



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

May 18, 2011

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its bi-monthly meeting on Wednesday, May 18, 2011, at the Hilton Garden Inn, Idaho Falls, Idaho. An audio recording of the meeting was created and may be reviewed by phoning CAB Support Staff at 208-557-7886.

Members Present

R.D. Maynard, Chair
Willie Preacher, Vice Chair
Seth Beal
Herbert Bohrer
Sean Cannon
Doc DeTonancour
Harrison Gerstlauer
Harry Griffith
Nicki Karst
Mark Lupher
Robert Rodriguez
Bruce Wendle

Members Not Present

April Mariska
Tami Sherwood
Fred Sica
Teri Tyler

Deputy Designated Federal Officer, Federal Coordinator, and Liaisons Present

Jim Cooper, Deputy Designated Federal Officer, U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Susan Burke, State of Idaho
Daryl Koch, State of Idaho
Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 10
Tom Dieter, CH2M-WG Idaho (CWI)

Others Present

Fred Hughes
Natalie Packer, ICP
Kevin Daniels, ICP
Roger Mayes
Danielle Miller, DOE-ID
Karen Bass, ICP
Dan Coyne, ICP
Mark Hutchison, NRF
Kevin Welsh, NRF
Erik Simpson, ICP

Bruce LaRue, DEQ
Kathleen Hain, DOE-ID
Jim Floerke, ICP
Rick Von Feldt, ICP
Mark Dehring
Rick Dale, AMWTP
Jeff Mousseau, AMWTP
Lori McNamara, Support Services
Bryant Kuechle, Support Services Facilitator
Peggy Hinman, Support Services

Opening Remarks

Mr. R.D. Maynard, Chairman, kicked-off the meeting. The DOE, CWI, State of Idaho, and EPA representatives welcomed everyone to the meeting. Outgoing members Seth Beal and Doc DeTonancour were thanked for their service to the CAB. New members Mark Lupher and Herb Bohrer were welcomed to the CAB. Susan Burke noted that the tour of the INL site conducted the previous day was informative and highlighted the amount of progress that has been achieved on cleanup.

Recent Public Involvement

Mr. Jim Cooper, the DOE Deputy Designated Federal Officer for the CAB, provided an overview of public involvement since the last meeting.

Progress to Cleanup

Mr. Cooper provided a status of the cleanup progress with active discussion among the CAB, including American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) work. Mr. Cooper briefed the CAB on Transuranic Waste Disposition, the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP), Waste Area Group (WAG) 7 Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC), and the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP) Interim Actions. He continued by outlining the progress related to the decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) at the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) Complex, Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC), RWMC, the Power Burst Facility (PBF; ARRA funding), and the Materials and Fuels Complex (MFC; ARRA funding). Additionally, Mr. Cooper briefed the CAB on the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU; Sodium-Bearing Waste) and Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Disposition. The status update also included the safety performance for CWI and AMWTP.

Mr. Cooper provided an outline for the Transuranic Waste Disposition project, listing accomplishments since March. They have completed the final shipment of EM RWMC remote-handled (RH) transuranic (TRU) waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). They have received all approved RH-TRU waste from the MFC. They will continue repackaging and shipping this RH-TRU waste out of Idaho. Conceptual design for the Sodium Process System is to be completed by the end of July 2011.

Mr. Cooper outlined the accomplishments of the AMWTP. A retrieval contamination enclosure is being constructed for the retrieval of the last 10% of the waste. The contract has been extended through June 30, 2011. Shipment of ARP waste has been accelerated to address the waste backlog. The project is behind schedule for shipping TRU waste offsite, largely because winter weather conditions and the schedule for receipt of waste at WIPP have constrained the ability to ship from INL.

Mr. Cooper briefed the CAB on the RWMC (WAG 7) project objectives. They will conduct targeted waste retrieval at the ARP I, II, III, and IV and disposition waste. The targeted waste, i.e., Rocky Flats 741, 742, and 743 sludges, graphite waste, roaster oxides, and filters/prefilters will be dispositioned. They have completed the objective of in situ grouting of 21 locations. They will continue subsurface solvent vapor extraction and environmental monitoring and institutional controls. Remediation work will be completed in accordance with the Record of Decision (ROD) for Operable Units (OUs) 7-13/14. Mr. Cooper outlined the project accomplishments since March. They have started ARP VI waste exhumation. Construction of ARP-VII is about 80% complete and is on schedule. They have started ARP VIII design and geophysical surveys. In upcoming months, DOE will complete ARP VII construction and begin ARP IV demolition.

Mr. Cooper outlined D&D objectives. A key accomplishment of the ARRA D&D-ATR/PBF/RWMC project since March is successful removal and disposal of the Materials Test Reactor (MTR). Upcoming activities include:

demolition of TRA-603, the MTR reactor building; demolition of the TRA-632 Hot Cells; and completing D&D of 27 ATR/PBF excess facilities and 4 high-risk facilities.

ARRA D&D-INTEC project objectives include the demolition of 36 excess facilities and the demolition of two high-risk facilities: CPP-601 (Fuel Processing Facility) and CPP-640 (Head End Fuel Processing Facility). Accomplishments since March include beginning CPP-602 exterior demolition. Upcoming activities include completing demolition of CPP-601 and CPP-1638, and D&D of CPP-602.

The ARRA D&D MFC project objectives include the demolition of 5 excess facilities and the demolition of MFC 767, the EBR-II reactor. Accomplishments since March include successful treatment of passivated sodium using a citric acid solution developed by the D&D project. Upcoming activities include 'melt and drain' operations to liquefy, drain and treat solidified sodium in piping components.

The IWTU (Sodium-Bearing Waste) project objectives are to design, construct, test, and operate the Sodium-Bearing Waste Treatment Facility and process all sodium-bearing waste material no later than December 31, 2012. The project construction is at 96% complete and the systems have been turned over to the testing program. Upcoming activities include completion of construction of remaining items and systems testing.

Mr. Cooper briefed the CAB on the SNF Disposition Project objectives. They will transfer legacy, EM-owned SNF from wet storage to appropriate dry storage (completed). Receive and store SNF from the ATR and receive Domestic and Foreign Research Reactor SNF for storage. They will prepare the Special Nuclear Material facilities for transition to another government entity by installing a segregation fence (completed). Additionally, they will provide safe, regulatory-compliant, routine operations for INTEC SNF handling and storage facilities. The project is planning for receipt of one remaining planned shipment of Domestic Research Reactor fuel this year. Upcoming activities include inspection of a Domestic Research Reactor in Mexico City and preparations for movement of fuel from EBR-II.

In conclusion, Mr. Cooper identified the project budgets and the human capital reports as items of potential interest for the CAB. The human capital reports are being prepared to evaluate work force impacts with the loss of ARRA funding.

Discussion

In response to a question from Harry Griffith, Mr. Cooper noted that the two critical projects for success are IWTU and the completion of the enclosure at AMWTP.

R.D. Maynard commented that the amount of innovation and training at the EBR-II D&D was impressive to him.

Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project

Jeff Mousseau, President and General Manager, Bechtel BWXT Idaho, provided a presentation on the AMWTP. Mr. Mousseau started with a safety share. He related his efforts to replace a garage door opener. When he realized he could not figure out the installation, he called a company to finish the job. He related that this is an important principle for AMWTP workers. It is important to realize one's limitations. He covered the AMWTP involvement as a Voluntary Protection Program Star Site. The project has 11.8 million hours of safe work. Mousseau stated that the mission of AMWTP is to disposition INL legacy stored transuranic waste and treat offsite waste for disposal out of the state. The project implements the Settlement Agreement with the State of Idaho and a Site Treatment Plan governing waste treatment and disposition. He noted the history of the project, which started as a privatized DOE project and was acquired by DOE in 2005. He provided a process flow for the waste storage/retrieval, characterization, treatment, payload/shipping, and disposal process. Disposal takes place at WIPP, at a commercial

treatment, storage and disposal facility (TSD), or at the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) (formerly the Nevada Test Site).

Mousseau identified the waste characteristics of the waste being processing. About 23,000 m³ of the original 65,000 m³ remains to be processed. He noted that the definition of transuranic waste has changed somewhat over time. Some of the waste is classified now as low-level waste or mixed low-level waste, and this waste is going to the commercial TSDs or to the NNSS. This waste is tracked through the Site Treatment Plan. The waste is about 65% debris and about 35% sludges. Some of the containers are in poor condition because they have been in earthen-covered storage.

The project is on pace to meet DOE's Settlement Agreement commitment of shipping the waste out of the state by 2015. The budget will impact ability to get the work performed, but it is feasible that the project could meet a 2014 date if funding is supported. The compliance tracking is fairly straightforward as actual amounts of waste shipped are tracked. The project has been the number one shipper to WIPP over the last 6 years in terms of volume. AMWTP has received, validated and processed 565 m³ of offsite waste. The project has 6 months to treat the waste after receipt and 6 months to ship it out of state after treatment. Shipments from the project are subject to the decisions at the WIPP project for when shipments can be made and received. The Idaho State Police inspects every shipment.

Mousseau provided information on the stored waste configuration and the retrieval efforts. Nearly 90% of the waste stored at AMWTP has been retrieved. The remaining 10% presents a big challenge due to the condition of the containers. An enclosure is being constructed around the remaining waste stack for contamination control. AMWTP worked together with CWI, who had constructed the original retrieval structure to design the enclosure.

Technology improvements are being implemented to accelerate production and expedite completion. Additional gas generation testing units have been installed to increase capability to analyze organic sludge waste. The project is developing capability to treat waste through macroencapsulation, to improve its processing of sludge waste, and to conduct size reduction of large items using a plasma cutting technology.

In terms of accomplishments, Mousseau noted that ARRA work had been completed last year ahead of schedule. AMWTP was able to place the people hired through ARRA funding. He also noted the many improvements gained by the volume reduction of the waste using the supercompactor. He attributed the success of the project to the dedication of the workers.

Discussion

Robert Rodriguez asked about any explosions involving the project. Mr. Mousseau related that when the project was managed by BNFL, a drum had a flammable release from buildup of gas that has not occurred since. Last October, a fire extinguisher went through the supercompactor and that caused a release.

R.D. Maynard asked about waste that does not meet WIPP criteria and is orphan waste. Mousseau replied that there are efforts in the project to disposition every drum of waste. They are focusing on each problem affecting disposal. Daryl Koch noted that this is more of a problem on the cleanup side.

Seth Beal asked about future plans for AMWTP after 2015 and whether there were plans in place to pursue work from other facilities in the complex. Mousseau noted that the facility is 6 years old, and it is in great shape. It has been well maintained and is reliable. AMWTP is first focusing on performing well to demonstrate its capabilities. The other DOE sites can save money by sending it to AMWTP. There are 14 sites that could ship waste to Idaho. Other potential uses are MLLW volume reduction for shipment of MLLW to Nevada. Cooper commented that

DOE recognizes the value of AMWTP for the complex. DOE is developing a strategy to market availability of the facility after 2015. There is waste from other sites, and there is also waste from new missions.

Doc DeTonancour asked about the employment picture for the rest of the fiscal year. Mousseau replied that employment is stable as cuts for 2011 were absorbed without cutting employees. There is work through the retrieval operations, which is about another year.

Harry Griffith asked if there is a plan for the amount of offsite waste that could come here: how much is there and what waste types are they? He asked what the perspective of the state was regarding bringing in offsite waste. He commented on the benefits of receiving waste from offsite but asked what was being done to explain these benefits to the public in terms of jobs, dollars and reduction of risk. Cooper replied that DOE is working on a plan to improve the marketability of the facility. R.D. Maynard commented that when the AMWTP started there was talk of making the facility the 'western hub' for treatment. It made sense then and it makes even more sense now due to budget issues. DOE should work on ways to override issues that keep other DOE sites from using AMWTP. The mission should continue. Cooper commented that the fact that the process is proven is a key aspect of its marketability. We have proven we can receive and treat waste and then send it offsite.

Susan Burke commented that the possibility of using the AMWTP for offsite waste has been recognized by the state and is provided for in the Settlement Agreement. This is Idaho's way of contributing to the bigger picture of cooperation between the sites regarding use of facilities for waste treatment and disposal. The main requirement for Idaho is that the waste leaves Idaho after it has come in. Idaho is careful to make sure that the waste that comes in can be disposed at WIPP. This has been successfully done for waste from Nevada. Mousseau commented that an agreement is developed for each offsite generator, and each one specifies that the waste will be returned to the generator if it cannot be shipped for disposal within requirements of the Settlement Agreement. Until AMWTP completes its onsite mission, onsite work is its main priority.

Nicki Karst asked about the stainless steel shipments that cannot go to WIPP. Mousseau explained the characterization and loading conducted to package the MLLW to meet the standards for offsite disposal.

Willie Preacher commented that when he goes to other meetings, he thinks the biggest success of Idaho is the waste shipments out of the state. This is an incentive to the other sites. Preacher noted that he would like to discuss with WIPP how the Tribes' agreements will be met after AMWTP closes.

Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, asked for more information on the shipments to WIPP. Mousseau explained that the slide showing shipments includes the actual number of shipments completed from each site to WIPP. The intent was to show the DOE sites and the number of shipments. Brailsford asked if every one of the sites on the map would be sending waste to Idaho or to WIPP. Mousseau stated that the sites allowed to ship to Idaho were identified in the National Environmental Policy Act ROD. AMWTP is limited to taking waste from those sites.

Idaho Cleanup Project Overview

Tom Dieter, President and CEO of CWI, provided information on the ICP. He explained the CWI organization. He addressed safety improvements since 2006. Recordable injuries have been reduced by 50%. This year the goal is to reduce recordable events by another 25% from last year. CWI is on track to meet this. He discussed the status of accomplishing the CWI work scope. Decontamination, decommissioning and demolition work is on target to be completed one year early and the project is currently \$288 million under budget. The project is close to achieving its goal of exhuming 2.55 acres of buried waste. IWTU is close to completion. This project is preparing for the test phase of some of the key systems beginning May 19. The actual process has been proven and they are very confident in the system. Some of the systems have already been tested, such as the remote-handled crane.

Discussion

R.D. Maynard asked if CWI had talked with NRF about its use of the air pallet systems for moving the vaults with the treated waste product. Dieter replied that they had and that they were also discussing this with the airline industry. One issue they have found is to control the side to side movement of the moving system. He noted that the distance for movement of the pallets is about 600 feet total for the first vaults. He described the process for completing the steps for startup readiness.

Dieter described the efforts of CWI to transition workers to new job opportunities as cleanup work scope is reduced. Maynard commented that the employees are aware of potential contract changes and he asked if Dieter has heard any conversation about this topic among the workforce. This can distract from everyday operations. Dieter replied that the company has gone to great lengths to learn how to deal with the stress people are going through.

Herb Bohrer asked if the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board had any concerns with IWTU. (This board has authority to review DOE nuclear facility operations; it reports to Congress and provides advice to the DOE Secretary.) Dieter replied that the Board has been kept involved in the project and has reviewed many of the documents. He believes the Board is happy with the project thus far. He expects the Board will be visiting again in July. The Board has indicated that the project is one that has made efforts to address its concerns as the project is implemented.

Gerstlauer asked about the education benefits offered to workers being laid off. The benefit is coming from CWI funds. DeTonancour asked about Areva's plans for hiring. Dieter replied that he heard that Areva is planning to go full tilt beginning next year. Workers from CWI may be needed on the Areva project. Mark Luper asked about the recovery act scope act. Dieter clarified how the scope was tracked. Beal asked about the status of capacity of INL CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF). Dieter replied that it is expected there should be plenty of room within ICDF to take waste from cleanup. Some of the predictions for use of ICDF have changed.

Public Comment

Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, asked to have the handouts on the website in the meeting section along with the minutes. Brailsford commented that as we looked forward at what could be dealt with at the AMWTP there was discussion of transuranic and MLLW. The world of waste that could come to the facility could be great. She encouraged the CAB not to be complacent about the risk of a slippery slope. She also commented that she disagreed with implication during the AMWTP discussion that since Idaho generated waste it has an obligation to take on waste.

Decontamination, Decommissioning, and Demolition

Mr. Dan Coyne briefed the CAB on the CWI Decontamination, Decommissioning and Demolition activities. He summarized the first aid and recordable injuries since March 2011. He covered accomplishments of D&D. He noted that the two most dangerous jobs are underway now – EBR-II and the Hot Cells at ATR. They are focused on being safe. He provided a status of the progress of work at INTEC, ATR Complex, and EBR-II. Challenges and issues are removal of TRA Hot Cells and completing the treatment of the sodium in EBR-II. He provided a look ahead to accomplishments planned for 2011.

Discussion

Mr. Gerstlauer asked about the levels of radiation in hot cells and how they were addressed. Coyne replied that the high dose material was grouted and the containers met the disposal requirements at ICDF. Coyne clarified that the basement of MTR will be filled with a combination of backfill and grout. A structural wall was constructed between MTR and building 604 so as not to impact continued operations.

In reply to a question from Nicki Karst, Coyne explained how demolition of EBR-II was planned. This project will also involve isolation of the reactor from associated facilities that will not be demolished. Karst asked about the hot cell being moved to ICDF and asked if it would be moved on the new road. Coyne replied that the new road was not needed for transport from ATR to ICDF, and transport on Highway 26 was not anticipated. However, the transport route would need to be carefully planned to transport such a large load. Gerstlauer noted that a bridge crossing the Big Lost River channel could be an issue, and Dieter replied that this was being reviewed.

INTEC Spent Nuclear Fuel and Calcine

Jim Floerke, CWI, provided a briefing on INTEC Spent Nuclear Fuel and Calcine. He described the historical INTEC fuel reprocessing mission, the current work scope for spent nuclear fuel management, and potential future work. He provided information on safety performance. It has been 416 days since the last recordable occurrence. He provided a look ahead for spent fuel receipts and transfers for 2011. Floerke then reviewed the background of the calcine generated as a byproduct of reprocessing spent nuclear fuel. The project is to utilize the IWTU with modifications for treatment of the calcine to an acceptable final form. Drivers for calcine disposition are the Settlement Agreement and the Site Treatment Plan, which have milestones associated with funding and implementing the treatment decision. Hot Isostatic Pressing (HIP) has been selected as the technology. He described the strategy to use technology testing to support the RCRA permit. Accomplishments include an approach for using the existing IWTU hot cells for the treatment unit. A subcontractor has also been obtained to support waste form testing for the HIP process. For the RCRA Part B permit, the closure plan has been drafted up front to help with the design process. Looking ahead, CWI will be implementing design changes to fit a larger size canister and beginning waste formulation tests.

Discussion

Mr. Gerstlauer asked how fuel was moved from wet to dry storage. Mr. Cooper replied that the fuel in wet storage is a higher risk than in dry storage. It minimizes impacts to move fuel to dry storage. Each large canister holds 21 pieces of fuel.

Gerstlauer asked whether the storage bins would be decontaminated and decommissioned, and Floerke replied that this would be needed. Griffith asked about the final vision for the wet pool basin. Cooper replied that eventually, only ATR fuel will remain in the pool and the facility will be turned over to DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy (NE). NE will continue to manage ATR and will then manage its fuel operations. It is planned to turn CPP-666 over to NE by the end of FY 2015.

Gerstlauer asked about the fuel coming from other countries. It goes into dry storage. Cooper described the location of the dry storage area at INTEC. Karst asked if DOE planned to complete processing calcine prior to the 2035 deadline. Floerke replied that they hoped to be done before then, but the HIP process could be lengthy – up to 80 hours per can.

Brailsford asked if a study about the degradation at the Three Mile Island storage facility had been reviewed with the CAB. Cooper described the problem of concrete in the concrete cap over the vaults spalling due to weather conditions. DOE has a plan to grout the cracks and put a neoprene covering over the cap to keep it dry. Brailsford

asked whether this was a problem with other storage systems at the site. Cooper replied that these are the only vaults that are in above ground concrete casks.

Accelerated Retrieval Project

Rick Von Feldt, CWI, provided a presentation on the ARP. He reviewed the history of the project, which started exhumation of waste in 2005. The actual footprint and amounts of waste to be retrieved and shipped out of the state was determined in 2008. He discussed improvements to the process that have been implemented, including use of additional excavators and telehandlers to access the waste more efficiently, a proactive maintenance program, anticipation of unexpected events, use of a seasoned work force, and use of a common infrastructure for air locks, maintenance, etc. He addressed the safety record. It has been 522 days without a recordable occurrence and over 6000 entries into radiological areas without an event. To date 2.34 acres of waste has been exhumed, 23,373 drums of targeted waste have been packaged, and 4080 m³ of targeted waste has been sent offsite.

Discussion

Nicki Karst commented that she was impressed to see the workers working together and in a coordinated fashion. Robert Rodriguez asked if radon was a concern while doing the work. Floerke replied that radon had not been detected. He thinks it is because of the dust suppression activities which help keep radon down. The ventilation systems also help. R.D. Maynard commented on the progress since the original Pit 9 project, to the GEM project, to today's work scope.

CWI Safety Program

Kevin Daniels, CWI, provided a briefing on the CWI safety programs. He reviewed safety successes in 2010, including just one lost-time injury in 2010 for a CWI employee. CWI employees have worked 9.85 million hours since the last reportable skin contamination. In response to a question, Daniels explained that OSHA defines a recordable case as one that involves medical treatment, and this includes prescription treatment. First aid such as a band aid does not count. A lost time injury is determined if an employee could not work due to the injury. Subcontractors are included in all these statistics.

Daniels also reviewed the CY 2011 Safety goals to improve safety performance. Daniels noted that near misses are part of the safety program; they are covered in pre-job briefings. Management observations and other factors are tracked and reported. Daniels also reviewed the other mechanisms available for reporting, trending and tracking. There are many avenues to follow and a lot of data available to review. Dieter stated that near misses are reported and tracked. Bohrer mentioned that CWI has daily safety assessment calls that really have a positive impact. It is a senior management call and safety events from the previous day are reviewed. These calls lead to a fair amount of action. The results are showing. The safety culture is improved. Daniels noted that CWI has received the Legacy of Stars for the VPP program which is only achieved by the most successful programs.

Discussion

Griffith asked if CWI follows up with subcontractors on their safety. Daniels replied that they do and he noted that the safety record of a subcontractor is a consideration in selecting a subcontractor. CWI looks at the injury rate and the types they were. Wendle asked how a reportable clothing contamination event is defined. Daniels responded that clothing contamination is when personal clothing underneath personal protective equipment (PPE) is contaminated. This applies even if the clothing is company provided. Gerstlauer asked about the checks performed for clothing. Daniels replied that the radiation control technicians do a good job of monitoring for contamination. Gerstlauer noted that these practices sound fantastic. Daniels noted it is a challenge not to be complacent and to

encourage people to bring up safety concerns. He identified the step back process used to allow employees to ask a question on a safety issue and get a response.

Maynard asked what the limit was for 'major' property damage. The limit is \$5000. Maynard noted that in the past the problem has been to have the subcontractor and DOE take safety seriously. He pushed to make subcontractors accountable. He has this same question today. Can a contractor get rid of a subcontractor that is not adhering to safety? Daniels noted that the CWI contracts have safety clauses that disincentivize bad performance. CWI keeps authority to shut down a subcontractor if they are not working safely. Daniels believes that CWI managers own their safety programs. With subcontractors, what is done is more important than what is said. Right now, there are few subcontractors. IWTU is the main subcontractor. It is a matter of setting expectations early to limit the number of misunderstandings that lead to stop work actions. Dieter commented that when CWI shuts down a subcontractor, they make them keep the workers there and take corrective actions while the workers are involved. It has to be very serious for a job to be shut down; most often measures can be taken to address the problem without a shut down.

Karst noted a difference between operating facilities and those under construction in terms of signs and safety warnings. She asked what is done in a construction environment to promote safety. Daniels replied that they have developed union safety representatives to assist in promoting safety. Construction is under the URS safety program. When they move into operations, the safety program will be much more integrated into the CWI program.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

CAB Work Session

The CAB work session started with a decision on who should attend the upcoming CAB Chair's Meeting June 12 – 15 in Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting had been postponed from April, and R.D. Maynard is now unable to attend. It was decided that Mark Lupher would attend along with Willie Preacher.

The CAB discussed the Greater-Than-Class C (GTCC) draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and determined that it should comment on this draft during the public comment period. Herb Bohrer took the action to draft an initial comment letter for review by the CAB.

The CAB discussed the EM budget and whether a letter from the CAB would be beneficial to support Idaho in securing funding. Harry Griffith will work with Nicki Karst to draft a letter using data provided by Jim Cooper. The letter will identify that further cuts will impact EM missions. It can be discussed at the next CAB meeting work session.

The CAB set a draft agenda for the July meeting. The meeting will be held in Twin Falls, Idaho.

The May 2011 meeting was R.D. Maynard's last meeting as chair. CAB members expressed their gratitude to R.D. for representing them as the chair for the last two years. Willie Preacher and Niki Karst were elected chair and vice chair at the March 2011 meeting.

Action Items:

1. Herb Bohrer to prepare draft letter from CAB commenting on draft GTCC EIS.
2. Harry Griffith and Nicki Karst to prepare draft letter regarding EM budget for review at the next CAB meeting work session.

Presentations given at this meeting are available on request from the INL EM CAB Support Staff.

I certify that these minutes are an accurate account of the May 18, 2011, meeting of the Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board.



Willie Preacher, Chair
Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board
WP/ph