



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

October 30, 2013

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Wednesday, October 30, 2013, 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 208-557-7886.

Members Present

Herb Bohrer, Chair
Harry Griffith, Vice Chair
Nicki Karst
Bob Bodell
Harrison Gerstlauer
Kristen Jensen
Betsy McBride
Bill Roberts
Tami Henvit
Teri Tyler

Members Not Present

Willie Preacher

Deputy Designated Federal Officer, Federal Coordinator, and Liaisons Present

Ric Craun, Acting 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)
Danny Nichols, Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP)
Daryl Koch, State of Idaho

Others Present

Sue Skinner	Nolan Jensen, DOE-ID
Mike Hickey	Natalie Packer, ICP
Mark Dehring	Tami Thatcher
Mark Hutchison, NRF	Romelia Martinez, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Roger Turner	Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Erik Simpson, ICP	Nicole Brooks, DOE-ID
Bruce LaRue, DEQ	Curtis Roth, DOE-ID
Tammy Hobbes, ICP	Ben Roberts, DOE-ID
Chris Cutler, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Lorie Cahn, ICP
Lori Howell, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Frank Webber, ICP
Stan Baldwin, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Howard Forsythe, ICP
Danielle Miller, DOE-ID	Lori McNamara, Support Services
	Bryant Kuechle, Support Services Facilitator
	Ann Riedesel, Support Services

Action Items

Assigned to: Ric Craun

Beatrice Brailsford asked if there is an anticipated bottleneck in meeting the 2023 deadline (see ICP Fiscal Year 2014 Work Plan, pg. 9)?

Assigned to: Ric Craun

Daryl Koch discussed the State's interest in the CAB weighing in on the proposal to clean up to industrial standards rather than residential standards (see CAB Work Session, pg. 10)?

Assigned to: Ric Craun

Roger Turner asked if there were any plays to get any more characterization on the bin sets in preparation for the treatment plan (see ICP Fiscal Year 2014 Work Plan, pg. 9)?

Roger Turner asked about the potential for consistency from bin to bin (see ICP Fiscal Year 2014 Work Plan, pg. 9)?

Opening Remarks

Facilitator Bryant Kuechle opened the meeting with a couple reminders: 1) use the microphones to ensure an accurate recording, and 2) public input will be held during the scheduled public involvement times (questions from the public may be allowed following the presentations if time permits).

Bryant asked CAB member Betsy McBride to discuss the “Dashboard” concept for use with the presentations to help highlight key information. The CAB’s public involvement committee developed a “dashboard” concept – red (stop and think about this/may be an issue); yellow (proceed with caution); green (good) for the presentations. The objective is to get the greatest amount of information from the presentations and wade through the high level of details to the items that are truly significant. The dashboard is designed as a tool to help the presenters highlight the key information and organize and summarize the information for the CAB. The public involvement committee drafted a memo that includes a draft list of questions for the presentations (as a guideline for presenters and CAB members to note the key points). The long-term objective is to improve the information exchange between the CAB and the community. It is also designed to encourage presenters to think about some of these questions. A copy of the dashboard form has been added to each presentation.

CAB Chair Herb Bohrer welcomed the CAB members and audience. He noted that Chris Cutler would be representing Willie Preacher for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes at the meeting. Bohrer also noted that Dennis Faulk (EPA) was unavailable for this meeting. Finally, he noted the passing of one of the first CAB Chairs, Chuck Rice, and recognized all the work Chuck put into the early years of the CAB.

Ric Craun (DOE-ID) welcomed the CAB. He commented on the dashboard approach and noted that it will allow presenters to fine tune their information and focus the briefings. Craun introduced Hoss Brown (CWI) and Danny Nichols (AMWTP) and welcomed them to the meeting and thanked them for their participation.

Kerry Martin was present representing Susan Burke (INL Coordinator for the DEQ). She noted that they are happy to see that work at ARPs has started again. They are also interested in Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) and AMWTP shipments.

Daryl Koch (State of Idaho) noted the state’s interest in Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), the IWTU project, AMWTP, land use and institutional controls, Advanced Test Reactor-Critical (ATR-C) potential new research facility.

Hoss reported that there is a lot good news happening at CWI. The Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC) has gone over 1 year without a recordable and no first aid incidents. That is quite an accomplishment on a project of that size and scope! The waste management group is getting ready to treat some SBW that will eventually go to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). They have set up a distillation system. The state witnessed the test and liked it. The system is now being installed at INTEC. At the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC), CWI has started Accelerated Retrieval Projects (ARPs) II and III. It is going well. They expect to finish by end of this calendar year. That means that ARP II, III, I, IV, & VI will be complete and ready for demo. ARP V is being used as a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) facility. ARP VIII (1.72 acres) completed the CRA last week; startup plan has been approved to start exhumation in ARP VIII. IWTU is continuing to progress.

Danny Nichols (AMWTP) expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to provide an update on AMWTP. He noted the excellent performance on safety and production at AMWTP; they have met all targets and have exceeded 15M man-hours without a lost time accident. They had a fire event on September 20 in the north box line. He will present more information about it later in the meeting.

Recent Public involvement

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

Bohrer asked about the purpose of the IG staff tour on October 2. Craun responded that it was mainly just a familiarization for staff members.

McBride asked if there is a way to fold a CAB discussion into the timeline for the IWTU permit mods. She noted that if it was something that required public comment, there should be a discussion with the CAB. Craun responded that DOE could set up a briefing at one of the CAB meetings to outline the permit mods and include the CAB in the existing process of reviewing them with the agencies.

ICP Status

Craun 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/>.

McBride requested more info about the warning letter from DEQ. Nichols reviewed the three issues noted in the letter. One issue was regarding some drums that contained mercury. Several made it through the project's checks and balances and two were compacted. The problem was discovered during the process back-end checks and reported to the State. The second issue was regarding a small cylinder that was processed. During processing it was discovered the cylinder was not empty and it caused a pyrophoric reaction when cut into. The third issue was regarding RCRA daily inspections. The operator incorrectly thought the inspections were required only during operations. The category of inspections should have been performed whether in operations or not; therefore some of the inspections were missed. All three issues were self-reported by ITG.

Bohrer asked about the contamination events. Craun reported that CWI had one contamination event; ITG had three contamination events. At ITG, a very experienced worker (with more than 300 safe entries) received some contamination during an entry. Craun noted that ITG did a great job determining the underlying cause. They did several mock ups to determine the cause. Based on the results, they made some modifications to improve their process. The employees are very happy with the results.

Bohrer asked if whole body counts are conducted following personnel contamination events (such as the plutonium contamination event at the Materials and Fuels Complex [MFC]). Nichols responded that they conduct a full suite of bioassay tests in all cases of personnel contamination. Brown reported that they use the same process for Batelle Energy Alliance (BEA).

McBride asked about the impacts to schedule. Craun responded that the focus is to get the facility operational and processing by March 2014. The goal is to complete the project in calendar year 2014 in order to release the prohibition on bringing fuel into the state. That goal is an update from the original December 2012 date.

Bohrer requested more clarification regarding the readiness assessments. Craun noted that DOE is pushing for the Contractor readiness assessment for December, and then January for the DOE readiness assessment. The assessment team would be made of people not local; similar to an operational readiness review.

Nicki Karst asked about the penalty restricting spent nuclear fuel (SNF) being brought in; is there also a monetary penalty? Craun responded that yes, through the contractor fee associated with the IWTU delay per the established contract. New milestones were included in the contract extension; those are now potentially being impacted.

Bohrer asked about the recent road closure. Nichols noted that it was not a standard transfer. It was the last shipment required to move the last of MFC contact-handled transuranic (TRU) waste to AMWTP. Because it went to AMWTP, it couldn't go on the onsite road and necessitated the road closure.

Harry Griffith asked where the SNF is being accumulated during the suspension on bringing it into Idaho, and if there will be an influx at one time once the suspension is lifted. Craun reported that the SNF is being held at the source until we are approved to receive it. Griffith asked if the domestic and foreign and reactor fuel are being held while waiting for INL or are they sending it somewhere else? And will there be a high influx when the ban is lifted? Craun was unsure but committed to checking into the answer. Kerry Martin noted that there was a previous discussion about what fuel is out there waiting; her recollection is that it wasn't a huge amount. Later in the meeting Craun provided an answer to Griffith's question: there is currently one shipment from Sandia in the queue that is being held.

Bohrer asked if CWI is planning any layoffs in the next period. Brown replied that there are no reductions in force planned at this time.

Bohrer asked if the Test Area North (TAN) groundwater pump and treat is on schedule. Craun responded that it is still in shutdown but going as expected and they are waiting for the rebound.

Tami Henvit gave a "cheers" to CWI for the cost savings over the years because it has kept people working and projects moving forward. Brown acknowledged all the different people involved in making it happen.

AMWTP Fire Update

Nichols provided a presentation about the September 20, 2013 fire event at AMWTP. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Griffith asked what's happening on the other side of the camera. Nichols responded that the operator will attempt to pull the CO₂ system and put out the fire. The operator will pull the fire alarm, which will charge the suppression system and evacuate the building. About 15 people were evacuated. ITG conducted a full accountability of all the personnel on the site and activated the emergency response process. Griffith asked how many people were impacted. Nichols estimated that approximately 75 people total. Other personnel were held in place until the event concluded.

Harrison Gerstlauer asked how much radiation was released during the event. Nichols responded that there was nothing detected.

Nichols noted that this is not an unexpected event and because of that, AMWTP has procedures in place to deal with such a situation.

Nichols noted that everything was left in place for the investigation. They are also working on a recovery plan to go in and remove the containers, restart the boxline, and ensure the CO₂ system is operational.

McBride asked Nichols to clarify his earlier statement that "DEQ didn't initially think you could handle these types of materials but you met with them and they approved it." Nichols noted that per the existing AMWTP process, they are allowed to segregate these items for separate processing (export out for manual handling). This process has been authorized by the state. ITG has proposed a new process to not export the items but rather process them in the boxline facility. That proposed process has not yet been approved. McBride expressed concern that a fire started based on the proposed change. Nichols responded that they are currently evaluating options and conducting a safety analysis to clarify exactly what can be done safely within the cell. There may be some items that will still need to be segregated. No formal permit modification has been requested at this time.

Teri Tyler asked how many fires occur that the CO₂ system covers. Nichols responded that they have had two fires in the year that he has been here. Tyler also asked if they have backup manipulators. Nichols replied that they have a second Brokk in this boxline and an additional Brokk in the south boxline.

Bill Roberts asked for clarification regarding Nichols statement that they are going to review the estimated frequency of the event and how they do that. Craun responded that they evaluate it internally to determine if it is likely to happen more frequently than originally estimated. The evaluation includes looking at potential frequency and existing safety systems. They will only propose a change with the state if they can do so reliably.

Gerstlauer asked if there are inspections that would cover the CO₂ line that broke. Nichols responded that yes, they are covered in inspections. According to Nichols, his engineers are postulating that the operator may have caught the line as he was reaching into the box. They believe that it was damaged between inspections. The damage resulted in it breaking when it was activated.

Public Comment

Tami Thatcher wondered if the combustible loading in the cell was enough to pose a threat to the windows or other structures. How much bigger would the fire have had to have been to pose a threat to the cell window? Craun responded that the design basis fire is five boxes. During this event, there was no challenge to the safety systems and structures.

Thatcher also asked about the DOE independent oversight report in 2010 on environmental monitoring at INL. One of their recommendations was that there needs to be a better technical basis for placement of instruments for monitoring. Has anything been done to address that report? Craun responded that they have a lot of reviews and he didn't know the details off the top of his head. He committed to meeting with Thatcher during the break to understand what she is looking for. Craun stressed that DOE reads all the reports, assigns action items for them, and tracks the actions formally. Martin recalled the report and noted that she believes there is a draft document in response to that report that is currently in review at DOE.

Sue Skinner asked a question about the contamination incident at AMWTP. Nichols clarified that it was 300 entries over two years and this was his *first* contamination.

Sodium Bearing Waste Treatment Project Update

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

Gerstlauer asked if it is an outside group that comes in and reviews readiness. Roth responded that yes, it is an outside, independent group.

Griffith asked what impact a sequestration or shutdown has on something like this. Craun responded that this project is very high in the funding priorities. Lower priorities would be cut or scaled back first. A shutdown (lapse in appropriation) would impact this. All the projects/facilities can be put in a safe mode (minimum required staffing level required to maintain safety and health). We were in the process of that during the recent shutdown. This facility would have been put in safe mode if the shutdown had continued.

Bohrer asked what happens to the people and the plant when the project is done in 2014. Craun responded that the current concept is to remove the internals of this facility and add the equipment to treat the calcine. The facility will then be held for other potential missions (2018 timeframe for the calcine).

McBride noted the good progress on the project. She also noted that the dashboard was helpful. McBride asked if the project delay and the hold on accepting fuel have resulted in any employment and economic development impacts. Craun responded that no, there have not been impacts in those areas. McBride also asked about the impact on the budget – how much did it increase and where did it come from. Craun responded that yes, IWTU has cost more and taken longer. Some of the funding came from the progress with exhumation, some from cost savings, and some has been reprogrammed. McBride also asked if the incentive clock was reset when the project was renegotiated. Craun replied that incentives were negotiated as part of completing the process. Relative to the extension, they are behind schedule and over cost. However, DOE is looking at ways to be fair and equitable with the funding and incentives (2013, 2014, and 2015).

Bohrer noted that earlier presentations on the startup of IWTU seemed much more simplistic than the current. He believes it was not rigorous enough previously and that more testing was needed. Bohrer believes the lesson learned is that it takes more testing than originally thought. He is concerned that the lessons learned are not taken seriously. Craun assured the CAB that lessons learned are looked at seriously and formally.

Roger Turner expressed concern about the hazardous waste aspect of the base material. Logic would suggest that you want to treat this from a hazardous waste aspect, stop at each interval, and test; especially if you hope to ship this out. How do you demonstrate that you treated the hazardous waste aspect of this waste? Roth responded that the primary hazardous constituents are addressed in the process (e.g., mercury addressed by the mercury adsorbers, hydrogen monitoring system to ensure hydrogen remains below acceptable levels). Throughout the process they will continually monitor for the hazardous constituents throughout the process. System performance test will demonstrate to DEQ compliance with all requirements and conditions. Turner asked how long it takes for results on the system performance tests. Craun responded that the samples are sent out to a laboratory, but he's not sure about the turnaround time on analysis. Once the analysis is complete, they have about 6 months to be reviewed by the state to determine compliance.

Beatrice Brailsford asked when the assessment with HQ, Hanford, and Savannah River will be completed and available. Craun replied that he will need to check on timing. He noted that it will be available and FOIA-able.

Advanced Test Reactor Soil Contamination

Nicole Brooks provided a presentation on the ATR Complex soil contamination. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked where the soil went. Brooks replied that it was sent to Idaho CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF), which is specifically designed to take this type of waste. They did not remove the lead from the soil; they just took all the soil that contained lead and transferred it to ICDF.

Bohrer asked if the debris was picked up or left behind. Brooks responded that the debris was left in place because there is no danger associated with it. Bohrer questioned if that created a situation where if the debris is found in the future will they assume they have to conduct another study. Brooks responded that all of it was logged for future reference.

Daryl Koch provided some background information. In 1995, DOE, DEQ, EPA, and the CAB looked at what a "reasonable time" would be – 100 years sounded reasonable. EPA (Wayne Pierre) agreed with the concept at the time too, especially for groundwater cleanup. It was reasonably expected that you could restore groundwater to drinking water standards within 100 years. The 100 years allows time for evolving missions at the site. That's where the 2095 deadline came from.

Henvit asked about the ANL-65 area and if there are plans to revegetate this area and return it to the background area. Frank Webber responded that there are no plans to revegetate at this time but eventually Mother Nature will take over and it will likely revegetate on its own. Brown noted the backfill was from an area near RWMC.

Gerstlauer asked about the areas off the INL site – how are they identified? Webber noted that they notify BLM if items are found. If a threat is posed, BLM can address the area through the Former Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). To date, only seven items have been found in the entire survey.

Gerstlauer asked if there was any threat to animals (e.g., sage grouse). Webber responded that there are really no hazardous constituents with it other than the firing mechanism.

Bill Roberts thanked the public for their interest.

DOE's Site Sustainability

Richard Kauffman gave a presentation on the INL Site Sustainability. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked if the focus was operational improvements or research or policy choices. Kauffman noted that it is primarily operational and not mission direct activities. They are looking at ways to save energy and lowering petroleum product usage. Their focus is not directly related to cleaning up the site or processing SNF, etc.

Henvit asked what was meant by the term “divert” on slide #7. Kauffman responded that it referred to diverting material from going to the landfill. For example, recycling materials rather than sending them to the landfill.

In response to a question, Kauffman responded that to achieve a reduction in petroleum consumption they are trying to reduce the number of trips back and forth to the INL.

Gerstlauer asked if the site is using electric cars. Kauffman replied that they are not using electric cars but they are using some hybrid vehicles.

Gerstlauer asked what the payback is on the solar wall. Kauffman responded that it is a short payback period – about 3 to 7 years (ballpark) depending on the building specifics.

McBride asked if the economic payback is inappropriate for adopting wind and solar but you have a greenhouse gas reduction target, can you get credits that would make it more feasible (e.g., changing to electrical)? Kauffman replied that it is not really feasible at this time on INL but they continue to look at it.

Griffith asked if biomass had been looked at. Kauffman responded that it has not been looked at a great deal at the site. Water flow is inconsistent on the site.

Gerstlauer asked the cost for power at INL. Kauffman responded that it is 3.2 cents per kilowatt hour.

Griffith asked if lighting is taken into account. Kauffman reported that they have changed a lot of lighting; there is still more to do. Griffith also ask if there had been any thought about nuclear power options for the future? Kauffman responded that nuclear does not count as renewable energy.

Transuranic Waste Strategies (Remote Handled and Contact Handled)

Ben Roberts and Nolan Jensen provided a presentation about TRU waste program, low-level waste (LLW) program, and buried waste program. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Bohrer asked if all the WIPP permit modifications are in place or are some still pending. Roberts responded that 3 or 4 were discussed at the last CAB meeting. Most of them were successfully implemented. A couple modifications were not implemented – following discussions with Carlsbad, we agreed with Carlsbad that they weren't appropriate. INL is not waiting for actions from Carlsbad at this time.

In response to a question from Karst, Roberts noted that degradation of the containers is a result of two things – those on top are likely a result of rain water; the ones further into the stack are more likely a result of the contents in the container.

McBride asked if the Carlsbad contractor is here in Idaho. Roberts responded that yes we have some here in Idaho to support our operations. They focus on different waste streams than we do, primarily at the ARP waste.

McBride inquired about what is causing the backlog. According to Roberts, they are waiting for TRUPACTS from WIPP to ship TRU waste and waiting for funding to ship LLW.

Bohrer asked if approval from New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) was needed for the WIPP RCRA permit. Roberts replied that no, Idaho will be the approver for that permit.

McBride inquired as to whether this technology is portable and if it is unique to Idaho. According to Jensen, there is nothing unique about this but CWI has perfected it. The “technology” is portable but what really sets this apart is the people doing it are excellent. Bohrer noted that Los Alamos is using something similar. ARP I was pretty unique/groundbreaking at the time and has resulted in a change in how DOE conducts these projects across the complex.

Henvit commented that considering the current fiscal restraints, the fact that everyone is really working together (AMWTP/ITG, ICP) is really commendable.

Gerstlauer asked if there is any potential for Hanford waste to be treated here. Craun responded that they continue to look at mission potential for AMWTP and are in some discussions with other sites to consider using AMWTP. Roberts also noted that our primary focus is meeting the Settlement Agreement milestones but can consider other missions as the Settlement Agreement milestones are met.

Koch noted that the retrieval program is at the halfway point. DEQ is finishing up statistical analysis about what has been removed, what was expected to be removed, and what may have been left behind. At the halfway point, analysis shows that we have been extremely successful.

Bohrer noted that ICP has done a good job keeping their experienced workforce there to keep the project going.

Public Comment

Beatrice Brailsford asked DOE to confirm that cost savings reported in the first contract (2007-12) was about \$500M. Craun confirmed that number and noted that the number was based on estimates that went through an external/independent review. Brailsford also asked if the savings stay at INL. Craun reported that most of the savings stay here and are spent on other cleanup activities. There can be a negotiation with HQ, but most of it stays here.

Tami Thatcher noted that she has a difficult time getting a sense of what a “severe” accident could be at INL. Thatcher asked if DOE could explain in a general sense, the extent of a “really bad day.” Craun noted that because we are working on waste, we don’t have dispersion energy like a power plant would, which limits how bad it can be on a “really bad day.”

Thatcher also asked at what temperature IWTU will operate? Craun responded that he believes it operates at approximately 900 degrees centigrade at a negative pressure. Thatcher asked additional questions about the design basis accident. Craun noted that if the CAB wants to hear more about the design basis accident for IWTU, it would be better covered in a separate presentation.

Idaho Cleanup Project Fiscal Year 2014 Work Plan

Craun provided a presentation about the ICP FY-2014 work plan. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked if another sequestration is pending. Craun noted that a second round is pending in January but it will allow more flexibility and they are optimistic that they will not be impacted.

Henvit asked about where EBR-II fuel is being transferred. Craun responded that they are transferring it from storage to a processing facility. Henvit also asked about D&D at MFC and INTEC facilities and if D&D of those facilities is the ultimate plan. She noted that these have some one-of-a-kind facilities. Craun noted that it refers to facilities that are mission-owned by EM and no longer in use. The ongoing nuclear energy (NE) activities are not included in this.

Gerstlauer asked if once the EBR-II fuel is moved, will that facility and the dome be D&D’d. The dome is not currently planned for D&D. It is demo-ready now so when funding becomes available, it will be planned.

Karst asked how much the potential for another shutdown is affecting operations – is it affecting any work, are you holding back on work. Craun responded that the earlier shutdown did have an impact due to the planning required to put the facilities in a safe mode and furlough employees. He noted that they are working with the contractor to proceed as if we have predictable funding. If another shutdown occurs, we won’t have carry over to help.

Griffith asked if there were any personnel morale issues due to the shutdown. Craun noted that it has had an impact, not only with the Department but also on the contractor side. No matter how hard we try to manage this, it’s hard to keep people’s heads in the game due to uncertainty. It’s a tough way to do business, especially in a highly skilled job environment. Brown noted that at ICP each area VP had an all hands with their staff and talked with smaller groups about the potential. They stressed that production was not the most important thing; safety is the focus and production will come as a result of staying safe and focused. Throughout the process they were open and honest with the staff. It was tough to keep focused. Craun noted that DOE worked with contractors to communicate updates from HQ (3 times daily in some cases). ITG also provided updates to their employees throughout the process.

Karst asked if it is within the CAB charter to write a letter to our elected officials to express our concern over the impacts of a shutdown. Or should we do that as individuals? Bob Pence replied that it could be considered lobbying, which is outside the CAB mission. A letter might be possible if it was worded carefully. Bohrer believes sending a letter from the CAB is prohibited by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

In response to a question from Roger Turner about the second sodium bearing waste milestone (Slide 8), Craun responded that the milestone is a processing schedule. Turner also asked if there were any plans to get any more characterization on the bin sets in preparation for the treatment plan. Craun was not sure but will check. Turner

also asked about the potential for consistency from bin to bin. DOE will follow up and respond at next CAB meeting.

Brailsford asked who the SNF work for others is for. Craun responded that it is work that DOE-EM is doing is for DOE-NE or others.

In response to a question from Brailsford, Craun confirmed that Ft. St. Vrain and TMI are the only licensed storage facilities.

Brailsford also asked how seriously is DOE-EM is going after funding for spent fuel facility. Craun responded that they are focused on the commitment from wet to dry and then the commitment to get it out of the state of Idaho. They are actively pursuing the planning and funding; it's not on the immediate horizon (2014), but it is planned. Brailsford asked where is the SNF put when it is removed from wet storage now? According to Jensen, most of it goes into the CPP-603 dry storage area. Finally, Brailsford asked if there is an anticipated bottleneck in meeting the 2023 deadline? Craun will provide this information for the next meeting.

Koch commented about land use. The State is looking to the CAB to give an opinion on whether Waste Area Group (WAG) 2, ATR-C, and the rest of INTEC would go under restricted access. The State would like the CAB to get more information on it and possibly weigh in. McBride asked what the downside would be. According to Koch, it would force cleanup to residential site on an industrial site. The state believes it is impractical to have a residential cleanup requirement on an industrial site.

CAB WORK SESSION

Bohrer commented about Koch's earlier statements about State's interest in the CAB weighing in on the proposal to clean up to industrial standards rather than residential standards. Craun knows that some work is happening on this, but is not sure of the details. If the CAB is expected to weigh in, then more information is needed. If they want input, then this topic should be added to the next agenda. Craun will get more information and if necessary get it added to next agenda.

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