



# **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**

June 23, 2015

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Tuesday, June 23, 2015, 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**

Bob Bodell  
Herb Bohrer  
Keith Branter  
Marvin Fielding  
Harry Griffith  
Kristin Jensen  
Trilby McAfee  
Betsy McBride  
Bill Roberts  
Cathy Roemer

**Members Not Present**

Brad Christensen  
Willie Preacher

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

Mark Brown, Substitute for Jack Zimmerman, DDFO, U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)  
Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID  
Hoss Brown, CH2M Washington Group Idaho (CWI)/Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP)  
Dave Richardson, Idaho Treatment Group (ITG)/Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP)  
Susan Burke, State of Idaho  
Daryl Koch, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

**Others Present**

Hoss Brown, ICP  
Dave Richardson, AMWTP  
Rebecca Casper, City of Idaho Falls  
Kaylie Rasmuson, DOE-ID  
Marilyn Case, GSS  
Doug Halford, GSS  
Richard Kauffman, DOE-ID  
Mark Brown, DOE  
Chris Henvit, Naval Reactors  
Kelly Galloway, MEI  
Ken Alkema  
Eric Schweinsberg, Stoller  
Mary Willcox, DOE  
Ben Roberts, DOE  
Kerry Martin, ID DEQ  
Erik Simpson, ICP  
Leslie Jones, PST  
Kathleen Hain

Mark Hutchison, NRF  
Luke Ramseth, Post Register  
Natalie Packer, ICP  
Curtis Roth, DOE  
Tami Thatcher  
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance  
Shannon A. Brennan, DOE  
Roger Claycomb, DOE  
Christina Cutler, Shoshone Bannock Tribes  
Preston Abbott, Canberra  
Betsy Holmes, DOE  
John Tanner  
Ethan Huffman, Representative Simpson  
Dana Briggs, Staff  
Andrea Gumm, Facilitator  
Lori McNamara, Staff  
Ann Riedesel, Staff

## Opening Remarks

Facilitator Andrea Gumm started the meeting at 8:00 a.m. She reviewed the agenda and noted the public participation period. She 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 noted that they will try to accommodate questions as time permits.

Mark Brown (DOE-ID) also welcomed everyone. He commented that he was filling in for Jack Zimmerman who was at a DOE Field Managers meeting in Washington, D.C. One of the topics at that meeting is the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) accident investigation report and the lessons learned.

Susan Burke (State of Idaho) commented that she is looking forward the meeting and the updates. She noted that the state is looking forward to the eventual restart of the WIPP and waste shipments out of the state resuming. Burke noted that DEQ has a new director – Senator John Tippetts from Montpelier.

Daryl Koch (DEQ) noted that the DEQ team is at the INL today for their annual tour and performing their annual institutional control inspections. The DEQ team tries to visit the INL at least once a quarter. He also noted that the EPA representative was not present due to a conflicting engagement.

Hoss Brown (CWI) commented that CWI has been at the INL site for 10 years. He recognized their exceptional safety record – the recordable rate is currently .27. Brown noted several significant accomplishments and updates: 3.8 acres have been completed at the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP); more than 3000 spent fuel units have been transferred to dry storage; more than 200 buildings have been demolished; teams have remediated 136 waste sites; 242,000 pounds of vapors have been treated at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) via the Organic Contamination in the Vadose Zone (OCVZ) treatment; the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) is undergoing reassembly; modifications to the Sodium Distillation System at the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC) are underway; and the sodium boiler building at the Materials and Fuels Complex is being prepared for demolition. Overall everything is progressing well at the site. Brown is really proud of the employees and the 10-year anniversary.

Dave Richardson (ITG) noted that this was his first CAB meeting as President of AMWTP. He noted that they are making good progress, particularly in retrieval – they’ve finished Cell 2 and are well into Cell 1 retrieval. He commented that they continue to treat waste, storing transuranic waste (TRU) until WIPP reopens. They have approximately 600 certified shipments ready to go to WIPP. In the meantime, they are shipping mixed and low level waste. They have shipped all of the legacy waste and are now shipping waste as it is produced. Richardson noted that he is looking forward to being involved with the CAB.

## Recent Public Involvement Activities

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

CAB member Betsy McBride commented that since none of the activities listed are really public involvement, perhaps it should be called communication outreach. She also asked if there is anything on the list that the CAB members should be researching in order to provide input. M. Brown responded that many of the documents that the CAB should review are shared regularly with the CAB through the INL mailing list. Those documents are a good source to get background information for providing input and asking

questions at the CAB meetings. He noted that there were several opportunities for public input on several of the items he mentioned, including contract procurement activities such as draft requests for proposals, and the opportunity to attend the pre-proposal conference for the draft supplemental analysis. M. Brown noted that the presentation includes public involvement opportunities as well as public outreach. McBride asked further if specific to this list was there anything that the CAB should provide input on. She noted that the CAB had previously asked DOE to identify opportunities in advance for the CAB input. M. Brown responded that there are several presentations during the CAB meeting to provide information

Pence noted that the presentation is both a review and forward looking and that the CAB is routinely sent info to keep them informed of what's going on.

Bohrer asked when Governors Batt and Andrus visited. H. Brown said they visited right before Memorial Day. Bohrer noted that their visit was not on the list.

Bohrer also asked what the permit modifications for CWI included. H. Brown responded that the one for RWMC is to allow processing the boxes and bins in ARP-V for RCRA sludge repackaging from ITG). The work involves sludge repackaging and venting drums inside the boxes. The paperwork has to be updated. The other permit mod is associated with the waste organization. H. Brown committed to getting the specifics before the end of the meeting.

CAB member Bill Roberts asked how much spent fuel is included in the two shipments. M. Brown responded that he is not sure of the specifics but he believes it is on the order of 80 kg. Susan Burke noted that the agreement the state has with DOE to allow fuel to be brought in for research purposes grants an allowance of up to 400 kg per year. The request is for 40 kg per shipment. Roberts asked if this was going to be ongoing. Burke noted that the allowance is for up to 400 per year up to a total of 55 metric tons total, per the Settlement Agreement.

## **ICP Progress**

Mark Brown 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/>.

Harry Griffith asked about the supercompactor incident. M. Brown responded that after drums are crushed they are lifted and moved down the conveyor line. When they lifted that puck, the arms were not engaged adequately and the puck dropped. It caused enough force that it cracked a glovebox window, which has since been replaced.

Borher asked about the other three occurrence reports. M. Brown responded that the boxline was not operating due to BROKK repair. They had not reported that they would be down for more than 14 days. Another incident involved an operator doing a pre-check on a tow motor with an engine block heater. When the operator opened the hood of the tow motor and reached inside, the cord had frayed and the worker brushed against it and felt a tingle. The near miss occurred when workers were replacing a camera which was tethered to a cable and the cable broke. Because they had people in the area, the event was declared a near miss.

McBride asked about the blockage. Is the system currently shut down and is this a new problem? M. Brown responded that the problem occurred last fall. They didn't anticipate that cadmium would be present (it was not listed in the Acceptable Knowledge for this waste stream). Because cadmium has a different freeze point than sodium, it caused a blockage in the line from the distillation vessel to the condenser and the collection vessel. CWI has redesigned the system to put both the condenser and the collection vessel into one

removable unit. The condenser was not originally designed to be removed from the system. Because of the blockage, they redesigned the system so the condenser and the collection vessel are now one system. They can both now be removed more often so we don't get a blockage in the future. McBride asked if it impacts the schedule. M. Brown noted that the schedule is still important and this has put the schedule behind schedule. They are installing the modifications and they expect that to be complete by the end of summer.

Cathy Roemer asked about the permit change to allow more use of water and what's involved for that modification. M. Brown noted that they prepare documentation and justification and present it formally to the state. The state can comment on it and then they negotiate with the state for the formal change. Roemer also asked what the change in volume was. H. Brown responded that the alternative methods of treating sodium – a spritzing method and an immersion method – require more water. M. Brown described these methods in more detail – small amounts of sodium-bearing waste are treated in the “Argon Repackaging Station” inside the Fluorinel Dissolution Process cell in CPP-666. There is a similar Argon Repackaging Station in CPP-659. An Argon Repackaging Station is an open-topped box flooded with argon. Sodium metal is so reactive to water that it reacts to water vapor in air, so argon is used to replace oxygen. Water is added via spritzing or the waste pieces are immersed in water. The sodium metal reacts with the water, forming sodium hydroxide and sodium bicarbonate, which are no longer reactive. The process is not simple, because the reaction of sodium and water can involve heat and fire. No combustibles are allowed in the Argon Repackaging Station or the area around it, an extinguishing agent is kept nearby at all times, and all operators are trained to respond appropriately. There are controls regarding the amount of sodium and the amount of water, and a thermal-imaging camera is constantly monitoring the operation.

Bohrer noted that the permit change to allow the use of more water is not on the list of public involvement opportunities, so is this in progress? H. Brown noted that this permit modification has been completed.

Bohrer also asked about the 133 cubic meters of waste treated – what is the total? M. Brown responded that the total may not be defined. He noted that for remote-handled transuranic waste, new waste is created on the nuclear energy side, so that number changes. H. Brown stated that the total is 133 cubic meters to date, with about 25 cubic meters left to hit the Settlement Agreement.

Koch commented that even the simplest changes require paperwork to keep the permits current.

Roberts commented that they keep hearing about things that will happen “when WIPP reopens.” He asked if they have any idea when that will happen. M. Brown responded that the Secretary of Energy has stated that WIPP will resume limited operations in 2016.

Bohrer noted that there are Settlement Agreement milestones associated with this waste. Where do we stand on those milestones and what penalties are in place? What is the current state of the system regarding the Settlement Agreement and TRU waste? Burke responded that DOE continues to report that they have sent 51,000 cubic meters of TRU waste out of Idaho and that includes mixed and low level waste. The TRU waste that has gone to WIPP is approximately 42,000 cubic meters. The Settlement Agreement does not count the mixed and low level waste. The Settlement Agreement requires that all TRU waste be out of Idaho by 2018. There is also a requirement for a 3-year running average of at least 2000 cubic meters TRU waste shipped out of state. That condition was not met by January 1, 2015. The consequence of not meeting that milestone is that no spent nuclear fuel is allowed into Idaho. M. Brown stressed that they continue to process waste despite the WIPP shutdown.

Keith Branter noted that there are 625 shipments ready to go. He asked how many are ready to go across the complex and where we stand in priority. M. Brown responded that he's not aware of how many shipments are ready at other sites. Ben Roberts noted that the above-ground waste at WIPP will be the first priority and

then the Waste Control Specialists waste. He noted that Idaho has the vast majority of waste in the complex and most of the other sites have less than 100 shipments. He believes that Idaho will be one of the early priorities.

Bohrer commented that they spent quite a bit of time discussing WIPP at the chairs meeting in April, and that the Idaho CAB is on record as stressing that Idaho should have priority when WIPP reopens. He also noted that it will be limited operations in 2016 and that the time to ramp up to full capacity is still in question.

McBride asked about the drum that had deteriorated and if there were any lessons learned. M. Brown replied that the main lesson was to not store waste inside an enclosed cargo container without any venting. Mary Wilcox (DOE-ID) commented that the drums have been in these cargo containers about 40 years. Prior to placing them in the cargo containers they were buried. These particular drums were initially buried in soil with all the winter and other weather conditions and then placed in cargo containers. She also noted that the cargo containers were buried under soil. She noted that none of the new cargo containers are buried but rather stored above ground, indoors, in permitted Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)-compliant storage.

Bill Roberts asked where the INL CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF) is located. M. Brown responded that it is located in the southwest corner of INTEC.

Branter noted that slide 13 indicated there are 1.9 acres to go and asked when that is scheduled to be completed. Koch stated that it has to be completed by 2023.

Branter asked how full ICDF is. M. Brown responded that it is at approximately 70% capacity. DOE estimates that the remaining space available is sufficient.

McBride asked if DOE is adding new items to be disposed at ICDF. M. Brown responded yes. There is an option to submit an amendment to the permit, which is what DOE is doing for additional items including a backhoe used in decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) activities and miscellaneous rad-contaminated equipment.

McBride also asked about the new well at Test Area North for trichloroethylene (TCE). M. Brown responded that this well was planned but because they found a new hotspot, they are drilling two new wells to conduct pump-and-treat as well as injecting some amendment material.

Bob Bodell asked about changing the amendment material for the TCE. Nicole Badrov (DOE-ID) noted that they are evaluating the change but haven't completed that evaluation yet. In the past they have used whey; they are currently evaluating using emulsified vegetable oil.

Bohrer asked if the 5-year review would be sent to the CAB prior to being finalized so they can provide input. Nicole said that the review is not a decision document so there is no public comment. Koch noted that there is no "official" opportunity; however, he noted that the state would be provided a copy. If the CAB wanted a copy of the review and requested it in a public information request, they could read it and provide comments to the state. Koch stressed that the CAB should have input to that document at least through the state.

Bohrer commented that requesting the 5-year review is something the CAB should discuss later today and decide if that is what they want to do.

Marvin Fielding asked how DOE can be 110% completed on a project. M. Brown responded that it indicates that they have completed more scope than initially planned on the project.

Bodell asked about adding .3 acres to CWI's contract – how does that transition with the new contract. M. Brown stated that the .3 acres was added to the current contract scope. He further noted that they expect the current contract to be extended and that additional acreage is likely to be added.

Bohrer noted that the tank farm closure date is likely to be missed. He asked if there are any penalties associated with that. Badrov responded that there are no penalties associated with the closure plan.

Branter asked about the recordable event that occurred in March. M. Brown responded that operators were moving an unloaded, unattached sling during Large Cell Cask activity. The sling caught on a trunnion protruding from the cask. By the time the crane operator was alerted and stopped the crane, the sling had been cut and parted.

Bohrer asked how DOE can say that there isn't an impact on their agreements with the WIPP shipment impacts and IWTU impacts. M. Brown said they looked at the cleanup project overall. While they have some areas that are behind schedule, they have several areas that are ahead of schedule, so overall they gave it a side arrow.

McBride concurred with Bohrer on the effect on agreements. She also asked about the ARPs and that the targeted waste is being removed but the non-targeted waste will be left and will be covered and left in place. She asked if the vapor extraction activities continue indefinitely or will they cease when ARP is closed. Her second question was regarding boxlines and other equipment – is there a plan to use that equipment elsewhere/is that possible and under consideration? M. Brown commented that the institutional controls at RWMC will continue as long as they are needed. That might include vapor extraction or other controls. Long-term monitoring will provide input regarding whether to continue, stop or even resume. Regarding the boxline and other equipment, DOE is exploring using the equipment and technology elsewhere.

Koch noted that regarding OCVZ there is a plan to shut the system down to see if there is a rebound. Monitoring will continue long-term and if the vapors rebound to a set level, they may have to resume.

Branter asked who is paying the fines to the state for IWTU. M. Brown responded that they come out of the project funds. Branter asked how they can be on budget if they are paying fines that aren't included in the budget. M. Brown responded that because they are ahead of schedule and under budget in some areas, they are making up some of the difference. The fine doesn't necessarily come from the same pot of money.

Bohrer commented that at the April Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs meeting, Mark Whitney (Acting EM-1) said that the CABs should be focusing on three things – waste disposition, budget priorities, and citizen engagement. Bohrer asked if there are specific areas that DOE needs the CAB's involvement in the next three months to help. Is there something DOE would like the CAB to study to make recommendations to help DOE? He also asked if M. Brown could give an update on the status of the ICP procurements. He noted that the CAB has talked many times about the transition process for these contracts to ensure a smooth transition without impact on safety, the people, and the environment. M. Brown responded that the CAB could really help regarding the budget. Bohrer noted that Zimmerman reviewed the budget priorities with the CAB in February and the CAB sent a letter agreeing with those priorities.

Regarding the procurements, M. Brown responded that they have sent out the Requests for Proposals for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) license and the ICP core contracts. Both of those have been closed for proposals and DOE is evaluating those proposals now. Bohrer asked what the schedule is for the award. M. Brown responded that there is a schedule, which is part of the procurement activity. He believes, based on the contracts and expected extension of the contracts, that it will be at least 6 months from now. DOE is working on a 6-month extension to the current contract through the end of March. M. Brown noted

regarding the transition process that there are specific items in the Requests for Proposals to ensure continuity and safety of the workers, the public, and the environment.

## **Integrated Waste Treatment Unit Update**

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

McBride asked what contaminants come out at the very end. She also asked if there is another method being used to treat this waste stream elsewhere. Are there options if they decide not to pursue IWTU? Roth noted that this is a first-of-a-kind facility and that they are a long way away from deciding to deviate from this treatment. The materials go through two sets of filters, trapping down to 2 microns. The Denitration Mineralization Reformer (DMR) is where the radioactive sodium-bearing waste is introduced into the system. The gasses that go through a process gas filter following that stage pass through the Carbon Reduction Reformer (CRR) into another process gas filter. Mercury is evaporated in the DMR. Once the gas leaves the CRR, the NO<sub>x</sub> has been eliminated. The gas goes into the offgas filter, which removes the material burned in the CRR. The gas that leaves the off-gas filter goes through the HEPA filters which take out any remaining particulate. At this point the gas still has mercury vapor in it which is why it is sent through the mercury-adsorbing GAC beds. The remaining gas goes out through the stack, which includes a monitoring station. McBride asked if the project has an idea of what will be in that gas. Roth responded that there won't be any hazardous materials still left once it goes through the stack. There will be combustion gases left over, but the hazardous materials will have been removed.

Fielding asked how the new contract will affect this project. M. Brown responded that DOE is looking at that issue to ensure a smooth transition.

## **WIPP Accident Investigation Report**

Roger Claycomb (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on the WIPP Accident Investigation Report. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Griffith asked how the mistake in material (organic absorbent vs inorganic diatomaceous earth absorbent) could happen. Claycomb noted that was a similar question the investigation team looked at. There were weaknesses in the execution of the processes that allowed the error to occur.

Bill Roberts asked if the decision to change the absorbent material was a financial consideration. Claycomb responded that they investigated whether it was a financial decision or even a "green" decision, but the board determined that the decision was just a misunderstanding during communication about the process.

Griffith asked if they evaluated using robotics. Claycomb responded that they did, but determined that this process was more efficient.

## **AMWTP Future Integrated Project Team**

Ben Roberts (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about the AMWTP Future Integrated Project Team. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride noted that it doesn't seem too early to initiate a conversation with the public on this and asked who is tasked with that. It is clear that AMWTP is something that serves the mission of the entire complex. Given the history here in Idaho, it is not going to be too early to initiate that conversation. Roberts responded that



at this point the process is being led by DOE-HQ. He noted that the Idaho Governor and his Leadership in Nuclear Energy (LINE) commission recognize that AMWTP is a national asset and have made a recommendation to DOE to consider future missions. Roberts responded that until DOE-HQ makes decisions on funding for the future of the AMWTP, it is too early to engage the public. He expects a decision from EM-1 in the fall. McBride brought up the acronym DAD (Decide – Announce – Defend). She said it sounds like DOE is going to make a decision and then announce that to the public. She encouraged DOE-ID to encourage DOE-HQ to include public input early in the process. Roberts noted that with CAB input and input from the LINE commission, DOE-HQ is incorporating public input. He stated that he will pass on to DOE-HQ the CAB's desire for more public engagement in this decision.

Bohrer noted the CAB is on record as supporting AMWTP as a national asset. He pointed out that in addition to operational funding needs, DOE also needs to look at what upgrades and maintenance would be needed to extend the mission past its original 2018 end date, including budgetary impacts. Roberts noted that is something they are considering as part of the process. ITG was recently asked to prepare a list of maintenance needs for the future. Compiling that list is in progress.

Gumm noted that the CAB has sent a letter with recommendations on this topic.

Burke noted that the SA allows for AMWTP to bring in waste to treat as long as it is treated and shipped out within one year of receipt.

Ben Roberts commented that if the CAB feels strongly that more public involvement is needed, they may want to consider an additional letter. He commented that the previous letter from the CAB was a big influence in DOE pursuing this mission.

## **AMWTP Retrieval Status**

Mary Wilcox (DOE-ID) provided an update on the AMWTP Retrieval Status. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked for more clarification about the history of the containers. Wilcox noted that waste was retrieved from the RWMC Subsurface Disposal Area and placed in cargo containers in the 1970s – about 208 cargo containers worth of drums were retrieved. (Waste was originally from the 1950s and 1960s.) This was to meet the 1970s era directive to store drums for immediate retrieval. The cargo containers were placed on Pad 1 (prior to construction of the Retrieval Enclosure over the area). The practice at the time was to cover the containers with soil.

## **Environmental Surveillance, Education, and Research (ESER) Program**

Betsy Holmes (DOE-ID) provided an overview of the ESER Program. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked how ESER collects stakeholder input and what is done with that input. Holmes responded that ESER receives input through a variety of ways including contact from individuals and organizations. For example, the Shoshone-Bannock Indian Tribe approached DOE about potential risk from consuming marmots. ESER evaluated the potential effects of consuming marmots that might have come into contact with buried waste by burrowing into it. ESER initiated a monitoring program to collect samples of marmots that had used the site, potentially burrowing into waste, and compared those data with off-site control samples to see if there was a difference between the two populations. ESER also did a dose calculation. Many concerns come through individuals and some come through interactions with other agencies. Based on

the input or concerns raised, ESER can implement various programs to address the concern. In addition ESER prepares an annual report each year and public comment is solicited on that report.

## **Naval Reactors Facility (NRF) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

Chris Henvit (NRF) provided a presentation about the NRF EIS. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked if both of the potential locations in the preferred alternative are in Idaho. Henvit noted that they never considered a location off the INL; however, they did look at other locations on the INL. They settled on a location at NRF.

Bohrer asked if the EIS discusses the fate of the current Expended Core Facility (ECF). Henvit replied that it addresses it only to the extent that they would continue operating it for a period of time. NRF does the examination work in ECF – this EIS does not include that capability, so even when they are done with the water pool, they will still need the hot cells. Eventual demolition of the ECF would be the subject of a different federal action.

Branter asked how the Settlement Agreement affects their ability to handle spent fuel. Henvit responded that NRF's agreement with the state does not affect this action. NRF has an addendum to the Settlement Agreement that they signed with the state in 2008 that recognizes their continued operation beyond 2035. The agreement has restrictions and caps on fuel the Navy can bring in to Idaho. For example: no more than 28 shipments per year; any fuel put into wet storage can only remain in wet storage for 6 years (after January 1, 2017, NRF must complete all operations and have it in dry storage within 6 years of receipt). The amount of fuel that they would bring into Idaho is completely independent of this proposed action. Fuel receipts are tied to those aircraft carrier and submarine defueling activities. Those shipments will take place whether the EIS is completed or not.

Bohrer also reminded that this topic is out of the scope of the CAB. If people want to comment as individuals it is separate from the CAB's responsibilities.

## **EM Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs Meeting Report**

Bohrer and Griffith gave a recap of the recent EM SSAB Chairs Meeting. Bohrer reported that the meeting was held in Augusta, Georgia in April. Mark Whitney, acting EM Assistant Secretary, gave an overview of the EM program highlights. Whitney noted that the priorities for the CABs should be waste disposition, budget priorities and citizen engagement.

Frank Marcinowski, Deputy Assistant Secretary, briefed the chairs on WIPP. Griffith noted that DOE-HQ indicated that Idaho's priorities regarding resumption of WIPP shipments had merit. Griffith noted that he feels optimistic about Idaho's priority.

Bohrer and Griffith reported that the chairs discussed the DOE communication strategy. DOE EM HQ has produced several products for each of the site to be used as communication tools. Bohrer handed out copies of the Idaho version that HQ developed and invited the CAB members to provide input about the product.

DOE also provided a simplified waste disposition map showing waste streams and where they go. Marcinowski presented a draft – the chairs agreed it was a good start.

The chairs discussed the budget process and priorities. The chairs felt that budgets are best addressed at the local level; they will not be developing guidance at the chairs level for CABs involvement in the budget process. Bohrer mentioned his appreciation for the chairs meeting giving CABs the opportunity to provide input on priorities.

Griffith told the CAB that he wrote a report on the chairs meeting, which will appear in the CAB newsletter. He stated that DOE told the group that Idaho's needs regarding WIPP were worthy of special consideration. He noted that DOE presented a historical look at cleanup, telling the group that, since the start of the cleanup program 25 years ago, \$144B has been spent on cleanup effort, and we've gone from 107 to 19 sites for cleanup. This helps put the process into context.

McBride noted that the \$144B number is huge and asked if handling the same waste multiple times (buried, retrieved, moved, moved again) is all included in that number, Griffith responded that he believes it's all included.

Bohrer noted that each board has different goals and sensitivities. Hanford is in the decision-making process. Places like Paducah and Portsmouth are focused on keeping their communities going. Other places like Idaho and Savannah River are focused on getting their cleanup completed. All of the chairs believe that the roles of their CABs are important and worthwhile.

Griffith also mentioned the vitrification plant at the Savannah River Site.. He found it very interesting to hear that it took four or five years from mechanical completion to getting it turned on. Our experience here seems to be on par with starting up a major new nuclear facility.

Bohrer introduced the letter considered by the EM SSAB Chairs regarding the resumption of WIPP shipments. The chairs began discussions a year ago regarding storage locations for waste that is awaiting disposition. Bohrer said we are on record as asking to be put at the front of the queue. McBride asked about the specific recommendations and what the thinking was that that went into generating recommendations 2 and 3 regarding shipping newly generated waste to an alternative storage site. Bohrer responded that nobody felt comfortable recommending a storage location beyond their own sites. The question originated with why build storage facilities all over the country rather than build them at WIPP. Looking at the complex as a whole – do we need additional storage and if so, what location (originating sites or WIPP) makes the most sense overall. Roemer questioned the purpose of this letter? Bohrer noted that it puts us on record to DOE with our position. The CAB members were in agreement to support the letter. Bohrer noted that if *all* the boards agree on *this* letter then it will be submitted to DOE. Bohrer noted that the INL EM Site CAB support for the letter will be communicated to DOE-HQ.

The next EM SSAB Chairs meeting is in Santa Fe, New Mexico, in September.

## **CAB Election Results**

Bob Pence (DOE-ID) reported the results of the CAB elections: for the next year (2015-2016), Herb Bohrer will be the chair and Keith Branter will be the Vice Chair.

## **Public Comment**

Tami Thatcher of Idaho Falls commented that the RWMC buried waste performance assessment and composite analysis of waste that will remain buried at RWMC shows 30-50 mrem doses continuing for hundreds of thousands of years. This document was last updated in 2008 and has not been available publicly until requested through the Freedom of Information Act recently. She would like to understand how

institutional controls will protect the aquifer. The assumption of perfect soil cap performance forever is not consistent with any other projects.

Thatcher also commented that there is a fairly lengthy list of ineffective programs that resulted in the incidents at WIPP. She is trying to understand why there was no understanding of these ineffective programs until after the incident. When will there be some independent oversight of INL programs? Now that we will be storing on-site larger quantities of waste above ground, ready to ship, are there safety concerns? She wants to understand how INL programs won't be susceptible to the same issues as WIPP.

Thatcher went on to note that past concerns have been documented in the administrative record about storing waste at the Idaho Disposal Facility. She is interested in getting a status on waste loading at the disposal facility. Have we alleviated the oversight concerns? She also asked if independent reviews are being considered for buried waste assessments (including ICDF, RWMC, and the future replacement for RWMC – the remote-handled waste facility).

Finally, Thatcher noted that chemical data for drinking wells is given to IDEQ but not the radiological data. The data for MCLs of carbon tetrachloride reported to IDEQ does not correspond with the data reported by the USGS.

M. Brown concluded the meeting.

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