



**Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board Meeting**  
**January 30, 2013**  
**1:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.**  
**Buffalo Thunder Conference Center**  
**Santa Fe, New Mexico 87506**

**Minutes**

---

**Meeting Attendees**

---

**Department of Energy**

Ed Worth, Deputy Designated Federal Office (DDFO)  
Christina Houston, DOE Environmental Projects Office  
Cassandra Begay, DOE  
Bob Zulick, DOE Environmental Projects Office – Project Time and Cost  
Pete Maggiore, Assistant Manager Environmental Projects Office

---

**NNMCAB Members**

1. Carlos Valdez, NNMCAB Chair
  2. Manuel Pacheco, NNMCAB Vice-Chair
  3. Douglas Sayre
  4. Joey Tiano
  5. Ralph Phelps
  6. Joseph Viarrial
  7. Robert Villarreal
  8. Nona Girardi
  9. Lawrence Longacre
  10. Allison Majure
  11. Arthur Mascarenas
  12. Deborah Shaw
  13. Lawrence Garcia
- 

**Excused Absences**

1. Bonnie Lucas
- 

**Absent**

1. Nicole Castellano

2. Adam Duran
3. Brenda Gallegos
4. Kyle Harwood
5. Michael Loya
6. Nick Maestas

---

**NNMCAB Support Staff**

Menice Santistevan, Executive Director  
Tiffany Ortiz, Administrative Assistant  
William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach

---

**Guests**

Adrian Chavez Sr, Public  
Allan Chaloupka, Public  
Stephen Schmelling, Public  
Joseph T Sena, Public  
Jonathan Phillips, City of Santa Fe  
Alex Puglisi, City of Santa Fe  
Angel Quintana, Public  
Chuck Wiggins, New Mexico Tumor Registry – UNM  
Angela Meisner, New Mexico Tumor Registry – UNM  
Jim Ferguson, Project Time & Cost  
Jeff Mousseau, Los Alamos National Security  
Felicia Aguilar, The Lakeworth Group  
Jeanne Green, Public  
Michael Brandt, Los Alamos National Security  
Jeanne Fair, Los Alamos National Security  
David Cobrain, New Mexico Environment Department  
Heidi Krapfl, New Mexico Department of Health  
Lorrie Bonds-Lopez, Los Alamos National Security  
Colleen Curran, Los Alamos National Security  
John Isaacson, Los Alamos National Security

**MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order**

The bi-monthly meeting of the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) was held on January 30, 2013 at the Buffalo Thunder Conference Center in Santa Fe New Mexico. Mr. Ed Worth Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) stated that on behalf of the Department of Energy (DOE) the meeting of the NNMCAB was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

Mr. Worth recognized Mr. Carlos Valdez as NNMCAB Chair. The Chair presided at the meeting.

The meeting of the NNMCAB was open to the public and posted in The Federal Register in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

---

**II. Establishment of a Quorum (10 Needed)**

**A. Roll Call**

Mr. William Alexander conducted roll call as the members arrived. During the call to order 11 members were present, establishing a quorum of the NNMCAB. Allison Majure arrived at 1:30 p.m. and Mr. Lawrence Longacre arrived at 1:57 p.m.

**B. Excused Absences**

Mr. Alexander recorded that Bonnie Lucas had an excused absence for this meeting.

**C. Absences**

Mr. Alexander recorded that Adam Duran, Brenda Lee Gallegos, Kyle Harwood, Michael Loya, Nicole Castellano, and Nick Maestas were absent.

---

**III. Welcome and Introductions**

Mr. Valdez welcomed the members and public to the meeting, He asked for introductions from the board members and all attending guests.

---

**IV. Approval of Agenda**

The board reviewed the agenda for the January 30, 2013 NNMCAB meeting. The agenda for the meeting was unanimously approved as presented.

---

**V. Approval of Minutes for the September 26, 2012 and December 4, 2012 meetings**

**A. September 26, 2012 Minutes**

The board reviewed the minutes from the September 26, 2012 NNMCAB meeting. By ongoing instruction from DOE Headquarters, the minutes were previously reviewed and certified by the NNMCAB Chair, Mr. Valdez. Mr. Valdez

opened the floor for comments. Dr. Deborah Shaw noted that page 7 line 19 had incorrect use of the word evasive, the correct word should have been invasive. The change was noted in the master copy of the minutes. Mr. Manuel Pacheco moved to accept the minutes from the September 26, 2012 meeting, Mr. Ralph Phelps seconded the motion. The Board voted all in favor to accept the minutes with the noted change.

#### **B. December 4, 2012 Minutes**

The Board reviewed the Certified minutes from the December 4, 2012 NNMCAB meeting. Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments. With no comments on the minutes from the board, Mr. Ralph Phelps moved to accept the minutes from the December 4, 2012 meeting, Mr. Joey Tiano seconded the motion. The board approved the minutes as presented.

---

### **VI. Old Business**

#### **A. Written Reports**

Mr. Valdez asked if the members had any questions on the written reports. With no comments on the written reports Mr. Valdez moved to the next item on the agenda.

#### **B. EM-SSAB Draft Recommendations**

1. Draft Recommendation for Waste Isolation Pilot Plant mission expansion. Mr. Valdez asked for questions or comments from the board, seeing none Mr. Valdez asked for a motion. Dr. Nona Girardi moved to approve the recommendation, Mr. Pacheco seconded the motion. The board voted all in favor, the motion to approve the recommendation carried.

2. Draft recommendation for disposal of DOE high-level waste. Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments.

Mr. Phelps noted that the recommendation had been discussed at an earlier meeting. He noted that he did not think this recommendation was needed, stating that the recommendation incorrectly portrays that high-level commercial waste is not ready for long term storage. Mr. Phelps noted that a pilot program for the canisters at Savanna River was proposed in recommendation 1 that the board had just approved. He noted what is proposed in recommendation number 2 is really bounded by what is proposed in recommendation 1.

1 Mr. Pacheco stated this recommendation was somewhat contentious in  
2 the committee meetings. He asked if this issue was something that the board  
3 should revisit or just seek approval and move on.  
4

5 Ms. Menice Santistevan replied that the recommendations could be  
6 voted up or down. She also noted that the NNMCAB would be the last board  
7 to vote on the recommendations and that the other boards were waiting to  
8 send the letter to EM-1.  
9

10 Mr. Pacheco asked if the recommendations could be approved with  
11 conditions.  
12

13 Ms. Santistevan stated that no amendments were allowed.  
14

15 Mr. Pacheco moved to approve the recommendation, Mr. Tiano  
16 seconded the motion. The board voted 4 for and 5 against, the motion to  
17 approve draft recommendation 2 failed.  
18

19 3. Draft recommendation for EM budget. Mr. Valdez opened the floor for  
20 comments. Mr. Phelps moved to approve the recommendation, Mr. Pacheco  
21 seconded the motion. The board voted all in favor, the motion to approve  
22 the recommendation passed.  
23

24 4. Draft recommendation for evaluation of recycling technologies. Mr.  
25 Valdez opened the floor for comments. Mr. Art Mascarenas moved to  
26 approve the recommendation, Mr. Pacheco seconded the motion. The board  
27 voted 9 for and 1 against, the motion to approve the recommendation  
28 passed.  
29

---

30 **VII. Public Comment Period**

31 Mr. Valdez opened the public comment period at 1:27 p.m.; he noted that Ms.  
32 Jeanne Green from Taos had signed up to address the board.  
33

34 Ms. Green provided packets of information for each board member on  
35 Plutonium Facility 4 (PF-4); she also read a letter that she had drafted, addressing  
36 her concerns with the facility. The letter and information packet are listed as  
37 attachments.  
38

1 Mr. Valdez asked Ms. Green to speak a little bit about what PF-4 is for the sake  
2 of the members.

3  
4 Ms. Green stated PF-4 is the building where Los Alamos National Laboratory  
5 (LANL) stores a lot of Plutonium. The letter in the packet from the Defense Nuclear  
6 Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), gives a warning that the building could easily  
7 collapse in the event of an earthquake; noting that the release of Plutonium would  
8 be equivalent to 900 rems. "As soon as we have an earthquake we may as well kiss  
9 the planet goodbye, this is not acceptable we need the NNMCAB to intervene for  
10 us," I am asking the NNMCAB to make a recommendation on PF-4.

11  
12 Mr. Valdez thanked Ms. Green for bringing the issue to the NNMCAB's attention.  
13 He also asked Ms. Green to elaborate on the information that she was requesting on  
14 the land transfers.

15  
16 Ms. Green stated that she had obtained the information on the land transfers  
17 from the NNMCAB's meeting minutes from a previous meeting.

18  
19 Mr. Valdez stated that the board would look into the land transfers and get back  
20 to Ms. Green.

21  
22 Ms. Green asked that the information provided include the level of cleanup at  
23 the sites.

24  
25 Mr. Valdez asked if the members had any questions for Ms. Green

26  
27 Dr. Girardi asked what the references were for the high level of cancer rates  
28 around Rocky Flats.

29  
30 Ms. Green responded that the NNMCAB should look at Kristen Iverson's book  
31 "Full Body Burden", on Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's web site, and the  
32 Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center website. Ms. Greene also stated that if the  
33 land is being transferred to San Ildefonso Pueblo it needs to be cleaned, and not just  
34 placed into the care of a county official that may or may not be in office for an  
35 extended period.

36  
37 Mr. Valdez stated that he believed that any land that was transferred had to be  
38 cleaned to residential standards, and ask Mr. Phelps for clarification.

1 Mr. Phelps stated the level to which the site needs to be cleaned is determined  
2 by the corrective measures required for the site. This means that some sites are  
3 cleaned to residential standards while others are industrial or recreational,  
4 dependent on the future use of the land.  
5

6 Ms. Green stated "I'm concerned with what is going to happen here at LANL,  
7 because they are going to be looking at stewardship, they are already looking at long  
8 term stewardship. I mean we don't need any nuclear bombs obviously. They want to  
9 continue their mission because they will make a profit; there is more profit in  
10 making nuclear bombs than cleaning up."  
11

12 Ms. Majure asked Ms. Green to clarify what she wanted the recommendation on  
13 the PF-4 to cover specifically.  
14

15 Ms. Green stated that she would like the recommendation to state that the PF-4  
16 needs to be dismantled, the plutonium removed, and the area decontaminated.  
17

18 Mr. Tiano asked Ms. Green if she had ever toured the PF-4 Facility or seen how  
19 the plutonium was stored.  
20

21 Ms. Green stated that no she had not toured the facility or seen how the  
22 plutonium was stored. She further stated that she was not an expert in building  
23 construction and was basing her request on the report that the DNFSB had  
24 submitted.  
25

26 Mr. Tiano responded that he was concerned with the amount of money that tax  
27 payers pay to protect the environment based on information that environmentalists  
28 publish, that may or may not be true. He further stated "I listened to your comments  
29 and I want to take them all in; but if you haven't even toured the building, how do  
30 you know the pits are not in a vault that would stop a release no matter the size of  
31 the quake."  
32

33 Ms. Green responded that if the DNFSB was concerned then she was concerned.  
34

35 Mr. Tiano replied do you think that your concerns are fueled by your passion  
36 against nuclear weapons.  
37

1 Ms. Green replied that she did not know how to respond to that. However she  
2 would encourage the NNMCAB to talk to the DNFSB as they are the experts on the  
3 subject.  
4

5 Dr. Girardi asked if Mr. Worth or Ms. Santistevan could elaborate on what the  
6 DNFSB is and how a member of the public would arrange to tour PF-4  
7

8 Mr. Worth responded that he was not an expert on the DNFSB but to his  
9 knowledge the DNFSB was a professional board with members that are experts in  
10 the field. He was not sure about requirements for touring the PF-4 but he would  
11 look into it and get an answer for the board.  
12

13 Mr. Valdez stated that he would like to remind everyone that the NNMCAB was  
14 chartered to give DOE recommendations on legacy waste issues. With no additional  
15 questions Mr. Valdez closed the public comment period.  
16

---

17 **VIII. New Business**

18 Mr. Valdez noted that Mr. Phelps and Mr. Doug Sayre would be attending the  
19 Waste Management Conference in Phoenix, Arizona in February. He asked Mr.  
20 Phelps to give a summary of the agenda for that conference.  
21

22 Mr. Phelps stated that he had been invited to speak on two panels at the  
23 conference. The first panel was related directly to Citizens' Advisory Boards, and  
24 would be discussing participation and membership and how to promote additional  
25 interest. The second panel that he would be participating in would be a LANL  
26 moderated panel discussing the effects that fires have had on the removal of  
27 Transuranic (TRU) Waste from Area G.  
28

29 Mr. Valdez stated that the other new business before the board was the  
30 upcoming Chairs meeting in April. He noted that the members that would be  
31 attending were Mr. Pacheco, Mr. Joseph Viarrial, and Mr. Valdez. Mr. Worth and Ms.  
32 Santistevan will be attending as staff support.  
33

34 Mr. Valdez stated that he had attended the Regional Coalition of LANL  
35 Communities (RCLC) meeting in January, and that it seemed like they were geared  
36 towards helping the economy in Los Alamos. He also noted the RCLC has been  
37 invited to attend the NNMCAB meetings.  
38



Mr. Allen Chaloupka asked if he might make a public comment out of schedule.

Mr. Valdez allowed the comment.

Mr. Chaloupka stated that he would like to recommend that the attendees of the Waste Management Conference take the time to watch some of the presentations and capture some of the lessons learned. He further recommended that the attendees take a look at the vendor information and see what new technologies might be available to help with the current projects concerning the NNM CAB.

---

**IX. Items from DDFO**

Mr. Worth noted that the skyline at TA-21 had changed the enclosures that were located there had been taken down. He also noted that the presentation for the Combined Committee meeting in February would be on air monitoring at LANL.

Mr. Worth stated that there had been a resignation from the NNM CAB; Mr. Kyle Harwood resigned due to increased work load and had submitted a letter of resignation. Mr. Worth noted that Mr. Harwood had stated that he would like to come back in the future, and that the possibility of a site appointment to accomplish that would be looked at.

Mr. Worth stated that Juan Griego who had recently replaced Kevin Smith as Site Manager; was asked if he would take on the role as the Deputy Adjutant General for the National Guard of New Mexico for a two year period. In the meantime the assistant managers will be rotating through the leadership positions at the office. Additionally, he noted that the Secretary of Energy would be leaving, and that Tom D'Agostino who was the head of the NNSA, had also stepped down.

Mr. Valdez announced that the NNM CAB would take a 15 Minute Break.

---

**X. Presentations**

**A. Presentation of Long Term Strategy for Environmental Stewardship Sustainability**

Mr. Michael Brandt from LANL gave a presentation to the NNM CAB on LANLs Long Term Strategy for Environmental Stewardship and Sustainability Plan. A Hard copy of the presentation may be obtained at the NNM CAB website <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov> under presentations. A video of the presentation has been posted to the NNM CAB YouTube channel <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y8-B8lNXI28>.

**B. Questions**

Mr. Robert Villarreal asked what the source of funding for the Environmental Safety Health and Quality (ESH&Q) organization was.

Mr. Brandt responded that funding for ESH&Q was from the LANL overhead budget.

Ms. Majure stated that there was quite a bit of management speak going on and she was getting lost in some of the tactics. In terms of staff and budget do you divide up your resources in terms of past, present and future?

Mr. Brandt responded that Jeff Mousseau, the Associate Director for Environmental Programs (ADEP) deals with the past and is separate from ESH&Q. ADEP operates with a budget that is roughly in the \$180 million range. The present is dealt with by ESH&Q, which operates with a budget that is approximately \$150 million. The future is dealt with by both programs; the combination of cleaning up the past and controlling the present will create the future.

Mr. Longacre asked why is it that the USDA can respond to problems in food rapidly, and it takes DOE so much longer to respond to problems and clean up environmental contamination. Secondly why is there so much waste on the hill and misuse of budget such as replacing computers every three years, could LANL save the money and put it into environmental programs? Finally why can't LANL do away with jobs and projects that the average citizen doesn't care about and put it toward environmental programs?

Mr. Brandt responded "I'm glad that the CDC intervenes very quickly to stop an emergent outbreak of a disease." He noted that typically the problem in cases dealing with food contamination, like wisteria in melons, are related to sanitation issues. As a member of the public I am thrilled that the CDC intervenes very quickly to resolve the problem. In answer to your remaining questions, in my organization we are outcome focused. My intent is to husband our resources wisely, do the job effectively with the funds available, and operate efficiently and effectively.

Dr. Deborah Shaw, asked what species of trees or plants were planted to uptake contaminants in the streambed. Are the plants periodically harvested to

1 remove contaminates that they uptake, and are there any herbivores in the area  
2 that are feeding on them.

3  
4 Ms. Lorrie Bonds-Lopez responded that over 10,000 willows were planted in  
5 the stream to slow down the speed of the sediment laden water, to keep the  
6 sediments on site. She noted the plants were not planted to uptake  
7 contaminates.

8  
9 Mr. Arthur Mascarenas asked how the environmental side fares against  
10 weapons and computers when budget cuts are passed down from DOE.

11  
12 Mr. Brand responded that the work is prioritized using a baseline process  
13 based on the work that needs to be completed. The budget for the computers or  
14 weapons is not necessarily weighted more heavily than environmental. The  
15 process attempts to identify projects that are required and projects that are not  
16 and fund them accordingly.

17  
18 A member of the public questioned where an earthquake causing a  
19 catastrophic release would fit into the equation.

20  
21 Mr. Brand responded that it would be taken into account in the overall  
22 scenario planning for protection of the public. He noted "however I'm not an  
23 expert in regards to the actions being taken for the PF-4, I do know that the  
24 facility has been hardened with regards to structural changes for the PF-4."

25  
26 With no additional questions the NNM CAB moved on to the next  
27 presentation.

28  
29 **C. Presentation on Radiation and Health/Cancer Rates in Northern New Mexico**

30 The New Mexico Department of Health (NMDOH) in conjunction with the  
31 University of New Mexico (UNM), gave a two part presentation. The first part of  
32 the presentation presented by Ms. Heidi Krapfl from the NMDOH related to  
33 Radiation and Health. Part two was presented by Dr. Chuck Wiggins of UNM, on  
34 the topic of Cancer Rates in Northern New Mexico Communities. A Hard copy of  
35 the presentations may be obtained at the NNM CAB website:  
36 <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov> under presentations. Video of the presentations  
37 have been posted to the NNM CAB YouTube channel,

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eLBH7gRiWT0> and  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sCGn7PSps9E> .

#### D. Questions

Mr. Villarreal stated that radon from uranium really gives us more radiation than anything.

Ms. Krapfl noted that one of the first slides had noted that and that where you find uranium individuals should test for radon in their homes.

Mr. Pacheco asked about radiation from building materials.

Ms. Krapfl responded that if you have granite counter tops you will be exposed to more ionizing radiation than if you use natural building materials. However, she noted that she was not aware of the exact amount of exposure difference.

Dr. Girardi asked how individuals that move from one place to another are taken into account when compiling the data.

Dr. Wiggins responded that most cancers take 10 to 15 years to develop, and that a study like this one would not be used to determine the final results. Interviews would be conducted with individuals to determine background, and history, and identify locations and types of cancers.

Mr. Villarreal stated that his doctor had informed him that all males will eventually develop prostate cancer.

Dr. Wiggins noted that that conclusion was likely derived from a study that looked at a large sampling of older men who had died. The results showed that almost 80% of the individuals tested had some form of prostate cancer.

With no additional questions the NNMCAB moved on to the next presentation

#### E. Presentation on Occupational Illness Compensation

Mr. Jim Ferguson gave a presentation on Occupation Illness Compensation. A Hard copy of the presentation may be obtained at the NNMCAB website <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov> under presentations.

**F. Questions**

Dr. Girardi asked how many out of the 3000 individuals had been diagnosed and what conditions they had been diagnosed with. Additionally were the jobs that the affected individuals were doing different from those that were not affected.

Mr. Ferguson responded that the DOE puts out an annual report that breaks down that information.

---

**XI. Items from Liaison Members**

**A. Los Alamos National Laboratory**

Mr. Mousseau noted that in worker safety there had been no accidents or injuries in the program since the last meeting. The OSHA recordable rate was at .34, the lowest it has been in several years. 500 workers in the TRU program have had 100 days without an accident, and 420 accident free days in the Corrective Actions Program (CAP). Mr. Mousseau also noted that the dose number for the year was 35% less than the goal of 11,000 mrem, and 25% less than the previous year's numbers.

Mr. Mousseau stated that on the 3706 Campaign, LANL has shipped 11,733 cubic meters to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant with 253 cubic meters of that number shipped this year. He noted that the WIPP site was currently in an outage that was scheduled to end February 15<sup>th</sup> 2013. He stated that 2 of the box lines and 1 of the drum lines were now operating 7 days a week 12 hours a day. Additionally the 375 box line is scheduled to turn over from construction to start-up some time later next week.

He also stated that since operations began in 1999 there have been a total of 1139 shipments; 42 shipments occurred this year.

In the CAP program the work at TA-32 has been completed, and NMED has completed a request for the transfer of land to Los Alamos County. Additionally Mr. Mousseau noted that the enclosures at TA-21 have been taken down. The final note was that the CAP program is working with NMED on an Interim Measures Plan for the chromium contamination.

Mr. Sayre asked based on the chart that you show and given that we are one third of the way through the fiscal year (FY) will LANL be able to make the 1800 drums this year.

1 Mr. Mousseau responded with the new box lines coming on line and the  
2 increased work load, LANL is on track to meet the expected goal for FY13.

3  
4 Ms. Majure asked if there was a schedule for disposition of the below ground  
5 TRU requiring retrieval, and has it been made public yet.

6  
7 Ms. Bonds-Lopez responded that there was a schedule and LANL was trying to  
8 get it out for the public sometime next week.

9  
10 Mr. Villarreal noted that the WIPP budget had gone down, and with that  
11 budget decrease how long would WIPP be able to support this effort.

12  
13 Mr. Mousseau stated that he was not privy to the exact amount of the  
14 decrease; however, LANL has been working closely with the WIPP team and  
15 LANL is the number one priority at WIPP. That being said, LANL would likely be  
16 the last to feel an effect from a WIPP budget cut.

17  
18 **B. New Mexico Environment Department**

19 Mr. David Cobrain noted that the NMED had issued a draft permit to add a  
20 TRU container storage unit at LANL that would be for newly generated TRU  
21 waste generated by LANL. He noted that the public comment period would be  
22 open from January 14, 2013 and would end March 15, 2013.

23  
24 **C. Environmental Protection Agency**

25 There was no new information from the EPA

26  
27 **D. Department of Energy**

28 Mr. Pete Maggiore started by thanking Carlos Valdez for attending the  
29 DOE/LANL legislative breakfast, and Ms. Menice Santistevan for help organizing  
30 the breakfast. Mr. Maggiore noted that DOE/LANL had held its first legislative  
31 breakfast earlier that day.

32 Mr. Maggiore also promised an update at the next NNM CAB meeting  
33 concerning the changes in the leadership at NNSA. He also noted in response to  
34 the questions on WIPP that Carlsbad had assured LANL that they could catch  
35 whatever LANL could process.

36 Mr. Maggiore addressed the FY'14 budget, noting that the pass back had been  
37 received at Headquarters. Currently the budget number is embargoed so he was  
38 not sure what the actual number was. He further elaborated that the President's

1 budget is normally released in February; however, with the FY'13 budget still  
2 undecided the release had been delayed.

3 Mr. Maggiore announced that if the sequestration scheduled for March 1<sup>st</sup>  
4 happens, LANL would face a budget cut of 7 to 10 percent over the FY12 actuals.  
5 He noted that the current continuing resolution expires on March 24, 2013;  
6 depending on the direction the budget takes that will tell us how much money  
7 will be available for the end of the FY.

8 Mr. Maggiore addressed the 33 Shafts, noting that DOE was in the process of  
9 kicking off a NEPA assessment. He offered to present more information on the  
10 NEPA process at a subsequent meeting.

11  
12 Dr. Girardi asked if DOE knew when the process was going to kick off  
13

14 Mr. Maggiore responded that DOE was trying to kick off the process now, that  
15 currently DOE was looking for funding to start the NEPA process.

---

16  
17 **XII. Public Comment Period**

18 Mr. Valdez opened the public comment period; with no comments from the  
19 public the public comment period was closed.

---

20  
21 **XIII. Consideration and Action on Draft Recommendation 2013-01**

22 Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments on Draft Recommendation 2013-  
23 01. The Recommendation addresses the 33 Shafts and the non-response from DOE  
24 on the previous Recommendation 2010-01. The Recommendation asks that DOE  
25 reply to the original recommendation 2010-01. Mr. Valdez asked that Ms. Majure  
26 walk the members through the new Recommendation.

27  
28 Ms. Majure responded that during the Combined Committee meeting the  
29 topic of the 33 Shafts was discussed, she noted that during the meeting she was  
30 asked to write a recommendation. Looking at the 2010-01 Recommendation, the  
31 response that was received from DOE was sort of a non-response. The response  
32 does agree that Recommendation 2010-01 will assist in determining the proper path  
33 forward; with that in mind Recommendation 2013-01 asks that DOE revisit  
34 Recommendation 2010-01 and respond more thoroughly.

35  
36 Mr. Villarreal noted that when Recommendation 2010-01 was written there  
37 were two recommendations written up, and the NNMCAB only accepted one of the  
38 recommendations. The second recommendation that was written but not accepted

1 recommended that LANL use remote operations to handle the waste in the 33  
2 Shafts. He also stated that LANL has a large amount of information on the 33 Shafts,  
3 and the waste configurations. He recommended that LANL might want to take the  
4 approach of working on the easier shaft configurations and then moving on to the  
5 more complex configurations as more is learned about the removal process. He  
6 further suggested that LANL should look into remote handling operations. He  
7 recommended writing the new recommendation in such a way as to present LANL  
8 with multiple options to choose from and let them decide which method would be  
9 best suited for removal operations.

10  
11 Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Worth if DOE/LANL had made a decision on leaving the  
12 33 Shafts in place or removing the waste.

13  
14 Mr. Worth responded that a decision had not yet been made and would likely  
15 not be made until the NEPA process was completed. He further stated that the  
16 NNMCAB should add to the Recommendation that DOE needs to make sure there is  
17 a disposal path for the waste before it is removed.

18  
19 Mr. Villarreal stated that maybe he should write up 3 or 4 recommendations  
20 to present to the board, and let the board decide if we should go forward with them.

21  
22 Ms. Majure noted that Recommendation 2010-01 addressed multiple  
23 methods for disposal; however, the underlying intent of the recommendation was to  
24 get DOE to respond to removing the waste or not removing the waste. The idea  
25 behind the 2013-01 was to get a response from DOE on the questions of removal,  
26 not necessarily how to do it.

27  
28 Mr. Valdez stated that Recommendation 2013-01 was basically stating take  
29 action, whatever that action is.

30  
31 Mr. Villarreal responded it's not so much how but the methodologies, we  
32 don't have to tell LANL how; but rather here are methodologies that could be used.

33  
34 Ms. Majure responded we need the do it now, before we move on to the  
35 how.



1 Dr. Shaw stated she would suggest adding recommendations that have been  
2 discussed, with an outline of the methodologies. She noted that she is to the point  
3 of demanding a response from DOE, on this issue.  
4

5 Mr. Lawrence Garcia agreed with Ms. Majure and Mr. Villarreal we are to the  
6 point where we need answers; are you going to move the shafts or leave them. He  
7 noted that the NNMCAB had already requested the 2014 budget and there are items  
8 tied to the 2014 budget, also noting that the 33 Shafts may have been included. If  
9 not, the 33 Shafts would need to replace items already in the 2014 budget. We need  
10 to find out if the 33 Shafts are tied to the 2013 or 2014 budgets.  
11

12 Ms. Bonds-Lopez responded that a small portion of the 2013 and 2014 budget  
13 have been assigned to the 33 Shafts, for investigation studies. She noted that Mr.  
14 Dan Cox would be the individual to ask for further information on the budget,  
15 allotted to the 33 Shafts.  
16

17 Mr. Garcia stated with that information at hand he believes that the  
18 recommendation 2013-01 could go forward.  
19

20 Mr. Worth stated that there are individuals actively looking at the 33 Shafts  
21 He believes that DOE is currently in a better position to address the 2010-01  
22 recommendation. He also noted that below grade TRU is addressed as part of the  
23 Consent Order.  
24

25 Mr. Pacheco stated that we should submit the recommendation and get a  
26 response from DOE. As part of the recommendation we should request possible  
27 technologies LANL would look at using.  
28

29 Mr. Phelps noted that we have two distinct issues, getting DOE off the dime  
30 and the technical approach to the problem. The NNMCAB could provide two  
31 recommendations, one requesting that DOE issue a response to the 2010-01  
32 recommendation, and a second recommendation addressing the issue of  
33 methodologies. He would recommend adding a line to recommendation 2013-01  
34 noting that the NNMCAB intends to provide a subsequent recommendation to DOE  
35 to address methodologies.  
36

37 Ms. Majure responded that would provide additional time to get information  
38 from Mr. Cox.

1 Dr. Girardi stated that she agrees with Mr. Phelps on submitting two  
2 recommendations. DOE can't make a 2013 or 2014 budget request without knowing  
3 what they are planning to do, so an answer to this is pertinent. She noted that she  
4 would be willing to ask for a vote on it. She also asked if the Waste Management  
5 Conference would be a good place to acquire information on new technologies that  
6 could be used for the 33 Shafts.

7  
8 Mr. Sayre stated that a sentence could be added requesting a response from  
9 DOE by a certain time.

10  
11 Mr. Valdez suggested that Recommendation 2013-01 be written as two  
12 recommendations on one sheet. The first recommendation 2013-01 as is, the  
13 second recommendation would be a request for DOE to provide a presentation on  
14 the 33 Shafts.

15  
16 Ms. Majure responded that she felt that would give DOE more room to  
17 shuffle; she was concerned that we would not get a response on the record.

18  
19 Mr. Worth noted that he believed that DOE would still issue a response to the  
20 recommendation in addition to providing the presentation.

21  
22 Ms. Majure responded that a presentation might lead to an analysis on why  
23 the project can't be looked at, "kind of an analyses paralysis."

24  
25 Mr. Phelps noted that he was not comfortable requesting that DOE respond  
26 by a certain date.

27  
28 Dr. Girardi asked if the request should include a request for the final disposal  
29 options on waste removed. She also stated that it would be good to get a  
30 recommendation out the door by the end of this NNMCAB Meeting.

31  
32 Mr. Longacre stated that he felt the NNMCAB's next recommendation should  
33 be on recommendations. The recommendation should ask that DOE give an up or  
34 down vote on recommendations submitted by the NNMCAB, and that unapproved  
35 recommendations should include a response for why the recommendation was not  
36 approved.

1 Dr. Shaw agreed with Dr. Girardi, the NNMCAB needs to get the  
2 recommendation out the door. She also noted that she would like to have a  
3 presentation on technologies that could be used; however, not in the form of a  
4 lecture but as a two way conversation between DOE and the NNMCAB.

5  
6 Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Worth if the request for a presentation should be added  
7 to the recommendation.

8  
9 Mr. Worth responded that he could get the presentation for the NNMCAB  
10 without the need for an official request for a presentation in the 2013-01  
11 recommendation.

12  
13 Ms. Santistevan suggested that the presentation be more of a round table  
14 than a Power Point lecture.

15  
16 Mr. Sayre noted that he would still like a time frame added to the  
17 recommendation. He suggested that instead of adding a sentence with an exact date  
18 for a response, the recommendation should simply ask for a timely response.

19  
20 Mr. Pacheco made a motion to approve Recommendation 2013-01 with  
21 amendments, Mr. Sayre seconded the motion. The NNMCAB vote all in favor; the  
22 motion to submit recommendation 2013-01 passed.

---

23  
24 **XIV. Wrap-up and Comments**

25 Mr. Valdez opened the floor for general comments from members of the  
26 board.

27  
28 Mr. Garcia, Dr. Shaw, Ms. Majure, Mr. Phelps Mr. Sayre and Mr. Joseph  
29 Viarrial all thanked everyone for attending; each felt it had been a good and  
30 productive meeting.

31  
32 Mr. Longacre noted that he felt the board should produce more  
33 recommendations; he suggested that all the members should go home and between  
34 this meeting and the next each member should write a recommendation.

35  
36 Dr. Girardi noted that the presentations at this meeting were very  
37 informative.

Mr. Pacheco also noted that the presentations were good, he agreed with Mr. Longacre's challenge to the board on writing recommendations.

Mr. Villarreal asked about the recommendation that had been submitted about WIPP.

Mr. Valdez noted that the NNM CAB had received a response that was thanks but no thanks.

Mr. Tiano noted that he felt it was a good meeting. Additionally he stated for the record that he felt Ms. Green was an Anti-Nuke protestor disguised as an environmentalist and was using the DNFSB memorandum to get rid of PF-4. He noted that at this point he would vote for a recommendation to build a better facility at PF-4 to protect the plutonium in the event of an earth quake.

Ms. Santistevan thanked all the members for attending; she also asked that members let her know if they would need a room for the March 20<sup>th</sup> 2013 meeting in Albuquerque.

Mr. Worth assured the members that he would bird dog the recommendation and make sure the NNM CAB received a response.

---

**XV. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, Mr. Worth adjourned the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

**Respectfully Submitted,**



**Carlos Valdez, Chair, NNM CAB**

**\*Minutes prepared by William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach, NNM CAB**

---

**Attachments**

- 1. Final NNM CAB Meeting Agenda for 01/30/2013**
- 2. Final NNM CAB Meeting Minutes for 12/04/2012**

3. Final NNMCAB Meeting Minutes for 09/26/2012
4. EM-SSAB Chairs October 3, 2012 Meeting Draft Recommendations
5. Information Package on PF-4 provided by Jeanne Green (Public)
6. Report from Carlos Valdez, NNMCAB Chair
7. Report from Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
8. Presentation by LANL on Long Term Strategy for Environmental Stewardship & Sustainability
9. Presentation by NMDOH on Questions About Radiation and Health (with Fact Sheet)
10. Presentation by UNM on Cancer in Northern New Mexico Communities
11. Presentation by LANL on Occupational Illness Compensation
12. 3706 Campaign information provided by LANL
13. Draft Recommendation 2013-01 on the 33 Shafts

---

**Public Notice:**

**\*All NNMCAB meetings are recorded. Audio CDs and Video disks have been placed on file for review at the NNMCAB Office, 94 Cities of Gold Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 87506.**

**\*Reference documents listed in the Attachments section of these minutes may be requested for review at the NNMCAB Office by calling (505)989-1662.**