



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

July 10, 2014

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Thursday, July 10, 2014, at the Hilton Garden Inn in Idaho Falls, Idaho. An audio recording of the meeting was created and may be reviewed by calling CAB Support Staff at 208-557-0843.

Members Present

Herb Bohrer, Chair
Harry Griffith, Vice Chair
Nicki Karst
Bob Bodell
Harrison Gerstlauer
Kristen Jensen
Betsy McBride
Bill Roberts
Willie Preacher
Tami Henvit
Cathy Roemer
Trilby McAfee
Keith Branter
Brad Christensen
Marvin Fielding

Members Not Present

Teri Tyler

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

Dave Borak, DFO, U.S. Department of Energy
Jim Cooper, DDFO, U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Tom Deiter, CWI
Daryl Koch, State of Idaho
Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Susan Burke, State of Idaho
Danny Nichols, Idaho Treatment Group (ITG)

Others Present

Preston Abbott
Lisa Aldrich
Bill Barker
Susie Barna
Mark Barth
Beatrice Brailsford
Lorie Cahn
Kevin Daniels
Mark Dehring
Darin Dobbins
Bob Holmes
Chris Henvit
Kathryn Hitch
Ethan Huffman
Mark Hutchinsen
Lori McNamara, Support Services
Ann Riedesel, Support Services/Facilitator
Niki Richards, Support Services

Randy Jensen
Bruce LaRue
Jim Malmo
Kerry Martin
Ramelia Marz
Danielle Miller
Natalie Packer
Ben Roberts
Curtis Roth
Erik Simpson
Amy Taylor
Tami Thatcher
Jerry Wells
Ken Whitham
Jack Zimmerman

Action Items

Assigned to: Bohrer requested a presentation at the next CAB meeting regarding Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP) future use and what the CAB can do.

Response:

Opening Remarks

The meeting started at 8:00 a.m. Facilitator Ann Riedesel introduced new staff support and asked the CAB members to go around the table and introduce themselves as several new CAB members were joining the meeting.

CAB Chair Herb Bohrer noted that this was the last meeting for Jim Cooper, DDFO for the INL CAB, who is retiring. Bohrer thanked Cooper for his support of the CAB and introduced Jack Zimmerman, who is taking over Cooper's role. He then welcomed the new CAB members and thanked the retiring members for their service. He informed everyone that they could entertain questions after the meeting and that it was important to stay on schedule since the schedule was very full.

Jim Cooper (DOE-ID) noted his support for Jack Zimmerman saying he interfaces well and has a background in construction management. He thanked the CAB for their willingness to provide input and work with DOE.

Dennis Faulk (EPA) commented that he enjoys working with INL people because they are very goal-oriented. He briefly discussed the Test Area North (TAN) groundwater issue and the path forward for it. He encouraged the CAB to have a presentation on it in the future. Regarding land use changes, Faulk noted that he felt there must be compelling reasons behind changes to restricted/unrestricted use. For some areas it is a clear decision with the compelling reason. Other areas may not be as clear. He believes that it should be considered on a site-by-site basis.

Daryl Koch (State of Idaho) thanked the departing CAB members and welcomed the new members. He noted the significance of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) to the state as well as its differences from Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). He also noted that the state feels very strongly about proposed land use changes.

Susan Burke (DEQ) commented that the tour the previous day was an excellent overview. She noted that she represents the State of Idaho for the Settlement Agreement. She acknowledged that the State has a very good relationship with DOE.

Tom Dieter (CWI) thanked Jim Cooper for his leadership. He thanked the retiring CAB members and welcomed the new ones. He highlighted CWI's safety performance, which they achieve by working closely with and listening to their employees. He discussed the progress on startup of the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU). He noted that they are extremely conservative in all their decisions as they proceed. He also noted the success with sodium treatment at the Manufacturing Fuels Complex (MFC) and the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP).

Danny Nichols (ITG) commented that he is coming up on his 2-year anniversary. He commended Jim Cooper and thanked him for his support. He expressed appreciation for the CAB tour the day before noting that it is a great opportunity to show their accomplishments.

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 thanked Beatrice Brailsford (Snake River Alliance) for her long-term commitment to providing public input to DOE and the CAB.

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/>.

Bohrer asked about the AMWTP DEQ letter. Cooper responded that, based on the fire in the AMWTP facility last fall, the DEQ letter advised AMWTP to account for the possibility of fires in their revised procedures and develop compensation for anticipated fires. AMWTP procedures were updated to account for the possibility of fires.

CAB member Tami Henvit asked about the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) waste that needs to leave Idaho within 6 months of processing. Cooper noted that 10 boxes are waste that ITG has processed through the supercompactor. The waste was sent to Idaho because we have the remote capabilities to process that waste. Those 10 boxes have been reduced to three. The waste is scheduled to be shipped out in the September/October timeframe; it may go back to LANL. That waste needs to leave by November 2014.

CAB member Betsy McBride noted the 54,000 cubic meters of transuranic (TRU) waste and asked what the total amount to be addressed was. Cooper responded that the total volume is 65,000 cubic meters; they are about 83% complete. McBride also asked for clarification about the remote-handled (RH) TRU waste that is being “processed and returned to storage,” and if it could be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) if WIPP were accepting shipments. Cooper responded that yes, that waste is part of the 65,000 cubic meters and could be shipped to WIPP if WIPP were operating. Cooper also noted that RH TRU is a very small portion of the volume (less than 20 cubic meters) and that they have significant storage capability at the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC).

Harry Griffith, CAB member, asked where the “stockpiles” of waste are coming from. Cooper responded that it is part of the stored waste at AMWTP. They are trying to maximize as much mixed low level waste (MLLW) as possible since that waste has a current disposal pathway. Nichols clarified their process: they characterize each container they retrieve so they know if it is TRU or MLLW. That way they can target MLLW. Before WIPP shut down, they were focused on TRU, so there is plenty of MLLW to focus on now.

Faulk noted that the vapor extraction system at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) has removed about 225,000 lbs of organics, mostly carbon tetrachloride, from the soil. From an environmental perspective, this is one of the most successful projects because if it hadn't been done, those organics could have ended up in the Snake River Plain Aquifer.

Burke clarified that the Settlement Agreement requires meeting a minimum number of acreage as well as a minimum volume of waste exhumed (5.69 acres and 7,485 cubic meters of waste). Almost 5,500 cubic meters of waste have been exhumed to date.

Bohrer noted that this whole process started in the late 1980s “between some pretty solid rocks and some pretty hard places,” and that “where we are today is a real tribute to the people who worked on this to negotiate the agreements and perform the work.” Bohrer believes that the solution accomplishes real risk reduction while not “breaking the bank.” He also noted that the process included active involvement from the EPA, the State, and the public.

Griffith asked if there were any operational or process issues with having two crews working in ARP 8. Cooper responded that the size of ARP 8 (over 2 acres) allows for multiple crews. In fact, they considered adding a third crew. Griffith also asked if the facilities (e.g., the box lines where waste is sorted) are sized appropriately for multiple crews. Cooper responded that they are planning to add more processing lines. They are also moving the

equipment from ARP 2 and ARP 3 (where operations have been completed) over to ARP 8 to expand the processing and sorting capabilities with the second crew.

Faulk asked if the Defense Board letter prompted any modifications. Cooper responded that the letter asked DOE to ensure they reviewed a couple additional areas: a conduct of ops assessment and an engineering assessment of the designs. Those two additional assessments have been added into the schedule and independent review teams will be brought in the second week of simulant testing.

Griffith asked what the cooling coils are and what their purpose is. Dieter responded that the cooling coils are on the bottom of the tanks and keep the contents at a steady temperature inside the tanks.

CAB member Nicki Karst asked for clarification on which tanks were being discussed. Cooper noted that there are four tanks for the sodium-bearing waste, one of which only has about 6,000 gallons.

Bohrer asked if ICP received an extra \$10M, what the priority would be for spending that money. Cooper responded that there are several priority projects that should be considered: dispositioning the calcine and improving the security configuration at Fort St. Vrain. Betsy McBride asked if extra money should be allocated to more trucks/containers for shipments to WIPP. Cooper responded that WIPP will come back on line very slowly and very methodically and the maximum number of shipments is unknown once operations resume, so additional trucks/containers are not likely needed at this point.

WIPP Update: Impacts to INL

Brad Bugger provided a presentation on the status of recovery operations at WIPP. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Henvit asked for clarification regarding how much the drum lid is raised. Bugger responded that it is raised “a few inches.”

McBride asked if there are more drums like the one involved the incident. Bugger responded that yes, there are drums in Room 7 and in room 6 (which is full but not yet closed), drums at Los Alamos, and drums at Waste Control Specialists in Texas that have similar constituents. McBride asked if there is a worry. Bugger responded that yes there is a concern so and they are taking measures to address that concern. At Waste Control Specialists the drums have been moved into concrete silos and covered with sand to keep them cool. At Los Alamos, they have isolated the drums in protected areas. In addition, the State of New Mexico has ordered DOE to close Rooms 6 and 7.

CAB member Bill Roberts asked for more information about the chemical reaction with the nitrite salt and the organic material. Bugger noted that it is speculated that the reaction generated significant heat.

Karst asked how the pictures of the drums/rooms were taken. Bugger noted that to ensure protection of the workers they must have a barrier between the workers and the waste stack. Therefore they used an “extender” to take photos in the stack. Currently, the extender doesn’t allow them to reach all the way to the back of the stack.

Henvit asked what the radiation level is in Room 7 where the incident occurred. Jack Zimmerman, who was on the accident investigation board, responded that external radiation levels at the waste face are very low, but the contamination levels are high, prompting full protective gear for the workers.

Tami Thatcher commented that the magnesium oxide is not a “pillow,” but is for absorbing plutonium if water seeps into the room so the plutonium wouldn’t move with any water. Thatcher also noted that the WIPP website doesn’t give a total amount of the release to the environment. She would also like to know what the release would

have been if the HEPA filtration system had not worked. Bugger responded that he would get Thatcher the contact information for WIPP to obtain that information.

Brailsford asked what spent fuel will remain at CPP-666 once the EBR-II fuel and Navy fuel are removed. Cooper responded that it will just be the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) fuel that will remain at CPP-666. Navy fuel is scheduled to be removed 2018 and EBR-II fuel by 2020.

WIPP-Directed New Work Plans for ITG and CWI

Jim Malmo provided a presentation on the impacts of the WIPP shutdown on Idaho and new work plans. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Burke asked for clarification about where the errant drum was located in Room 7 and what the full capacity of Room 7 is. Malmo responded that the drum is in row 12 and that waste had already been placed in rows 1 through 24 when the incident occurred. He noted that he didn't have the exact total number of rows for the room, but that they had just started placing waste in that room. He estimated that the room was approximately 10% of capacity. Burke confirmed with Malmo that if DOE decides that the room must be closed, that space will simply be lost.

Griffith asked how long the drum had been in the room. Malmo didn't know the specific time but said it had to have been placed within just a couple months of the incident because they had just started Room 7.

McBride asked for clarification about the mix of drums and boxes. Malmo noted that there are different containers depending on the waste stream and how the waste was treated (e.g., debris waste, compacted waste). Containers including 100-gallon drums, standard waste boxes, 55-gallon drums, 85-gallon overpacks, and 10-drum overpacks, are all in various configurations in the mine.

CAB member Keith Branter asked if there was any consideration to adding another supercompactor. Malmo responded that adding another supercompactor would not really increase processing capability. Not all waste can be compacted (e.g., sludge waste). For the waste that can be compacted, the current supercompactor is keeping up with retrieval activities. If at some point waste is being retrieved faster than it can be compacted, then adding another supercompactor might be a viable option but for now it wouldn't make much of a difference.

Bohrer inquired if there is any risk to continuing to certify the waste since the root cause of the incident at WIPP is not yet known. Could the results of the investigation cause changes in the current waste acceptance criteria and result in having to recertify the waste? Malmo responded that there is little likelihood of changes to the waste acceptance criteria for the debris waste. It is unlikely that the reaction that occurred at WIPP could occur in debris waste. However, AMWTP is holding off processing additional sludge waste drums until they know the results of the WIPP investigation.

Koch commented that Location A is not the State's first choice; they prefer Location B for additional storage space at RWMC. The State CERCLA program does not want to construct anything other than the ARP facilities in the Subsurface Disposal Area (SDA). In addition, new storage facilities in Location A could impact the design of the SDA cap.

Bohrer asked at what point is Idaho no longer compliant with Settlement Agreement milestones and what is the impact. Malmo responded that the 3-year rolling average (2,000 cubic meters each year averaged over 3 years for a total of 6,000 cubic meters over 3 years) is the next milestone. We currently still need about 1,000 cubic meters this year to meet that milestone (600 cubic meters yet to go this year), which is putting that milestone at risk. Volume reduction through the compactor also counts in that rolling average. If AMWTP can achieve enough volume reduction through compaction, they may still be able to meet the 3-year rolling average milestone. DOE is

watching that milestone very closely. They are providing routine updates to the State on the status of the milestone. The penalty is that the State would not allow new spent fuel shipments into the State of Idaho.

Griffith asked if the area west of the retrieval enclosure where the air support building used to be was considered for storage space. Malmo responded that the area was not considered because it doesn't have enough space. In addition, it would impact characterization activities. Griffith also asked if areas at other INL facilities were considered. Malmo responded that they did consider some additional INL areas, but those areas would require transport across the highway to send over to the facility and then back to AMWTP. The impacts from transporting the waste were considered too significant to further consider those areas.

McBride asked about the waste being put back into storage pending shipment to WIPP and if any changes are required for safe storage. Malmo responded that when the waste is retrieved, it is at its worst form because it has prohibitive items such as aerosol cans and liquids mixed in which are removed in treatment process. After the waste is treated, it is in better form for storage than when it was retrieved. From a safety standpoint, the procedures are designed to handle the waste at retrieval (at its worst) so no changes were required for the additional storage. Malmo also noted that the waste from Los Alamos, which is the waste that was involved in the WIPP incident, is different in makeup than the waste here in Idaho.

Brailsford asked what the storage capacity is for the new storage facilities. Malmo responded that they are 15,000 drum equivalent each, allowing for 1 year's worth of drums.

AMWTP Update/Status

Nichols provided an update on operations at AMWTP. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Bohrer asked for more information about AMWTP's radiological controls performance. Nichols responded that there have generally been no personnel contaminations in the retrieval area. The process works really well and incorporates a number of preventative measures. In addition, whenever there is residual contamination on the floor, it is bound to the floor with an epoxy paint to ensure it is not tracked anywhere. That will also make eventual decontamination easier as the contamination is fixed. Entries into the boxlines for maintenance have been the more challenging area. They have had some contamination on the personal protective equipment but no contamination on the individuals. Because of that, they have added some additional layers of personal protective equipment for the workers. Henvit commended Nichols and his employees on their excellent safety performance.

Integrated Waste Treatment Unit Status

Curtis Roth (DOE-ID) provided an update on the status of the IWTU startup. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Roberts asked how far behind the project is behind the original schedule. Roth responded that the original schedule was to have the facility on line by the end of 2012. Roberts also confirmed with Roth that the IWTU facility is a first and only one of its kind facility. He then commended the team for their focus and care on getting this unique facility on line.

Karst asked how it was determined that 30,000 gallons of simulant would be enough to test the facility. According to Roth, they estimated that they needed to run the process for 2 to 3 weeks for the test, and 30,000 gallons is the estimate to run that duration. He also noted that they have additional simulant if it is determined that they need to test simulant for a longer period of time. Karst then asked for clarification regarding what is looked for in the outage after the simulant test. Roth responded that they will look at the performance of the filtration system; they

will also look at any other design modifications that have occurred since start up activities commenced to ensure they are operating correctly and achieve all the requirements.

CAB member Harrison Gerstlauer asked for clarification about the steam valve that was replaced. Roth responded that they replaced it because it was not shutting properly when it is at temperature. He also noted that it is still not operating properly and they continue to evaluate it and make the necessary changes. In the meantime, they operate with manually operated steam valves (operated from the control room).

FY-2015 Planned Work Scope and Funding

Cooper gave a presentation on FY-2015 planned work scope and funding. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked if DOE-ID was given a target number for FY-2015. Cooper responded yes. McBride asked what budget number they proceed with in the new fiscal year while a budget is decided by Congress. Cooper responded that a Continuing Resolution actually works in our favor in the short-term; however, ultimately, we need to get costs down, and that is the focus.

Griffith asked if other labs are facing similar funding situations. Cooper responded that EM's funding is a little lower for 2015 so it affects all the sites. He also noted that with the major event at WIPP, more funding has to be directed to address that, which will likely impact all the other sites. Faulk noted that Hanford is facing a \$100 million cut.

Public Comment

No members of the public provided comment during the public comment period.

Repurposing EM Facilities

Ken Whitham (DOE-ID) gave a presentation about repurposing EM facilities. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Henvit appreciated the idea of repurposing facilities; however, she questioned the value of trying to repurpose 30+ year old buildings. Whitham responded that evaluating the age and capabilities of the facility and any ongoing role is part of this program.

Bohrer noted that at the EM SSAB Chairs meeting in April Frank Marcinowski (DOE-HQ) commented that "they want to put together a plan to identify AMWTP future use." Bohrer asked who is doing that and what can the CAB do to be involved in that process. Cooper responded that the LINE (Leadership in Nuclear Energy) Commission said that AMWTP is a national asset. Cooper commented that the process has started but it will take time. Nichols noted that the challenge for this will be transportation of the waste. Bohrer requested a presentation at the next CAB meeting regarding this effort and what the CAB can do. Bohrer also asked if transportation options were considered in the programmatic environmental impact statement. Cooper responded that the details were not included.

Koch commented that some time ago DOE-ID indicated that all the buildings now at INTEC would likely be turned over to DOE-NE as part of the long-range plan. Cooper responded that the Remote Analytical Laboratory is really a pilot on this transfer process. DOE-NE is not going to take a facility without testing it to ensure it meets their functionality requirements. The facilities will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine their role and value. Koch noted the length of time spent trying to find a user for the high bay facility before it was ultimately

D&D'd the facility. Whitham responded that they spent about 2 years in the process. He noted that the last thing they want to do is rush the process and miss an opportunity but that they will define an endpoint as well.

Gerstlauer asked how long fuel has to be stored in the pools at ATR before transport to INTEC. Whitham responded that the fuel is stored about 6 years. Cooper noted that a team is looking at alternatives for managing ATR fuel including an option to store the fuel at ATR until it can be put into dry storage rather than sending it to CPP-666, in order to allow emptying the basin. Gerstlauer also asked if DOE-NE was going to take over CPP-603. Whitham responded that is not planned in the short-term but something that may happen long-term.

New Contract Structure

Richard Craun (DOE-ID) gave an update and status report about the new ICP contract structure. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Griffith asked for clarification regarding the scope. Some of the scope seems to be identified by project while other scope is broken out by focus area. Craun responded that two are large scopes and major system acquisitions, and will include smaller projects as part of them. The "big" projects that require hundreds of engineers and years of planning and preparations are believed to be uniquely different.

Branter asked if all of the contracts will have their own dosimetry, ES&H, and industrial hygiene programs. Craun responded that it would be very inefficient if all of them had their own infrastructure. However, details are still being worked.

Griffith asked if DOE considered staggering the contracts regarding schedule. Craun responded that they are staggered so they don't all come due at the same time. Griffith also asked about the NRC contract and if they considered a longer duration for the contract. Craun responded that they are complying with DOE-HQ policies regarding contracting.

Bohrer noted a concern borne out by past history. The most recent contract transition between BBWI and ITG was not smooth and production was lost. Now there will be four new contractors transitioning with two existing contractors. Bohrer believes the transition issue is a huge issue and is interested in knowing how DOE plans to address and mitigate the issue. Craun responded that they are discussing that issue and planning accordingly. They are very focused on not repeating what happened with the BBWI/ITG transition. That issue will also be part of the proposals from the contractors.

Faulk asked for clarification on the duration of the ICP Core contract. Craun noted it is a term limit 5-year contract with no option years.

Karst asked for clarification regarding what activities the current contractors are responsible for. Craun noted that CWI has done a fair amount of work on the calcine project as well as Idaho Spent Fuel Facility, Nuclear Regulatory Commission licensed facilities, and D&D. Craun also noted that the work done to date belongs to DOE and will be transferred to the new contractors.

Koch noted that the State and EPA are never involved in review of the RFPs. He also commented that there is a potential for a protest following award of the contracts, which could impact the schedule.

Brailsford asked for clarification about the repackaging of Navy waste that is listed as part of the waste management scope. She thought the Navy waste was separate from the rest of the waste streams. Craun responded that for the most part, the Navy waste is separate; however, there are 103 canisters of material that will be processed through the hot cells at CPP-666 and disposed of at WIPP. That activity is part of the new contract scope. Brailsford asked where the waste is stored now. Craun responded that it is in CPP-666.

Brailsford also asked about ceasing disposal of Navy fuel at RWMC and wondered what the replacement facility is and where that scope shows up. Craun responded that the project to construct the new facility is already underway and the new facility should be operating by 2018.

Thatcher asked if shipping the ATR fuel back east for reprocessing was still planned. Craun responded that he is not aware of any plans for that. Thatcher also asked about domestic reactor research and if it includes past reactor research or is it focused on bringing in new fuel. Whitham responded that is an ongoing program focused on recovering highly enriched uranium from domestic and foreign research reactors to ensure material security. Thatcher asked about research missions. Craun noted that the scope for the contract is strictly EM work.

Discussion of Draft Recommendation on Land Use Changes

Henvit reviewed the work the CAB has done on developing a recommendation on proposed land use changes at INL. Nolan Jensen (DOE-ID) provided additional background information about the proposed changes. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Griffith asked if this decision creates precedence for future decisions on future sites. Jensen responded that DOE always follows EPA guidance and regulations. He noted that the logic applied in this case would likely be applied with future sites.

Bodell asked for clarification regarding the tank farm. Jensen noted that the tank farm area is already designated in the Record of Decision to be cleaned up to industrial standards not residential standards. The proposed land use changes are specific to two new areas.

Preacher asked about other land uses and if these proposed changes will affect the Tribe's use of the area. Jensen responded that whether the area is cleaned up to 4 feet or to 10 feet probably isn't going to make a difference regarding Tribal use.

Koch commented that although Faulk had to leave the meeting early, they had had a chance to discuss this topic and he wanted to share their thoughts about it. EPA is okay with all of INTEC being designated "industrial." Regarding ATR, Faulk believes it should be done on an individual site basis. Koch noted that there is a potential likelihood for future uses and new missions, which must be considered in these decisions. The State questions "why clean up to residential standards when there are likely future nuclear missions?"

McBride asked if the State agrees or disagrees with EPA's position. Koch said they agree on INTEC, but they disagree on handling ATR on a case-by-case basis.

Trilby McAfee asked why this is a topic since it is Federal land and restrictions and controls can be enacted. Jensen clarified that because this is a policy change, DOE presents the information for CAB consideration.

Karst asked for clarification regarding the sites. Jensen responded that the new sites at ATR are being addressed under the WAG 10 process for additional sites. Originally ATR was planned for cleanup to residential standards; however, after 25 years of cleanup, we know that some contamination has been left in place. Therefore, DOE believes it makes more sense to cleanup to industrial standards rather than residential. Karst went on to ask if they are asking for this change just for these specific sites or if it is for any new sites. Jensen responded that it makes sense to apply it to any new sites at INTEC and ATR.

Koch noted that there is already a 100-year period (to 2095) established under institutional controls that the INL is assumed to be under Federal government control.

McBride commented that she believes there are two issues – first, is the CAB supporting making a blanket change for future sites undesignated at this point simply because they are in the vicinity of other places; and second, is the CAB supporting cleaning up to a lower standard. McBride believes that it makes more sense to look at each site on a case by case basis.

Griffith shared Bohrer’s position that the CAB should not be talking about a blanket policy but rather as specific sites. Griffith questioned what specific boundaries were under consideration for the recommendation. Henvit responded that the committee felt that the boundaries should be the fence lines of each of the facilities (ATR and INTEC). Both Koch and Faulk agree with that at INTEC. At ATR, EPA feels that the proposed changes should just be for the specific areas identified; the State believes it should be the entire area within the fence line.

Karst noted that this is not a CAB decision. The CAB is simply making a recommendation for consideration by DOE. Karst noted that she is comfortable regarding the specific sites as being considered industrial sites as long as the reasoning is also specified. She is not comfortable applying it to similar sites.

Gerstlauer, Roberts, Preacher, Bodell, and Fielding noted that they are comfortable with the recommendation and the proposed changes being applied to all the areas within the area fence lines at ATR and INTEC.

Kristin Jensen commented that she doesn’t feel she has the background to be able to make a recommendation on the topic. She feels more comfortable relying on decisions by the experts – if the experts feel that the decisions should be made on a case-by-case basis, then she is comfortable with that.

Branter noted that there is nothing “magic” about the fence; contamination doesn’t stop just because there is a fence. He also noted that if contamination is there, it will be there for a very long time (>200 years). He believes the areas need to be controlled for a long time.

Henvit commented that she agrees that the facility fence lines should be the boundary. She is more concerned about groundwater issues. She would prefer to see money saved on decisions like this put toward groundwater cleanup.

Cooper noted that the CAB deliberation is a helpful part of their decision process. DOE is not the sole decision-maker; the regulators will also weigh in. The CAB represents the local community and provides an avenue for additional feedback into the decision. Cooper commented that they will take this information and develop a position paper that could be presented at the next CAB meeting. Cooper doesn’t believe that actions taken at INTEC and ATR will likely set precedence at other INL sites. He referenced the cleanup at the Power Burst Facility and TAN where they were able to achieve a clean closure. He thanked the CAB for their work on this. He noted that even though the CAB didn’t have a consensus based recommendation on this proposed change, the varied responses still give DOE good feedback on the topic.

Discussion of EM SSAB Draft Recommendations

Griffith reviewed the draft recommendations from the April EM SSAB meeting:

- Recommendation regarding highlighting the positive accomplishments of EM
 - DOE should sponsor an independent examination of remediation efforts with the intent of producing video clips and other materials
 - DOE should engage the EM sites in producing video and other materials to help communicate the positive progress completed on cleanup activities

- Recommendation for DOE to request adequate funding to meet its cleanup obligations and to expedite milestone establishment and request funds for sites that don't have site and state cleanup milestones in place.

McBride asked who would provide the funding for the recommendations. Griffith noted that the topic of funding was a key discussion; however, it was agreed that funding is a tactical aspect of implementing the recommendation and not within the scope of the EM SSAB.

Dave Borak (DOE-HQ) noted that the EM SSAB Chairs specifically requested an extensive cc list on the funding recommendation to help ensure that a wide audience understands that the advisory boards from across the country support this recommendation.

The CAB members all supported both recommendations.



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