



IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT

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

Meeting Minutes

February 21, 2019

List of Acronyms

AMWTP	Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project	IWTU	Integrated Waste Treatment Unit
AoA	Analysis of Alternatives	LLW	Low Level Waste
ARP	Accelerated Retrieval Project	NE	Office of Nuclear Energy
ATR	Advanced Test Reactor	NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
CAB	Citizens Advisory Board	NRF	Naval Reactors Facility
CAP	Corrective Action Plan	NWTRB	Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board
CPP	Chemical Processing Plant	OSHA	Occupational Safety & Health Administration
DDFO	Deputy Designated Federal Officer	RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
DEQ	Department of Environmental Quality	REDI	Regional Economic Development for Eastern Idaho
DOE	Department of Energy	RH	Remote-Handled
EM	Office of Environmental Management	RI	Remedial Investigation
ET	Evapotranspiration	RWMC	Radioactive Waste Management Complex
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation	SBW	Sodium-bearing waste
FS	Feasibility Study	SDA	Subsurface Disposal Area
HEU	Highly Enriched Uranium	SNF	Spent Nuclear Fuel
HQ	Headquarters	SSAB	Site-Specific Advisory Board
HVAC	Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning	TRU	Transuranic waste
ICP	Idaho Cleanup Project	WAG	Waste Area Group
INL	Idaho National Laboratory	WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
INTEC	Idaho Nuclear Technology & Engineering Center		
ISA	Idaho Settlement Agreement		

The Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Thursday, February 21, 2019 at the Residence Inn Marriott in Idaho Falls, Idaho. An audio recording of the meeting was created and may be reviewed by calling CAB Support Staff at 208-557-7886.

Members Present

Josh Bartlome
Keith Branter
Brad Christensen
Teri Ehresman
Marvin Fielding
Brandon Leatham
Trilby McAfee
Cathy Roemer
Larry Schoen
John Sigler

Members Not Present

Jackie Agenbroad
Talia Martin

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

Jack Zimmerman, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Connie Flohr, Deputy DDFO, DOE-ID
Brad Bugger, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Fred Hughes, Program Manager, Fluor Idaho
Mark Clough, State of Idaho
Daryl Koch, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

Others Present

Valerie Kimbro, Fluor Idaho
Teresa Perkins, DOE-ID
Howard Forsythe, Fluor Idaho
Troy Burnett, Fluor Idaho
Kathryn Hitch, Senator Mike Crapo
Nolan Jensen, DOE-ID
Susie Barna, Moxie Endeavors
Kelly Gallows, Moxie Endeavors
Mark Hutchison, Naval Reactors Facility (NRF)
Joel Case, DOE-ID
Jay Kunze
Laurie Hernandez, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Brennan Summers
Amy Taylor, U.S. Senator Risch
Dana Kirkham
Mary Woullen
Jordan Davies, ICP CAB Support Staff

Kevin O'Neill, DOE-ID
Jim Malmo, DOE-ID
David Eaton
Mayor Rebecca Casper, Idaho Falls
Dave Parmelee, DEQ
Danielle Miller, DOE-ID
Peter Christensen, DEQ
Aubrey Johnson, Fluor Idaho
Amy Hilton, Snake River Alliance
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Chris Henvit, NRF
Theresa Kaufmann, Snake River Alliance
Kerry Martin, DEQ
Tami Thatcher
Ann Riedesel, Fluor Idaho
Andrea Gumm, ICP CAB Facilitator
Kelly Green, ICP CAB Support Staff

Opening Remarks

Facilitator Andrea Gumm began the meeting at 8:00 a.m. She reviewed the agenda and noted that the public comment periods would be held at 10:15 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. She reminded attendees of the process for public comments during the meeting, time permitting, or via question cards.

Brad Bugger (Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID) commented that as he nears the end of his career, he often thinks about the history of the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) and the people who laid the groundwork for DOE's current efforts. In the week leading up to the meeting, three people who were very important to the INL, the CAB, and the community passed away:

Nick Nichols hired Bugger at Westinghouse Idaho Nuclear Company. Nichols had been the City Editor at the *Idaho State Journal* when Bugger first began working there, but left and became Public Affairs Director at Westinghouse in 1984. He was a humble, kind, and generous man who was an excellent communicator. Bugger commented that he learned a lot from Nichols.

John Commander was an engineer at INL for 25 years and worked on many of the Site's major projects. He was a co-founder of Coalition 21, a major support organization for the INL mission.

Rod Thomas was a key person behind the Waste Area Group (WAG) 7 Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS), which paved the way for excavation of buried waste at INL.

Bugger commented that he wanted to honor all three of these folks, and stressed how important history and the people who come before us really are. He also thanked Jay Kunze, former Dean of Engineering at Idaho State University, for attending the meeting.

Keith Branter (CAB Chair) welcomed everyone to the first meeting of 2019. He commented that the day's agenda was full, and that the CAB would take questions from the public when able.

Jack Zimmerman (DOE-ID) agreed with Branter that the agenda was full. He commented that Betsy Forinash (DOE-HQ) intended to be there in person to present on the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP) decision, but was unable to make it due to weather. Zimmerman said she would deliver her presentation by video. He also added that the CAB holds a February meeting so it can weigh in on DOE-ID's budget priorities.

Mark Clough (State of Idaho) commented that Daryl Koch, the other state representative, would be unable to make it as he, too, was delayed by weather. Per Koch's request, Clough mentioned that DEQ submitted comments on the draft 90 percent evapotranspiration (ET) cover over the Subsurface Disposal Area (SDA) at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC), which had been delayed somewhat both by the government shutdown and DEQ's 20-day extension to more fully evaluate the draft. Clough commented that he was glad to attend and participate in the meeting.

Fred Hughes (Fluor Idaho) commented that Fluor Idaho continues making progress across the site, which Zimmerman would cover during his presentation. He added that the latest simulant run at the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) came within a day or two of bringing on simulant. Unfortunately, a power outage at the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC) disrupted operations and the plant was shut down. Fluor Idaho is working to recover from the outage.

Recent Public Outreach Activities

Brad Bugger (DOE-ID) reviewed recent public outreach activities. The document is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://energy.gov/em/icpcab>.

Idaho Cleanup Project Overview

Jack Zimmerman (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on the status of cleanup at the Idaho Site. The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://energy.gov/em/icpcab>.

Teri Ehresman (CAB Member) asked if Idaho is the primary shipper of transuranic (TRU) waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Zimmerman confirmed that Idaho is the primary shipper of TRU waste to WIPP and said they make 65 percent of the shipments WIPP receives, which amounts to about 10 shipments per week. He added that because other sites do not have the backlog of waste that Idaho does, Idaho is also permitted to make additional shipments when WIPP has capacity for more. Zimmerman concluded that DOE is looking for opportunities to accelerate shipments and make the process more effective complex-wide.

Hughes added that Fluor Idaho has 30 to 40 payloads ready to load and another 20 to 30 payloads available for quick assembly.

Larry Schoen (CAB Member) asked how many containers are generally included in each shipment. Zimmerman responded that each shipment typically includes 14 containers, but said that number can vary from 10 to 20. Schoen asked what the optimal number of shipments per week will be once WIPP's ventilation system has been upgraded. Zimmerman responded that current estimates show Idaho will complete shipments in 2028. While there are a few opportunities for acceleration, he said he does not anticipate a completion date before 2026.

Schoen asked why spent nuclear fuel (SNF) is going into final storage if it is classified as material of value, not as waste. Zimmerman responded that obtaining the value of SNF requires reprocessing, and fuel reprocessing facilities no longer exist in the United States. As such, a waste determination must be made before SNF is disposed of to essentially declare it a disposable waste. Schoen commented that this may be an interesting topic for a subcommittee to examine.

Trilby McAfee (CAB Vice-Chair) asked why there are no reprocessing facilities in the United States. Zimmerman responded that during his term, President Carter banned fuel reprocessing in the United States. The only commercial plant in operation, in West Valley, New York, was shut down in the 1970s. Defense reprocessing continued for a while, but it was shut down permanently in the early 1990s. McAfee commented that she does not understand the dynamics, and asked why fuel reprocessing is considered a bad thing. Zimmerman responded that it is political.

Clough added that fuel reprocessing creates another waste stream. If there is no need to reprocess, it does not make sense to create more waste.

Bugger added that the decision to discontinue reprocessing in Idaho was driven by two factors: As Clough mentioned, it was creating a large liquid waste stream, which is now referred to calcine, and there was no longer a use for the recovered highly enriched uranium (HEU) that is the aim of reprocessing. Idaho used to send HEU to Oak Ridge, where they fabricated it for driver fuel ultimately used in the production reactors at the Savannah River Site. Once those reactors were shut down, there was no longer an end-use for the recovered product.

Branter commented that he thought DOE was performing some fuel dissolution and processing at the Savannah River Site and H Canyon. Joel Case (DOE-ID) confirmed they are doing a very limited amount at H Canyon.

Nathan Small (Chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council and representative for the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) commented that he had recently learned of a process for disposing waste called deep borehole drilling, where DOE would drill anywhere from two to five miles down into the earth and deposit SNF. He

asked if that method was being seriously considered, and commented that if so, he hopes Idaho will not go there. Zimmerman responded that the Department was performing some initial tests, but that Idaho was not considered for that process. He added that the Trump Administration is focused on reviving Yucca Mountain, which is where Idaho would send its SNF.

Schoen referred to the safety slide in Zimmerman's presentation and asked for an explanation of the rate. Zimmerman explained that it is an Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) definition, averaged over a rolling 200,000 man hours. When it says 0.4 is the target, it means 0.4 injuries per 200,000 man hours.

Small asked if there is a scheduled date for the completion of organic vapor extraction. Zimmerman responded that they will complete organic vapor extraction prior to the cap's completion at RWMC. Right now, soil vapor extraction underneath the areas where they are digging up buried waste is ongoing. They will soon undergo a rebound test, which involves halting all extraction activities and seeing how the levels perform. Once they have the results from the rebound test, they will decide whether or not they can turn off the extractions. Zimmerman added that this should occur in the next two or three years, however all indications are that the extractions have been very successful.

Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) Update

Kevin O'Neill (DOE-ID) provided an update on IWTU. The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://energy.gov/em/icpcab>.

Branter asked what would happen if IWTU were in radiological operations during a power outage. Zimmerman responded that upon loss of power, all automatic sequencing has everything fail safe. There would be no impact exterior to the plant, but there may be some necessary recovery actions to get back into operations.

O'Neill added that they do not yet have all the details, but are fully evaluating both the cause and effect of the power outage.

Brandon Leatham (CAB Member) asked if they have systems in place for safety and ventilation to keep the plant safe during these shutdowns. O'Neill confirmed that the plant has safety and ventilation procedures to keep the plant safe.

Branter asked about the logistical procedure for removing a filter during hot operations. O'Neill responded that the vessel would need to be contained and drawn up into a sleeve or bag. Branter asked what kind of radiation workers would likely be exposed to in that scenario. O'Neill responded that he would discuss what they are doing to improve that condition in a moment, but said he does not know specifically what the levels would be.

Ehresman asked if the power outage was the result of a failure of a system within a system. O'Neill said no, the outage occurred outside the plant. IWTU obtains its power from INTEC. They were performing general maintenance on a substation there, and the work they were doing was approved. Unfortunately, it caused a response in the grid that isn't fully understood yet. Hughes added that the workers at INTEC were doing maintenance on one of the main breakers, they did all the right line-ups, Fluor Idaho verified it, and then seven minutes into the maintenance, INTEC lost power. An engineering team is in the process of evaluating what happened.

Josh Bartlome (CAB Member) asked O'Neill to confirm that while there is no back-up power for the entire system, there is back-up power for safety shutdown operations. O'Neill confirmed that Bartlome is correct. He added that IWTU is unlike a reactor in that there is no concern about decay heat. During a power outage, they would simply stop injecting the sodium-bearing waste (SBW) for treatment. In most cases,

much of the process would typically continue without the injection of that waste. In this instance, however, they lost so much power that the blowers, heating, and ventilation all fell offline. Even for such a short period of time, this power outage created problems warranting a shut-down.

Schoen commented that he would be interested to learn how the site is powered, and said it might make a good presentation topic for a future CAB meeting.

Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Proposal

Jack Zimmerman (DOE-ID) provided an update on the FY 2021 budget proposal. The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://energy.gov/em/icpcab>.

Bartlome asked what the likelihood is that SBW will leach into the aquifer. Zimmerman responded that SBW is in safe storage right now, which is why delays with the IWTU start-up do not affect SBW's safety profile. The single-shell storage tanks undergo regular maintenance and inspection. DOE previously closed seven tanks, and those tanks did not show signs of degradation for the period of use they were in service. The tanks are still safe for storage. Zimmerman added that there is no threat to liquid storage in the decades window.

Small asked why SNF is put in wet storage and how it is transitioned to dry storage. Zimmerman responded that when SNF is initially taken out of service, it is very hot. Putting it in wet storage helps to cool it down, but the water also acts as a radioactive shielding. In the past, SNF was first put in the pools and then fed into the reprocessing cycle. When fuel reprocessing was shut down several decades ago, however, the pools were full and needed to be emptied. DOE is just now removing the last of that SNF from of the pool. Once moved from wet storage, the SNF goes through a drying process before being transported in a cask to dry storage. Zimmerman added that the Idaho Site has dry storage capacity for all fuel currently remaining in wet storage.

Small asked if the fuel would ultimately be moved out of the state. Zimmerman confirmed that Small was correct.

Clough clarified that when Zimmerman said the SNF was hot, he meant thermally hot. It is actually warm to the touch. As it takes time for some of the materials created in the fuel during its use to finish the process of decay, it must be stored under water to improve the cooling capabilities of the environment on that fuel. When the decay heat decreases enough, it can be safely moved to dry storage.

Schoen asked if all SNF is placed in wet storage initially. Zimmerman responded yes, as far as he knows. Clough added that placement of SNF in wet storage can depend on the fuel's power history, or how the fuel was actually used. If it wasn't used but five minutes, it may not have generated enough thermal heat to require liquid cooling. That said, Clough continued, in the vast majority of cases, SNF requires wet storage.

Branter asked what will happen to the SNF currently being generated at the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) once DOE completes the transfer from wet to dry storage. Zimmerman responded that this is a DOE Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) concern. For now, however, the Office of Environmental Management (EM) will temporarily store NE's SNF at Chemical Processing Plant (CPP)-603, a dry storage facility at the site. As ATR generates fuel moving forward, NE will have capacity to store two to three years' worth of SNF in their fuel pool at ATR. This will be enough to allow the fuel to cool down before being placed, temporarily, in dry storage at INTEC. CPP-603 has about 15 years of capacity, giving NE time to figure out its next steps.

Ehresman noted that DOE-ID's priorities are ambitious and asked what the CAB can do to help ensure adequate funding for successful and efficient completion of remaining cleanup projects. Zimmerman responded that EM typically requests a recommendation from the CAB, either endorsing or expanding on the priorities outlined in his presentation. This typically occurs by the first week of March.

Schoen commented that the CAB must get something done before the next meeting. He added that nothing in Zimmerman's presentation is new information, and everything presented was understandable.

McAfee asserted that if the CAB is going to submit a recommendation by March, this was the meeting to make it happen. She asked if the CAB could add something about the budget to its HLW recommendation. Bugger said the CAB really should submit a separate recommendation to the Department.

Schoen asked if the CAB's budget recommendation is limited to cleanup in Idaho, and expressed an interest in mentioning concerns surrounding disposal paths as a key component of cleanup successes in Idaho. Zimmerman responded that CAB budget recommendations are typically limited to site priorities, but agreed with Schoen that Idaho's ability to accomplish its scope will be impacted if things across the complex do not change.

Connie Flohr (DOE-ID) added that the CAB has the latitude to offer advice on large Departmental decisions if they deem it necessary. However, she said she was unsure if DOE-ID would be able to provide data to support that analysis.

McAfee commented that decisions pertaining to WIPP and Yucca Mountain affect the Idaho Site, and suggested that a recommendation pertaining to disposal facilities might be appropriate for consideration by the EM Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB).

John Sigler (CAB Member) added that the Reinterpretation of High-Level Waste (HLW) Subcommittee included some strongly worded recommendations in its full recommendation, up for consideration by the CAB later in the day, that DOE immediately begin work to expand WIPP or resume preparations of Yucca Mountain, or a facility similar to Yucca Mountain.

Marvin Fielding (CAB Member) asked what portion of the budget will go toward the calcine initiative as there has been some discussion about how beneficial those activities are at this point. Zimmerman responded that a relatively small portion of the budget is given over to calcine activities, merely because of where it stands in the priority space. He added that DOE is on a two-year budget cycle. In February, he is delivering a presentation on budget priorities for Fiscal Year 2021, and in April there will be another presentation showing the actual breakout of funding for 2020.

Ehresman asked if the priorities for FY 2021 are about the same as they were for FY 2020. Zimmerman responded yes.

Tami Thatcher, Idaho Falls, commented that Zimmerman's presentation neglected to specifically state which Idaho Settlement Agreement (ISA) milestones are being missed. She asserted that both milestones currently being missed, and those at risk of being missed in the future should be explicitly stated in this presentation moving forward. Thatcher added that the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board (NWTRB) provided a presentation to the CAB last year, during which they said a fuel repackaging facility would take 15 years to build, so DOE was already late. She asked when DOE will communicate which milestones they are at risk of missing.

Zimmerman responded that the ISA milestones for liquid SBW destined for treatment at IWTU, were missed in 2012, as was the December 31, 2018 milestone for stored TRU waste. The status of these milestones is discussed at every CAB meeting. In addition, there was a milestone for shipping 2,000 cubic meters on a three-year rolling average in the ISA which was missed when the WIPP incident occurred, and discussed at length at that time.

Zimmerman said that looking to the future, milestones for making HLW road-ready and moving SNF out of the state by 2035 could be at risk as they both require disposition options that do not currently exist. The first step for achieving both is knowing the waste's end-state.

Zimmerman concluded that HLW is in very safe storage, with all indications pointing to hundreds of years of safe storage capacity. DOE is putting plans in place for SNF and all associated aging management issues.

Public Comment Session #1

Thatcher, a former nuclear safety analyst, commented on the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP) V Drum Event Corrective Action Plan (CAP). She said the CAP acknowledged the drums blew their lids because they were over pressurized, and commented that DOE failed to conduct safety and chemical compatibility analyses required by state and Federal laws. Thatcher also stated that DEQ grants Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permits. Despite two explosions occurring at RCRA facilities handling nuclear material, the state has not taken enforcement actions. She asked why DEQ does not question anything DOE hands to them, despite these serious events.

AMWTP Long-Term Mission Decision

Betsy Forinash (DOE-HQ) provided by video a presentation regarding the AMWTP long-term mission decision. The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://energy.gov/em/icpcab>.

Branter commented that Forinash's business case analysis does not account for the cost of the facility. DOE has half a billion dollars invested in AMWTP. Forinash confirmed that they did not look at the sum cost of AMWTP, but at the costs associated with continuing to operate the facility moving forward, as well as the viability of transporting waste to Idaho in order to sustain operations. Forinash said that DOE did look at the potential for cost savings at other sites if standing up new facilities could be avoided by sending waste to AMWTP. However, even factoring that in, it was not cost-effective to transport waste to AMWTP for treatment.

Branter commented that DOE will now have to build another five hundred thousand dollar facility at the Hanford Site. Forinash agreed, but said DOE will have to build that facility regardless of whether they send their TRU waste to AMWTP as they need it to process remote-handled (RH) waste, which AMWTP is unable to handle.

Branter stated that he did not believe DOE adequately considered the transportation piece. A large majority of the waste in Idaho was shipped via railcars. Forinash responded that DOE did closely examine the options available to them under existing agreements. Unfortunately, some of the large boxes are too large to fit in train containers.

Brad Christensen (CAB Member) asked if the analysis would have made sense to the tune of \$75 million had it been started two years earlier. Forinash commented that she recognizes there has been frustration with the analysis and the decision not to proceed. However, DOE took it in stages to understand first what the possibilities were, second what kinds of waste could benefit from processing at AMWTP, and lastly if those possibilities were practical. At every step, DOE learned something new that merited a closer look. Forinash said she appreciated Christensen's frustrations, but said DOE learned there are some challenges and uncertainties they were not sure they would have time to solve.

Christensen asked if it would be feasible to consider a standby scenario, a semi-mothball state until AMWTP could process Phase 3 waste. Forinash responded that they considered warm standby, which keeps the facility nearly operational, allowing for a flip of a switch and almost immediate feeding of waste into the facility. DOE would need to maintain staffing as well as regulatory compliance and permitting for this scenario, which would cost almost as much as operations. For that reason, warm standby is not viable.

Forinash added that DOE also considered cold standby, which is considerably more affordable. Under this scenario, DOE would allow permits to lapse, perform minimal maintenance, and maintain a skeleton crew. It would cost \$100 million or more to start up the facility again. If AMWTP were to be operated for only three or four more years, this scenario ends up in no better place than the warm standby scenario.

Christensen asked how many billions of dollars it takes to start a facility if it takes \$100 million to restart one. He also observed that the cost analysis dwells on transportation, but seems not to give the costs of standing up new facilities around the complex much weight. Forinash said she appreciates that sentiment. She acknowledged that it is no small task to stand up a new facility, but said DOE did not take that into account. There is a possibility of avoiding standing up new facilities at smaller quantity sites, but DOE also did not take those cost savings into account. Forinash added that at Hanford, for example, facilities will need to be built to process RH-TRU waste, even if waste is sent to AMWTP. There, they are looking at the possibility of revamping existing facilities.

Ehresman asked what the Department's plan is once treatment stops at AMWTP. Forinash responded that operations will continue at the facility until the current mission is complete, which should be sometime later this summer. At that point, they will proceed with RCRA closure and dismantling the facility. Forinash added that AMWTP operations associated with characterizing and certifying TRU waste for acceptability at WIPP will continue.

Christensen commented that DOE has discussed the challenges associated with integrating AMWTP employees into other services at INL and asked Hughes for an update on that effort. Hughes responded that since DOE made the decision, he has held two rounds of meetings with AMWTP employees. The first round was in the November/December timeframe, during which Hughes met with each employee to explain the decision and the path forward. The second round was recently concluded and covered updates, the current plan to finish debris processing in the June to September timeframe, and the process for workforce restructuring in the coming months. Hughes commented that he encouraged the employees to finish the project with their heads held high, and to go out with a bang.

Hughes continued on to say that Fluor Idaho has been working to find jobs for AMWTP employees. Some local opportunities include:

1. Jobs at INL, both within Fluor Idaho and at NRF. As of February, half a dozen employees had been transferred within Fluor Idaho to work at INTEC and IWTU. In addition, on March 11 and 12, NRF hiring managers and human resources representatives will be meeting with AMWTP employees, who are then able to apply for positions online and in real-time. Any employee selected for a position at NRF may finish their AMWTP job while their NRF clearance is processed. Once their clearance passes, they will be able to transfer to NRF and begin work immediately.
2. Jobs with nearby companies performing nuclear work. In the late May/early June timeframe, Regional Economic Development for Eastern Idaho (REDI) and the mayors of Idaho Falls and Arco will sponsor a job fair in which nearby companies performing nuclear work will be eager to see what skills are available.
3. Jobs at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The FBI is looking to hire at least 400 employees. One AMWTP employee recently left to be the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) manager for the FBI's new building in Pocatello.

Hughes concluded that he has not seen adverse reactions from the AMWTP employees. They continue to work safely and productively and appreciate being kept in the loop. They will finish the mission safely and knock it out of the park.

Zimmerman added that after the decision was announced, he walked through the facility and talked with many of the workers. Every worker he spoke to said they were disappointed but knew when they were hired that they were brought on for a very specific mission, Idaho stored waste. They knew the timeframe for completion was roughly 2018. It was communicated when they were hired, they understood all the way through, and they accepted it. They were disappointed, but they did what they signed up for, and they did it very well.

Budget Fiscal Year 2021 Recommendation Discussion

The CAB discussed at length the FY 2021 budget priorities presented earlier in the day. Working from a prior budget recommendation and editing in real-time, the CAB unanimously agreed to submit the following recommendation in support of DOE-ID's budget priorities:

<https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2019/04/f61/icpcab-rec156-fy21-budget-priorities.pdf>

Public Comment Session #2

Thatcher paraphrased comments provided to Assistant Secretary Anne White by DEQ, the Idaho Governor's office, and the Idaho Attorney General's Office regarding DOE's reinterpretation of HLW proposal.

Thatcher also read from the letter she submitted to DOE: "The reality is that allowing the DOE to reclassify its HLW to non-HLW will mean that vast amounts of DOE's HLW would become low-level waste (LLW). While this could mean some of the waste is shipped to WIPP, if laws for WIPP change, it also means that DOE has far fewer regulatory requirements about how it chooses to dispose of LLW on its DOE sites. The reclassified HLW would become LLW with no limit as to how high the concentrations of long-lived fission products, activation products, or TRU waste can be. The DOE's proposed reclassification is really about eliminating Federal requirements pertaining to HLW disposal. It is about reclassifying vast amounts of HLW, not just incidental waste remaining in tanks. It's about removing tank closure requirements of the federal law that require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to be involved and state approval for tank closure. It is about allowing DOE to shallowly bury its HLW on DOE sites."

Subcommittee report on DOE redefinition of high-level waste proposal

The CAB's Reinterpretation of HLW Subcommittee, formed during the October 2018 meeting in Sun Valley, presented the draft recommendation it prepared as a result of five conference calls in January and February. After significant discussion between the CAB members, suggestions from members of the public, and some editorial changes, the CAB unanimously agreed to send the recommendation to DOE. It can be viewed on the ICP CAB website: <https://www.energy.gov/em/icpcab/downloads/icp-cab-recommendations-pertaining-reinterpretation-high-level-waste>

Other subcommittee reports and CAB organizational topics

Schoen commented that the Calcine Subcommittee, formed during the October 2018 meeting in Sun Valley, participated in one call a week prior to the meeting. He commented that the Calcine and Reinterpretation of HLW Subcommittees' scope overlaps, as calcine is HLW. The subcommittee agreed there should be a further exploration of alternatives, such as interim storage, and would next participate in a conference call with Case, who would hopefully answer some questions that arose following a thorough review of the Analysis of Alternatives (AoA). Schoen commented that the AoA makes several assumptions, necessitating several conference calls to fully understand them. Schoen committed to reporting on the subcommittee's progress during the April meeting.

Conclusion

Zimmerman concluded the meeting.

Keith Branter, Chair
Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board