed four times per year. CAB members will provide newsletter topic suggestions and the subcommittee

will work with the CAB support team to develop and issue the newsletter. The CAB Chair will approve the final draft with final approval given by DOE.

Griffith asked if the subcommittee discussed topics of mutual interest from other CAB newsletters that may be of interest to our audience. K. Jensen responded that no, the subcommittee focused on INL topics. That will enable us to keep it short, easy to put together, and easy to read and digest. Griffith recommended that there may be times (e.g., WIPP fire) that we may want to include information from other CABs. Bohrer stressed that this is focused on being a communication tool for the CAB, not for INL. Henvit commented that it might be good to include various perspectives so it is a representation of the entire CAB.

K. Jensen noted that the CAB members needed to decide who is writing the newsletter. Kuechle noted that it would be helpful to have an “editor” who will make writing assignments and then be supported by the CAB support team (North Wind). Cooper believes it’s helpful to DOE to hear CAB member perspectives.

Kuechle asked if the CAB wanted to include something on the meeting form where CAB members can note where they would be interested in a story about and/or in volunteering to write that topic.

The first issue is expected sometime between now and next meeting.

Preacher asked about the newsletter distribution. K. Jensen responded that it would be distributed to CAB members who could forward it as necessary. It could also be posted on the website and people could sign up for the newsletter.

Griffith asked how it will be distributed. Kuechle responded that it will be posted on the website and e-mailed to CAB members and people who subscribe/unsubscribe.

Preacher asked what the protocol was if CAB members received media calls regarding the newsletter. Pence reiterated the policy that CAB members should be clear that they are representing themselves and speaking as a member of the public. They should be clear that they are not a subject matter expert and are not speaking for the CAB or for DOE. Speaking for the CAB or DOE requires advance coordination. Pence clarified that CAB members can make public comment at the EM SSAB Chairs meeting public comment period, but they must represent themselves, not the CAB.

The subcommittee will meet in the next couple weeks to work on the initial newsletter.

Timing of CAB Notifications

Bohrer expressed frustration that CAB members often hear about events from news outlets rather than from DOE. He is concerned that DOE is not communicating with the CAB quickly enough and/or with enough information. His initial reaction is that the CAB was left in the dark on the AMWTP fire information.

Cooper agreed that they could do better getting information quickly to the CAB. CAB members noted that they received the WIPP fire information the day after it happened. They appreciated getting the information that quickly.

New Member Training/Training Subcommittee Volunteers

Kuechle asked for a group of existing CAB members to help identify what information new CAB members will need and recommendations on how to get them up to speed. Bill Roberts, Willie Preacher, Betsy McBride, and Kristen Jensen will serve on that subcommittee. A half-day training session will be scheduled for the new members.

New Recruits

We received nine applications for the open CAB positions. We anticipate seating five new members. The applications have been reviewed and five candidates have been identified.

WIPP Funding Support Letter

The CAB members decided that the letter should be an EM SSAB Chairs recommendation rather than an INL focus. Our CAB will draft it and then present the letter at the April SSAB meeting for chairs' consideration. Bohrer volunteered to write an initial draft with input from DOE/Cooper.

Work Session Restructure

Bohrer asked what CAB members thought about the restructured/longer work session. Overall CAB members liked having the additional time for the work session but are concerned that it limits the number of presentations.

Pence noted the backlog of topics. We could add one more presentation to the agenda and push out the work session to run until 6:00. The group agreed they like the extended work session but do not want to push out to later in the day.



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