



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

April 26, 2022

List of Acronyms

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
AMWTP	Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Plant	IEC	Idaho Environmental Coalition
ATR	Advanced Test Reactor	ICP	Idaho Cleanup Project
CAB	Citizens Advisory Board	INL	Idaho National Laboratory
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act	INTEC	Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center
CFA	Central Facilities Area	ISA	Idaho Settlement Agreement
DCAA	Defense Contract Audit Agency	IWTU	Integrated Waste Treatment Unit
DDFO	Deputy Designated Federal Officer	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
D&D	Decontamination and Decommissioning	NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
DEQ	Department of Environmental Quality	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
DMR	Denitration Mineralization Reformer	NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
DOE	U.S Department of Energy	NRF	Naval Reactors Facility
DOE-ID	U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office	NRP	National Response Plan
DNFSB	Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	PGF	Process Gas Filter
EBR-II	Experimental Breeder Reactor-II	RSS	rapid system shutdown
ESCM	End State Contract Model	RWMC	Radioactive Waste Management Complex
		SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
		SNF	spent nuclear fuel
		TRU	transuranic
		WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

The Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Tuesday, April 26, 2022. The public was invited to attend in-person at the Shoshone Bannock Hotel & Event Center in Fort Hall, Idaho and virtually via Zoom. An audio recording of the meeting was created and may be reviewed by calling CAB Support Staff at 208-557-7886.

Members Present

Jackie Agenbroad	Dick Meservey
Teri Ehresman	Talia Martin
Debi Farber	Mark Permann
Monica Hampton (virtual)	John Sigler
Roger Hernandez (virtual)	Bob Skinner

Member(s) Not Present

Josh Bartlome
Brandon Leatham

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

Connie Flohr, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Danielle Miller, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Ty Blackford, Program Manager, Idaho Environmental Coalition, LLC (IEC)
Pete Johansen, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Lynne Hood, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Ben Leake, EPA

Others Present

Timothy Dwyer, Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB)	Erin McCullough, DNFSB
Jason Redman, NRP	Alana Baldwin, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Chairman Devon Boyer, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Jennifer Cate, DOE-ID
Tami Thatcher	Shayna Martin, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Beatrice Brailsford	Anna Bowers, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Lee Juan Tyler, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Roselynn Yazzie, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Roland Marshall, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes	Laurie Hernandez, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Joel Case, DOE-ID	Magie Smith, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Trent Neville, DOE-ID	Chris Henvit, Naval Reactors Facility (NRF)
Wayne Barber, Weapons Complex Monitor	Mark Hutchison, NRF
Fred Hughes, Fluor	Ty Sanders, DOE
Sergio Hernandez, DOE-ID	Shelby Goodwin, DOE-ID
Susan Stiger, Bechtel	Ted Livieratos, DEQ
Dana Kirkham, IEC	Nicole Hernandez, DOE-ID
Ann Riedesel, Sigma Science	Betsy Holmes, DOE-ID
Aaron Nebeker, DOE-ID	Alan Carvo, Idaho National Laboratory (INL)
Natalie Walker, State of Idaho	Nick Balsmeier, DOE-ID
Kelsey Shank, TheEDGE	Keith Ridler, Associated Press
Amber Fugal, A/V Support	Cris Erasga, A/V Support
Hayley Price, A/V Support	Andrea Gumm, Facilitator
Kelly Green, Support Staff	Jordan Davies, Support Staff

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Facilitator Andrea Gumm began the meeting at 9:00 a.m. She reminded everyone of the rules for Zoom and reviewed the agenda. She noted the times of the two public comment periods. She reminded attendees of the process for public comments during the meeting, time permitting.

Teri Ehresman (CAB Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting. She said it was great to see people in person and to have people in the audience again. She said she was looking forward to a great agenda.

Connie Flohr (DOE-ID DDFO) agreed it was nice to see everyone in person. She thanked her tribal partners for hosting the meeting. She said last Friday she celebrated Earth Day with Tribal members. They visited the Middle Butte Cave, shared lunch and saw a dance demonstration from some STEM students from the ShoBan School. She stated that the ICP Partnership (federal staff and contractor team) has been celebrating a lot of different accomplishments lately. In February, the last of the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) spent fuel elements were removed from the basin and put into dry storage. Now, only Experimental Breeder Reactor-II (EBR-II) fuel remains in the basin, and they are ahead of schedule to meet the 2023 milestone. In March, they completed exhumation at Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) under the subsurface disposal area. The Governor, Attorney General, and Ike White all came for the celebration, and she was really proud of the team for that accomplishment. She said the fiscal year 23 budget request hasn't rolled out yet, but she was able to get a 10-million-dollar line item in the budget for the calcine treatment project. She said they are gaining some momentum on some of the IEC projects. Trent is here to talk about IWTU and how things are going there. Maria is here to talk about 10-year task order on the contract. They have a lot of work to do but they have a really good structure in place. They are very close to issuing Task Order 3. They will be the first to do this under the new model and will have done it in 120 days. Flohr said she is proud of the partnership with the team and the work they have been doing. She is looking forward to the discussion today and said she hoped they would be able to talk about the topics that they wanted and encouraged asking questions.

Pete Johansen (DEQ) said to ask him any questions regarding Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) cleanup for DEQ. He said that Mark was traveling and couldn't attend, but he would pass on any questions regarding the Idaho Settlement Agreement (ISA) to Mark. He said he was looking forward to the meeting.

Lynne Hood (EPA) said she wished she could be attending in person, but their travel is still restricted. She said it should be opening up soon and she is looking forward to seeing everyone in person. She said to let her know if you have questions.

Ben Leake (EPA) said he was excited to be here and hoping to attend the next meeting in person as well.

Ty Blackford (Idaho Environmental Coalition, LLC) said he was sorry he couldn't attend in person. He said they are busy with the task order process and IWTU. He said he was happy to answer questions as they come up throughout the day.

Council Member Lee Juan Tyler (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, ID) welcomed everyone on behalf of the tribes. He described that he was a past tribal council member and talked about his past work experience with DOE. He said it is good to see that they have come so far in their relationship. He said it would be great if there could be help to preserve their language because they are losing their elders. He offered a prayer for the group to start the meeting and said he hoped that everyone enjoyed their day.

Recent Public Outreach

Danielle Miller (DOE-ID) reviewed recent public outreach activities. The document is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://www.energy.gov/em/icpcab/articles/icp-cab-meeting-materials-april-2022>.

IWTU Update

Trent Neville (DOE-ID) provided an update on the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU). The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://www.energy.gov/em/icpcab/articles/icp-cab-meeting-materials-april-2022>.

Teri Ehresman asked about the size/scale of the progress gas filter bundle assembly. Neville said the entire bundle is approximately 4.5 to 5 feet.

Mark Permann asked if there was a digital twin that they can feed data into to understand the process. Is there a computer process of what is happening in the physical world? Neville said he wasn't sure. He said they have looked at one other facility in Irwin, but he said he was not sure if that was what Permann meant by a digital twin. They have done models and checked to see if the design was adequate, and he said it turned out it was. Neville said if that didn't answer the question, Permann can talk to him offline.

John Sigler said Neville was talking about high temperatures and asked how that heat is generated. Neville said the heat source is the DMR for the process gas, the first reaction vessel. They start heating up with fluidizing nitrogen; then they burn charcoal, and then calcine coal. That's the initial heat source.

Debi Farber said it seemed like there were two events. One was a maintenance defluidization event and then later the pressure and temp differential was observed. Is there any reason they would think the two were related? Neville said the first event wasn't a defluidization, but the plant took automatic action to put itself in a safe condition by design. That was basically because they missed a step. It could have precipitated the indications seen when they got back on feed. The plant was operating pretty well and then the rapid system shutdown (RSS) happened, because of the maintenance activity, and then the plant never behaved the same after. He said they were not sure if it was related, but they are taking steps to make sure it doesn't happen again.

Bob Skinner asked when they start using the real waste, what method do they have to refluidize it if they get this agglomerate? Neville said they are looking at this at Hazen. They are looking at what chemicals they can add to refluidize it if they see this agglomeration. They want to avoid it, but also want to be prepared in case they ever see this agglomeration. Skinner asked if part of the cause of the agglomeration was the rapid shut down of the plant. Neville said no. It was a shock to the process and there might have been a pressure transient, but the RSS would not have caused it. He said there were too many solids getting downstream causing the agglomerates.

Ehresman asked if they thought they would be operating by October. Neville said they were hoping for the September/October timeframe. Ehresman asked if this happened in January. Neville said the nitrogen shortage was in January and then they recovered. The defluidization happened at the end of February.

Monica Hampton asked if the spare components are readily available. Where do they get those? How do you manufacture those or supply those when things need to be replaced? Neville asked if Hampton was talking about the spares for the bundle assemblies. Hampton replied yes. Neville said that during outage J, they ordered enough for three full Process Gas Filter (PGF) changeouts. And they could go back to the vendor if they needed to order more. He said they have put in a couple preassembled spares, and they have a lot of extra parts.

Farber asked about the 50-day confirmatory run – is it 50 contiguous days? Neville said it was a minimum of 50 run days, but after all the fits and starts during this run, the department has said they want to get the facility up, on feed, and keep it up. They have a new metric that measures the plant on time, where the facility is up and on feed. Farber asked where they are currently. Neville said they had been on feed about 20 days, not continuous, but they are at zero now because they reset it.

Flohr said they have never shut the plant down on their own accord. She added that there is no such thing as a 50-day run anymore. They are going to meet the conditions and then they will decide how much longer they are going to go. She said they need to be comfortable that they are in control of the

facility. Some of the issues they have encountered have been problematic, so they want to make sure that they are comfortable running the plant not in rad space so they can protect workers as much as possible when running with the actual waste. Farber asked if the new metric will be provided in the future. Flohr said yes, they will continue to update on the process. Neville said the ratio is something they want to do over a long duration. It will be a much more rigorous test because it will be over a longer duration.

Talia Martin asked about the agglomerate being formed in the downstream process – would that be considered a waste by-product that may not have been accounted for and that they should be cautious of? Neville said if this had happened when they were rad, then yes it would be a waste by-product. But because they are still in the testing phase it is not. They are continuing to meet with the Technical Review Group to discuss the issues that are arising. He said they need to make sure the filters work over time with the differential pressures.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 Budget

Connie Flohr (DOE-ID) provided an update on the FY 2023 budget. The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://www.energy.gov/em/icpcab/articles/icp-cab-meeting-materials-april-2022>.

Teri Ehresman asked about worker shortage issues; are they having any issues with employee hiring or retention to complete the projects? Ty Blackford said they have not had any shortage, in fact they have brought a lot of people on. They are working through a turnover process because they are faced with the retirement of a lot of people, so they are bringing new people on. He said they have probably brought about 100 people on in the last couple of months, and are planning on about 140 more before the end of the fiscal year to complete the work scopes that they have. Ehresman asked if there is long range job security for these people. Blackford said yes, they are managing a lot of that with attrition over time. He said their job work scope will change over time and will decrease, so they need to manage that.

Talia Martin (ICP CAB Member) commented that Idaho's budget has decreased for the first time. Did our recommendation have any impact? How can the CAB help? Flohr clarified that we did not go down. If you look at the request levels, this is the highest we've ever gone in with. Request levels going in are often less than the appropriated values. We always play that game. There are a lot of priorities going on. Hanford has a lot going on. Flohr said she feels like they are doing fine. If you look at the request levels and appropriations – we are better off. It's a really good story. We have a year's worth of funding in carryover of community regulatory, we go and do whatever the CAB needs to do and provide funding to DEQ. She said she told them they didn't need that much money in that account. If we get too much more, it'll be tough to spend it. Flohr added that Blackford has been working with the lab and Naval Reactors Facility (NRF) leadership about how to encourage young people to want to work here. People may be worried about longevity. They are working on integrating with the lab for Idaho site branding, to explain that people can transfer and have that longevity.

Flohr followed up on Martin's question regarding CAB recommendations. She said they just had a meeting and the recommendation letter was discussed with Ike White. There was a lot of dialogue about the recommendation and what the CAB would like to see.

John Sigler said 450 million is a significant amount of money in this area. He asked how much money is spent on salary and wages, how much is spent on diesel fuel and pickup trucks and things you need to make a project run, that aren't necessarily tied to a specific project. Flohr said EM is labor intensive. She estimated 80% labor, when she was in the budget shop, and the other 20% was stuff.

Martin thanked everyone for coming to the meeting in Fort Hall. She thanked the Fort Hall staff and Fort Hall Business Council and she encouraged everyone in attendance to visit with the DOE representatives that were here in person.

Idaho Environmental Coalition, LLC (IEC) Contract 10-Year Task Order Plan/Task 3

Maria Mitchell-Williams (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on the IEC contract 10-year task order plan/Task 3. The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website:

<https://www.energy.gov/em/icpcab/articles/icp-cab-meeting-materials-april-2022>.

Teri Ehresman asked how soon they think they will get started working on Task Order 3. Mitchell-Williams said the duration of Task Order 3 was scheduled to run 17 months, and they are going to start working on Task Order 4 soon. The goal is to have Task Order 4, the Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) subtask, awarded by the end of the fiscal year or the 1st quarter of the new fiscal year.

Bob Skinner commented that this is a breath of fresh air, and this process is easier to understand. He said he has heard that the transition has been very smooth. He added that he appreciated Mitchell-Williams's presentation.

Permann referred to slide 5, under spent nuclear fuel (SNF) packaging, and asked if they are looking at adding another \$10 million line item that would help with that piece of work and that facility? Flohr said unfortunately she was asked, if she had to choose one to get help with, which one would it be? Given that they are behind the interim milestones, in the site treatment plan, for building the calcine treatment facility and are already out of compliance, that was a greater priority for this year. But she's hopeful for the next budget.

Ehresman asked if they are developing lessons learned to share with other labs and contractors. She asked if other labs are interested in what they are doing and if they are helping them. Mitchell-Williams said that EM HQ is developing an End State Contract Model (ESCM) post-award lessons learned document. She said they meet with them monthly and the dialogue will continue.

Flohr added that Mitchell-Williams and her team receive calls from other sites all the time. She said they are involved in ongoing feedback. They have become an invaluable resource to everyone in the EM complex.

Dick Meservey asked how they got the cost estimate for decommissioning. Was that done locally or did they bring a contractor in for that? Mitchell-Williams replied that IEC developed it for Task Order 3, and it was a bottom's up estimate. They do rely a lot on historical data but they haven't done D&D for a while so it was a bottom's up estimate that they had to look at closer. It is being audited by Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) right now, which will take a few months. They have language in Task Order 3 in case they need to reopen it if the audit finds anything. Meservey said there are almost always some unknown things that pop up. Mitchell-Williams replied that by having these task orders in post award, they are hoping that they can bound the scope requirements.

Ehresman asked if Blackford could talk about the process and how it has worked. Blackford said, from a contractor perspective, he thinks it is the way to go. It is a way for both parties to agree on what the scopes are, and end states they are looking for, are. It is a lot of work - 120 days was tough, they burned a lot of midnight oil getting it done. This provides certainty of cost and certainty of estimates for shorter durations on those end states. It helps to justify budgets and funding because you get results. It incentivizes both parties to get results together. Mitchell-Williams added that previously, these contracts would take more cost and time upfront and could strain relationships. That is not a factor under this model, because you can focus on the post-award task orders and get to work. Blackford agreed that this was an excellent point.

Public Comment Session #1

Tami Thatcher (Idaho Falls) said she has been attending CAB meetings for over eight years. She said she was surprised because, as she was looking around online, she found that the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Plant (AMWTP) had sent waste containing liquid, to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), which is prohibited. It caused an evacuation of WIPP on April 7. Thatcher was surprised she didn't hear a peep about why that happened. Last December Thatcher commented on the IWTU permitting and had perused several thousand pages of the permit documentation. She said the changes made certainly gave her the feeling that they were accepting that the flowing of radioactive sticky sand into places it wasn't wanted was going to be more likely. And it turned out it was more likely. The extent to which this is a safety problem isn't being discussed. If you have to stop and flush out every week when you are running radioactive, you are going to be creating more waste than you are treating. Thatcher doesn't feel like that is being described, or that the whole design process is working out. The design life of the equipment for the IWTU has already been passed. They thought it would run for one year ending in 2012. Now it is recognized that it will run for five to seven years, if it ever runs, and is already beyond the design life. Thatcher said she has serious doubts about the process. She wondered why the number of treated IWTU waste canisters grew so much. Why is so much newly generated waste being added, and how much? What is DOE going to do with it if the IWTU doesn't run or once it finishes running? It is rarely discussed that this sodium-bearing waste has not had a designated place to go, for three decades. This is still a problem. The buried waste exhumation has now ceased - the documents, created by the DOE, that explained how much waste was remaining have been kept out of sight. Thatcher said she is wondering if those have ever been updated. Most of the waste that was buried is remaining buried. Over 90 percent of the americium is remaining buried. She thinks people should be reviewing how much waste is remaining buried. There is so much radioactive and chemical waste still buried, and they are putting a cap on that is enormously thick. Thatcher said that waste is going to start smoldering and fires are going to start underground that can't be put out. It is going to be another failed EPA-approved disposal facility.

Councilmember Lee Juan Tyler (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Fort Hall, ID) said he appreciated the presentations. There is so much technology going on and he's not an expert on that. He said he knows reactors generate energy. When he went to ISU, there was a presentation about how nuclear is going to be the future. Climate change is a concern. Hydropower is out there. Rivers are depleting and the ice is melting. This affects the wild salmon that run, which you might have heard from Congressman Mike Simpson's proposal. Tyler asked if there is a way to come up with technology to help provide energy to offset the hydroelectricity needed to light this room before they go extinct? He said it is a sad situation. We need to help protect. He said that is the prophesy of their elders that salmon will go extinct, no longer run, and it will be the end of time, gifts of life, a food chain that lives on, and the Earth Mother. In 1996 Tyler looked at a book, written in 1969, about people up in deep space who exclaimed that Earth Mother was such a beautiful jewel. Imagine what our earth looks like now. Let's protect it. We are here for a reason. Tyler said he hopes your technology can think about that and come up with innovative minds and our great minds can come together to help solve this problem.

Nathan Small (Fort Hall Business Council Member, Fort Hall, ID) said when he was listening to the presentation about the PFG and the bundle assembly design, the first picture looked clean and probably workable, but the inspection results are a mess. You have corrosion, you have to expect something to happen. That can't last forever. Small said he is not sure what was in these assembly bundles. He asked what was inside the bundles and if there are fuel rods or sodium. He said that it is somewhat alarming to experience cracks like this, and it looks like a blow out as opposed to seepage on the bottom photo on page 5. He said it sounded like this was glossed over. These things are happening. If there were fuel rods inside, this would have made a lot more noise than what we haven't heard. He said he hasn't seen anything in the press come out about these failures. He thinks you may consider it minor, but when you look at the overall picture and what we've been dealing with for the last 50 or 60 years, out there, it makes you concerned about the safety of everything going on. Small said that the lady mentioned

something about another leak, and that leak leaked right through this reservation. We have concerns about those kinds of things. Maybe it wasn't a big deal because it's another thing being glossed over. The public should be aware of these types of situations that are going on. Small said he doesn't know about whether the CAB only knows as much as they're being told, but again, when you look at these pictures, it looks like no one did anything about this for years or maybe decades. He has handled a lot of hot fuel, helped build sub-assemblies, torn them apart, and received them from different reactors like Hanford. A lot of everything we've done, we've provided preventative maintenance, but it doesn't look like that has been occurring on this particular bundle. He said that it seems like we should be a lot more concerned with our health and welfare in this part of the state. If things like this happen now, it could happen when you have hot fuel coming through. You have a lot of fuel and waste leaving, that is leaking. Are we being relaxed? It's time to tighten up some of these things. On the last note, congratulations on the cleanup. It's been a long time coming. Small said in 1968 and 1969, he helped create that mess out there when he was working for Central Facilities Area (CFA). Congrats and good luck. Let's be a lot more careful about what we're doing out there.

Cultural Repatriation

Taylor Haskett (Shoshone Bannock Tribes) provided a presentation on cultural repatriation. The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://www.energy.gov/em/icpcab/articles/icp-cab-meeting-materials-april-2022>.

Ehresman asked how many bodies they have found on the site and if they have been protected the way the Tribes want. How is it working at the site as far as protecting their heritage? Haskett said she does not have an exact number. She said the DOE has been phenomenal in understanding the tribes perspective, about why they want people to be buried there or why they don't want them disturbed by INL activities. Ehresman asked if Tribal members can go out onto the site to visit remains. Haskett said that through the Middle Butte Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Tribal members can access sacred sites, so yes, they can. They just have to let INL security know.

Debi Farber asked what the process is for requesting that artifacts in storage be returned. Haskett said there is a process through the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). The act entails certain documents that are required to be fulfilled and consultation between repository and tribal government. Lots of paperwork and deadlines make it hard to accomplish.

Dick Meservey asked if, in recent times, they have had teams of people go out and search the area on the INL or if it has been a long time. Have you done walk downs to find these sites and areas? Haskett replied that yes, a lot of these sites were found through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), which requires an archaeological survey be performed. If they wanted a new project, they would have to go out and survey and INL would submit a report to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

Beatrice Brailsford (Pocatello) asked about the land closer in that is farmed and rented out and if they have any way of protecting what is found in a potato field. Haskett said that they unfortunately do not, because it has already been disturbed and a lot of the land is privately owned. When someone owns the land they have ownership over those artifacts. It just depends on who owns the land.

DOE Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Programmatic Agreement for National Historic Preservation Act

Betsy Holmes (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about the DOE INL programmatic agreement for the National Historic Preservation Act. The presentation is available on the ICP CAB website: <https://www.energy.gov/em/icpcab/articles/icp-cab-meeting-materials-april-2022>.

Talia Martin asked for an explanation of why the the signatories for the Programmatic Agreement include DOE-ID, SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) but not the Shoshone Bannock Tribe, and what the role and responsibility of a signatory is. Holmes replied that a signatory to the agreement means that you have some responsibility or action in the agreement. You are responsible in some way for carrying out the agreement. The view they took was that the agreement is the implementing document for the relationship between the tribes and DOE. So that is where the signatories belong with DOE and the tribes versus the Programmatic Agreement. There are different kinds of signatures that can go into the agreement. Holmes said they can talk about that further and added that she thinks that is part of the consultation process.

Public Comment Session #2

Tami Thatcher (Idaho Falls) said some of the things she worries about, as someone who used to do probabilistic risk assessment of nuclear accidents, are seismic and flooding events. She would like to see the CAB request an update on the status of the Mackay Dam upgrades. She said she understands people around Mackay and Arco have gone to DOE to get help for funding. The Mackay Dam is 100 years old and was designed one way, but halfway through building, the designs were changed, but not the design documentation. The dam was not well maintained. When it is not full of water it could break and not have a lot of impact. The time you want to repair a dam is when it is not full of water. If it were full and a seismic event caused it to collapse, it would flood INTEC where spent nuclear fuel and highly soluble calcine is stored. Intakes would float and break the pipes hanging off of them. She thinks it would be a perfectly appropriate CAB topic, to give a little more visibility not just to the town of Mackay disappearing but to the safety implications at INTEC that are affected by Mackay Dam. The money to repair it might be somewhat modest. Thatcher also said she thinks the CAB should request to be kept apprised of the continually changing status of the storage capacity at WIPP. Recently the New Mexico Governor was concerned about DOE's shifting plan to place more of DOE's surplus plutonium in WIPP. Statements Thatcher has read say this is kind of a problem because WIPP is already over committed. Often it is hinted that containers have been purchased for the treated sodium-bearing waste, should the IWTU ever operate and treat all of it, with the idea that it will all go to WIPP. But it has never been allowed to be sent to WIPP, it is still waste with no disposal path. Keeping apprised of the status of the over commitment of WIPP for designated waste would be appropriate. Thatcher said she has been waiting 10 years for IWTU to operate. The CAB should be kept apprised of waste tank inspections for tanks that are storing sodium-bearing waste. She asked if there is a spare tank, and at what point do you replace the tanks because you are spinning your wheels on IWTU?

Conclusion

Andrea Gumm concluded the public portion of the meeting.

Teri Ehresman, Chair
Idaho Cleanup Project Citizens Advisory Board