



Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board Meeting

January 29, 2014

1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The Lodge at Santa Fe

Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501



Minutes

Meeting Attendees

Department of Energy

1. Pete Maggiore, DOE Assistant Manager Environmental Projects Office
2. Lee Bishop, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO)
3. David Rhodes, DOE Environmental Projects Office
4. Robert Pfaff, DOE Environmental Projects Office
5. David Nickless, DOE Environmental Projects Office
6. George Henckel, DOE Environmental Projects Office
7. Cheryl Rodriguez, DOE Environmental Projects Office

NNMCAB Members

1. Carlos Valdez, NNMCAB Chair
2. Doug Sayre, NNMCAB Vice-Chair
3. Bonnie Lucas
4. Daniel Mayfield
5. Gerard Martinez
6. Nona Girardi
7. Stephen Schmelling
8. Angel Quintana
9. Adrian Chavez, Sr.
10. Manuel Pacheco
11. Ashley Sanderson
12. Joey Tiano
13. Bob Villarreal
14. Allison Majure
15. Alex Puglisi
16. Brenda Gallegos

NNMCAB Student Members

1. Deidre Roybal
2. Kaitlin Martinez

Excused Absences

1. Mary Friday
2. Deborah Shaw

3. Joseph Viarrial
4. Mike Loya
5. Irene Tse-Pe
6. Jerry Trujillo
7. Gary Johnson

NNMCAB Support Staff

1. Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
2. Bridget Maestas, Administrative Assistant
3. William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach

Guests

1. Connie Martinez, Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo Environmental Department
2. Scott Kovac, Nuclear Watch New Mexico
3. Rick Verhaagen, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
4. Jonathan Plane, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
5. Patti Jones, Los Alamos National Security
6. Tony Grieggs, Los Alamos National Security
7. Allison Dorries, Los Alamos National Security
8. Erika Schwender, New Mexico Environment Department
9. Vivian Valencia, Portage
10. Kathryn Roberts, Los Alamos National Security
11. Laura Day, Project Time & Cost
12. Carolyn Bateman, Project Time & Cost
13. Sandra Stubbleful, Go Local Santa Fe
14. Rick Ulibarri, Los Alamos National Security
15. Jay Coghlan, Nuclear Watch New Mexico
16. Danny Katzman, Los Alamos National Security
17. Dave McInroy, Los Alamos National Security
18. Fran Berting, Los Alamos County Council

***All NNMCAB meetings are recorded. Audio CD's and Video DVD's have been placed on file for review at the NNMCAB office, 94 Cities of Gold Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 87506. The written minutes are intended as a synopsis of the meeting.**

Minutes

I. Call to Order

The bi-monthly meeting of the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) was held on January 29, 2014 at the Lodge at Santa Fe in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Mr. Lee Bishop 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 1:04 p.m.

Mr. Bishop recognized Mr. Carlos Valdez the 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 (12 Needed)

a. Roll Call

Mr. William Alexander conducted roll call as the members arrived. At the call to order 16 members were present. Mr. Alexander recorded that Ms. Brenda Gallegos left the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

b. Excused Absences

Mr. Alexander recorded that the following members had excused absences: Ms. Deborah Shaw, Ms. Mary Friday, Mr. Mike Loya, Mr. Joseph Viarrial, Mr. Gary Johnson, Mr. Jerry Trujillo, and Ms. Irene Tse-Pe.

c. Absences

Mr. Alexander recorded that there were no unexcused absences at this meeting.

III. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Valdez welcomed the members and the 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 29, 2014 meeting.

Mr. Doug Sayre made a motion to approve the agenda as presented; Mr. Joey Tiano seconded the motion. The motion to approve the agenda as presented was unanimously passed.

V. Approval of Minutes

The board reviewed the minutes of the November 20, 2013 NNMCAB meeting. By ongoing instruction from DOE Headquarters, the minutes were previously reviewed and certified by the NNMCAB Chair.

1 Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments from the board, with no comments from the
2 board Mr. Valdez asked for a motion.

3
4 Mr. Manuel Pacheco made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Ms. Bonnie
5 Lucas seconded the motion. The members voted all in favor, the motion to approve the
6 minutes from the November 20, 2013 meeting as presented passed.

7
8 **VI. Public Comment Period**

9 Mr. Valdez opened the floor for public comment at 1:18 p.m.

10
11 Mr. Scott Kovac of Nuclear Watch New Mexico (NWNM) thanked the members for
12 taking the time to work on these complicated issues. He asked that the NNMCAB consider
13 having the public comment at the end of the meeting in an effort to facilitate a more useful
14 comment period, he noted that at the end of the meeting the public would have an
15 opportunity to comment on presentations and information that had been presented.

16 Mr. Kovac requested that the NNMCAB draft a recommendation for Material Disposal
17 Area G (MDA G) remedies. He noted that he would like to see Los Alamos National
18 Laboratory (LANL) reconsider the proposed remedies for MDA G and permanently reduce
19 the toxicity, mobility, and volume of contaminants stored there. Mr. Kovac noted that MDA
20 G has waste from pre 1980 to post 1980 many active low level waste cells, and it all needs to
21 be characterized.

22
23 Mr. Gerard Martinez responded that he agreed with the proposal to move the public
24 comment period to the end of the agenda.

25
26 Mr. Valdez noted that in the future the public comments would be moved to the end of
27 the agenda. Additionally, he noted that he would like to have some members work with Mr.
28 Kovac to draft a recommendation for MDA G.

29
30 Mr. Alex Puglisi noted that he is currently working on a draft recommendation for MDA
31 G, which he was planning to bring to the next combined committee meeting. He noted that
32 he would not have a problem working with a committee and Mr. Kovac to discuss an MDA G
33 draft recommendation.

34
35 Ms. Allison Majure asked Mr. Kovac if the recommendation that he was requesting the
36 NNMCAB draft; would be a recommendation requesting a reframing and piece by piece
37 approach to the completion of the MDA G waste removal.

38
39 Mr. Kovac responded that yes that was what he was looking to have the
40 recommendation propose. Additionally, he noted that the MDA G issue needs to be kept on
41 the table.

1 Ms. Lucas asked if Mr. Kovac would describe what he meant by poised over the aquifer.

2
3 Mr. Kovac noted that the Española basin is a sole source aquifer that serves Santa Fe,
4 Española, and Los Alamos. He noted that sole source is described as more than half of the
5 population receives water from an aquifer. He stated that 25% to 30% of the water in the
6 aquifer comes from beneath the laboratory.

7
8 Mr. Stephen Schmelling stated that with the 3706 Campaign nearly complete, his
9 understanding was that the next big project was the below grade waste retrieval. He noted
10 that at this point he was unsure if there was sufficient information to draft and approve a
11 recommendation. Additionally, he noted that whoever drafts the recommendation would
12 need to be very clear as to which waste the recommendation was addressing.

13
14 Mr. Bishop responded that the issue of MDA G had come to light due to Mayor Coss's
15 resolution to the City of Santa Fe, and Mr. Kovac's recommendation at the last NNMCAB
16 Combined Committee meeting. He noted that Mr. Schmelling was correct in that there is a
17 great deal of information that needs to be understood before a conclusion can be made. He
18 encouraged all the members to listen, ask questions, and develop their own opinions on the
19 issue.

20
21 Mr. Valdez noted that as the 3706 Campaign winds down; how do we bridge into the
22 next project. Additionally, he noted that Framework Agreements (FW) seemed to be
23 popular with the public and with the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED).

24
25 Mr. David Rhodes, from DOE Los Alamos Field Office stated that Mr. Pete Maggiore,
26 from DOE Los Alamos Field Office, would be presenting on the plan for MDA G, and that the
27 discussions with the NNMCAB were so that public discussion on the issue could be initiated.
28 He noted that DOE/LANS would be waiting on NMED to make a decision on the plan before
29 any decisions were made; additionally, he noted that DOE/LANS had not had an opportunity
30 to sit down with Mr. Kovac from NWNM but look forward to it. Mr. Rhodes noted that his
31 only request would be that we might not circulate a recommendation to the board in
32 advance of those discussions.

33
34 Ms. Lucas asked if Mr. Bishop could address the lining issue at MDA G for the benefit of
35 the public who could later be viewing the meeting on public access TV.

36
37 Mr. Bishop noted that the current technical understanding of the MDA G disposal site is
38 that trans-evaporation occurs at the site. The general theory is that more water evaporates
39 off the surface of the mesa top than ever infiltrates into the mesa. He noted that lined pits
40 would possibly interfere with the transfer of moisture out of the mesa top.

1 Mr. Puglisi noted that he would like to add clarification to the recommendation, which
2 had come verbatim from NMEDs comments on the MDA G Corrective Measures Evaluation.
3 Mr. Puglisi read for the NNMCAB members verbatim the NMED comment. Mr. Puglisi also
4 noted that a similar recommendation was currently before the Regional Coalition of LANL
5 Communities (RCLC). Mr. Puglisi stated that he would recommend that the NNMCAB draft a
6 similar recommendation.

7
8 Mr. Valdez noted that MDA G was a good subject; however, before the NMCAB could
9 discuss it in depth it would be good to have a draft in front of the members. He noted that
10 perhaps a draft could be available by the next full board meeting.

11
12 Dr. Nona Girardi noted that there appears to be two possible sources of water
13 contamination at MDA G: surface water runoff into the Buckman Diversion, and secondly
14 infiltration into the ground water. Dr. Girardi asked if both routes need to be considered and
15 if there is currently protection for both of those.

16
17 Mr. Rhodes responded that storm water is considered separately, there is an NMED
18 piece and an EPA piece. He noted that MDA G currently has a cap that was installed to
19 protect against storm water infiltration; additionally, the area at MDA G also has asphalt
20 areas that cover a large amount of the space. He noted that there has been no evidence of
21 infiltration. Mr. Rhodes stated that in regard to the groundwater there is no evidence of
22 deep infiltration into the mesa. He noted that the identified vapor plumes are hundreds of
23 feet above the aquifer.

24
25 Mr. Sayre noted that it seemed to him that the agenda for the next meeting should have
26 Frame Work Agreement approach as one of the agenda items.

27
28 Mr. Schmelling asked if the rain event back in September 2013 had affected MDA G.

29
30 Mr. Bishop responded that the rain event had been a 1000 year event. He noted that
31 MDA G had not had any impact to the below ground disposal pits, and that there had not
32 been any releases from the site.

33
34 Mr. Gerard Martinez asked if the trans-evaporation could transport contaminants down
35 into the aquifer.

36
37 Mr. Bishop responded that the nature of the trans-evaporation is that the evaporation
38 occurs in the upward direction. He noted that the trans-evaporation creates a negative
39 pressure and moves the water out; additionally, he noted that MDA G is a solid waste
40 disposal site and it has minimal liquid contained in the waste.

With no additional comments Mr. Valdez closed the public comment period at 1:50 p.m.

VII. Old Business

a. Written Reports

Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments on the written reports. With no comments on the written reports Mr. Valdez moved on to the next agenda item.

b. Other Items

Mr. Valdez noted that the next NNMCAB meeting would be on March 26, 2014 and that it would be held at the Sandia Resort in Albuquerque.

VIII. New Business

Mr. Valdez stated that Ms. Cate Alexander was retiring and that her replacement is not yet known.

Mr. Valdez advised the members that there would be two different conferences in March. He noted that Ms. Angel Quintana and Ms. Irene Tse-Pe would be attending the Environmental Justice Conference in Washington, D.C., and Mr. Puglisi and he would be attending the Waste Management Symposia in Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. Valdez also noted that the spring Chairs Meeting in Hanford would be April 21-25, 2014.

Mr. Bishop noted that for the upcoming meeting at Sandia, any members that had to travel more than 50 miles to the facility were eligible for hotel rooms. He encourages the members to be safe and take advantage of the accommodations if they felt it necessary.

With no additional business to discuss Mr. Valdez moved on to the next agenda item.

IX. Upcoming Hearings, Permits, and Public Comment Periods.

Mr. Tony Grieggs gave the NNMCAB an update on the status of Los Alamos National Laboratory's permits, closures, and upcoming hearings. "Los Alamos National Laboratory Environmental Permits Update for January 29, 2014." An electronic copy of the presentation may be obtained from the NNMCAB website; <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov/7-presentations/presentations.htm>. Video of the presentation is available on the NNMCAB's YouTube channel (NNMCAB).

Mr. Bishop thanked Mr. Grieggs for his time, and noted that the intent of the update was to keep the members updated on the permits. He noted; however, that most of the permits are on the operations side of the house, not a part of the EM scope. He asked that for future reports Mr. Grieggs separate the two for the members; so that the members would know which permits are part of EM scope and which are part of operations.

Mr. Valdez moved to the next item on the agenda.

X. Presentation on MDA G

a. Material Disposal Area G Presentation.

Mr. Maggiore from DOE and Mr. Jeff Mousseau from LANS gave a presentation to the NNMCAB on "MDA-G: Post TRU Waste Retrieval Proposed Remedy; A Path to Long Term Stewardship." An electronic copy of the presentation may be obtained from the NNMCAB website; <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov/7-presentations/presentations.htm>. Video of the presentation is also available on the NNMCABs YouTube Channel (NNMCAB).

b. Questions

Mr. Valdez asked in terms of inventory, is there an accurate list of what was disposed: in the pits, shafts, and trenches.

Mr. Mousseau responded that the records in more recent years under the new regulations are better than the legacy records.

Mr. Martinez asked about the lining in the MDA G Area.

Mr. Mousseau responded that the MDA G disposal area is not lined.

Mr. Bob Villarreal asked what was happening with the 33 Shafts.

Mr. Bishop noted that the Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement has the 33 Shafts slated for removal. He noted the 33 Shafts are currently going to undergo a NEPA assessment, to determine a path forward up to and including a complete removal of the shafts.

Mr. Maggiore noted that the factor that had prevented the NEPA assessment was available funding. He noted that he and Mr. Mousseau were in the process of identifying projects to be funded in FY'14, and that the 33 Shafts was a priority.

Mr. Daniel Mayfield asked if there was newly generated waste being stored at MDA G.

Mr. Mousseau responded that except for low level waste (LLW) there is no waste being disposed at MDA G. He noted that newly generated waste is sent to MDA G to be characterized and stored until it is shipped off site for disposal.

Mr. Mayfield asked if the pits for the disposal of LLW are lined.

1 Mr. Mousseau noted that Pit 39 is not lined. He also stated that the Performance
2 Assessment & Composite Analysis (PACA) that MDA G operates under do not require
3 linings at Technical Area 54. He stated that DOE/LANL would be happy to brief the
4 NNMCAB on the PACA at a future meeting.

5
6 Ms. Majure asked if the bore holes were all the same depth and angle.

7
8 Mr. Mousseau responded that the bore holes were of varying depth; and angles,
9 dependent upon what was being sampled.

10
11 Mr. Valdez asked if the Pueblo de San Ildefonso had any monitoring wells of their
12 own.

13
14 Mr. Mousseau noted that LANL did not have any monitoring wells on San Ildefonso.
15 He also stated that the water flow is away from San Ildefonso.

16
17 Mr. Puglisi noted that NMED has questioned that assertion, and noted that there was
18 a need for additional wells northwest of MDA G. Mr. Puglisi asked what the status of the
19 well was and why it hasn't been drilled yet.

20
21 Mr. Danny Katzman noted that the existing data shows what could be a perturbation
22 in the water table in that area, that lead NMED to request the well be installed to the
23 northwest of R-41. Mr. Katzman noted that LANL had proposed to evaluate the need for
24 that well as part of the long term monitoring of the MDA G area.

25
26 Mr. Puglisi asked if NMED had responded to the LANL proposal.

27
28 Mr. Katzman stated that an extension request to drill the well post CME approval had
29 been approved by NMED.

30
31 Mr. Sayre asked about the below-grade TRU removal and if it had started.

32
33 Mr. Mousseau noted that the below-grad TRU removal had not yet started; however
34 the engineering methods for the removal have been worked on. He noted that the
35 corrugated metal pipes are the first items slated for removal, in FY'14.

36
37 Mr. Valdez asked if there were any alternatives on the proposed plan for complete
38 removal, something like a 95% removal.

1 Mr. Maggiore responded that a more in-depth discussion on the alternatives could
2 be given to the NNMCAB at a different meeting. He noted that this would allow for
3 greater discussion on the topic.
4

5 Ms. Majure asked if the excavation alternative was in CME revisions 1 and 2 or only
6 in revision 3.
7

8 Mr. Maggiore stated that to his knowledge it was in all three revisions of the
9 document.
10

11 Dr. Girardi asked if the cost of the no action alternative, had accounted for the cost
12 of ongoing monitoring.
13

14 Mr. Maggiore noted that the no cost alternative had assumed direct costs only, not
15 the cost of the ongoing monitoring.
16

17 Mr. Schmelling asked how confident DOE/LANL was in the ability to fix or repair the
18 property in say 100 years.
19

20 Mr. Maggiore responded that the property that MDA G sits on is not likely to ever be
21 subject to land transfer. He also noted that plans would need to be developed and
22 followed through on in order to maintain the Long Term Stewardship.
23

24 Dr. Girardi asked if 100 years was long enough. She also asked what is done with the
25 volatile organic compounds and Tritium once it is extracted.
26

27 Mr. Mousseau noted that in 100 years the site would need to be evaluated to
28 determine if continued monitoring was needed. In regard to the second question Mr.
29 Mousseau noted that the VOCs are extracted in vapor phase and changed back to the
30 liquid phase and disposed as hazardous waste.
31

32 Mr. Katzman responded that the Tritium was collected on resin and disposed of as
33 hazardous waste.
34

35 Mr. Puglisi asked if MDA G would need a permit modification to close or if closure is
36 part of the CME.
37

38 Mr. Mousseau responded that there would be a closure process and suspension of
39 operations for legacy waste at TA-54, a closure process would be initiated. He noted
40 that the new facility at TA-63 would process newly generated waste.
41

XI. Update From Liaison Members

a. New Mexico Environment Department

No representative from NMED was present

b. Los Alamos National Laboratory

Mr. Jeff Mousseau gave the NNMCAB an update on the Environmental Programs, the status of the 3706 Campaign, below ground waste retrieval, and safety. "Associate Directorate for Environmental Programs Update for January 29, 2014" an electronic copy of the presentation may be obtained from the NNMCAB website;

<http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov/7-presentations/presentations.htm>. Video of the presentation is available on the NNMCAB's YouTube channel
<http://www.youtube.com/user/NNMCAB>.

c. Department of Energy

Mr. Pete Maggiore gave the NNMCAB an update on the FY'14 Budget. "Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Update" an electronic copy of the presentation may be obtained from the NNMCAB website; <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov/7-presentations/presentations.htm>. Video of the presentation is available on the NNMCAB's YouTube channel
<http://www.youtube.com/user/NNMCAB>.

Mr. Valdez asked why only \$91 million was requested in 2007.

Mr. Maggiore responded that he was not at Los Alamos at that time and was not sure why the request was \$91 million.

Mr. Valdez asked after the 3706 Campaign is successfully completed what the next project would likely be.

Mr. Mousseau stated that the lessons from 3706 will be integrated into the new campaign approach with a risk based approach.

Mr. Maggiore noted that he had made a brief presentation to the RCLC and addressed the same question. He noted that the possibility he had mentioned at the RCLC meeting for the new campaign approach were: chromium, and below ground TRU. Mr. Maggiore noted that he would like to execute the next campaigns quickly and efficiently to show continued progress.

Mr. Mayfield asked what the status of MDAs H & L was.

Ms. Kathryn Roberts responded that the CMEs for MDAs H & L are at NMED waiting on review and approval.

XII. Update from DDFO

Mr. Bishop reviewed the recommendations that had been submitted by the NNMCAB in FY'13, and noted that only recommendation 2013-09 was awaiting a response from DOE.

Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Maggiore to update the NNMCAB on the new Field Office Manager.

Mr. Maggiore stated that effective January 27, 2014, Kim Davis Lebak became the new Field Office Manager at the Los Alamos Site Office. Ms. Lebak has a Masters Degree in Environmental Engineering.

Mr. Bishop noted that NNMCAB members would be attending the Waste Management Symposia in Arizona at the beginning of March, the Environmental Justice Conference at the end of March, and the spring chairs meeting in Hanford at the end of April. Additionally he noted that if members had requests for travel they should submit them to the Executive Committee for review and approval. Mr. Bishop noted that the members who attend conferences are required to come back to the board and brief the members on the conference or tour.

Mr. Bishop noted that the NNMCAB staff had started using Pasatiempo in the Santa Fe New Mexican for advertisements, in an effort to expand the reach of information.

Mr. Bishop stated that the upcoming presentations that he had identified from this meeting were: MDA G cost estimates, MDA G PACA, MDA H & L CME.

Mr. Valdez noted that in regard to travel he would like to send members to some of the other CABs across the complex.

Mr. Bishop responded that it had been discussed before, and if there is sufficient budget, he would certainly entertain the Idea.

XIII. Second Public Comment

Mr. Valdez opened the floor for public comment at 4:35 p.m.

Mr. Jay Coghlan from NWNM reminded the NNMCAB that being highly regarded by the DOE may not be the criteria that you actually want. He noted that he knows members of the Hanford board, and that board is not currently well regarded by DOE. Mr. Coghlan noted that he regards that as a badge of honor.

Mr. Coghlan congratulated Jeff Mousseau on the 3706 Campaign; however noted that his next comments went above Jeff's pay grade. Mr. Coghlan stated that the 3706 campaign should have been completed 10 years ago and the Lab was only catching up to what should have already been done. He states that the campaign in his view was being used as a red herring, where by the LAB does not have to meet all the other requirements of the Consent

1 Order. He noted that he “was not blaming just the Lab but also the Martinez gubernatorial
2 administration.”

3 Mr. Coghlan stated that the NNMCAB Chair had rightfully implied that you were
4 impressed with the 40 deliverables under the Consent Order that LANL had completed;
5 however it should be asked how many were requests for extension in time, essentially
6 asking for permission to not deliver.

7 Mr. Coghlan noted that in request to the \$29 billion cost for MDA G that Mr. Maggiore
8 had brought up, he would like to assist him by providing background details to him. He
9 noted that out of the alleged \$29 billion which is clearly a show stopper, out of that nearly
10 \$1 billion was in design. He asked why does it take nearly a billion to design taking
11 something out. He noted that \$7 billion was for management, \$9 billion for contingency
12 almost 33%. He noted that as Pete observed that some folks cry loudly about when the Lab
13 doesn’t want to do something it high balls it, probably referring to me. Mr. Coghlan agreed
14 that offsite disposal would incur increased costs. Noting that Mr. Mousseau had pointed out
15 during the 3706 Campaign that disposal at Waste Control Specialists is a relative bargain to
16 what it used to be.

17 Mr. Coghlan stated that he believed it was true that no groundwater contamination had
18 been found under MDA G, and that Pete’s slide stating that DOE wants to be transparent,
19 open, and honest in all of its communications is commendable; however, as late as 1996 the
20 head of Los Alamos Groundwater Protection Program was saying that groundwater
21 contamination was impossible, “because the volcanic tuff overlying the aquifer was
22 impermeable.” He noted that this went so far that the Laboratory requested from NMED a
23 permanent waiver from ever having to monitor groundwater. Mr. Coghlan noted that Mr.
24 Maggiore was the Secretary of NMED at the time and that he had rejected that variance.

25 Mr. Coghlan closed that while he believes it is true that there is no groundwater
26 contamination below MDA G, he noted that VOC’s have migrated to 250 ft. below the
27 surface; however, conceded that could be treated with soil-vapor extraction. Additionally,
28 he noted that there are small amounts of plutonium found at 200 ft. below the surface. He
29 stated that even if the Lab does not want to remove all the waste, is Los Alamos and Los
30 Alamos National Laboratory prepared to state in writing that groundwater contamination
31 will never occur at MDA G.
32

33 Mr. Maggiore responded that he appreciated that comment. He noted that he
34 appreciated the acknowledgement about the decision that had been made in his former
35 position. Mr. Maggiore noted that what Jay had been referring to was a groundwater
36 monitoring variance requested by LANL pursuant to RCRA. He noted that he felt that there
37 wasn’t sufficient information available to grant that variance. Mr. Maggiore noted that he
38 was not going to go on the record at this time in response to Mr. Coughlan’s questions.
39

40 Mr. Puglisi asked where the assertion that the 3706 Campaign should have been
41 completed 10 years ago came from.

1
2 Mr. Kovac responded that as part of the Consent Order dates; MDA G was supposed to
3 be cleaned up by the end of 2015.
4

5 Mr. Maggiore noted that if you walk backwards in the Consent Order one might logically
6 conclude that the waste would have needed to be removed early on. Mr. Maggiore noted
7 that he did not know if that would have been 10 years or not.
8

9 Mr. Mousseau elaborated on the comment Jay brought up about Waste Control
10 Specialists and the waste disposal cost. He noted that the cost of disposal is \$5k - \$10k per
11 cubic meter; he noted that the volume of waste in MDA G would account for a couple billion
12 dollars. Mr. Mousseau noted that LANL would be happy to provide a more in-depth
13 presentation on the cost analysis.
14

15 Mr. Kovac noted that while it is a lot of waste to remove it is doable. He stated that one
16 of his concerns was the groundwater monitoring well network at the laboratory. Mr. Kovac
17 stated that the collection system under most lined landfills can immediately identify leaks,
18 rather than trying to catch it with a monitoring well. Mr. Kovac also noted that DOE Order
19 435.1 would be up for public comment in the spring.
20

21 Mr. Bishop noted that at this point an announcement on the specific review cycle for
22 435.1 had not been released.
23

24 With no additional comments, Mr. Valdez closed the public comment period at 4:51
25 p.m.
26

27 **XIV. Wrap-up and Comments**

28 Mr. Villarreal noted that the meeting had been very productive, and he appreciated
29 being able to voice what he feels.
30

31 Ms. Katlin Martinez thanked everyone for attending.
32

33 Mr. Puglisi noted that the title on the recommendations sheet should be changed from
34 realignment of the consent order to alignment of the consent order.
35

36 Ms. Majure, Mr. Adrian Chavez, Mr. Sayre, Ms. Ashley Sanderson, Mr. Manuel Pacheco,
37 Mr. Schmelling, Dr. Girardi, Ms. Lucas and Ms. Angel Quintana all thanked the attendees and
38 the staff for a great meeting, and the presenters for the presentations and their factual
39 information. Additionally, Mr. Schmelling asked for an update later in the year on the
40 chromium plume.
41

Mr. Tiano thanked the conference staff, presenters, and NNMCAB staff for the great meeting. Additionally, Mr. Tiano noted that the way Mr. Coghlan had presented his comments was aggressive, noting he should remember that the NNMCAB members are citizens also. Mr. Tiano noted that if you become too aggressive you are likely to turn off the individuals you are addressing.

Mr. Martinez stated that he wanted to thank everyone for the great meeting. He also stated that he welcomed all comments and wanted to thank the Chair for allowing an open discussion.

XV. Adjournment

With no additional business to discuss Mr. Bishop adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Carlos Valdez, Chair, NNMCAB

***Minutes Prepared by William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach, NNMCAB**

Attachments:

1. Final NNMCAB Meeting Agenda for 01/29/2014
2. Final NNMCAB Meeting Minutes for 11/20/2014
3. Report from Carlos Valdez, NNMCAB Chair
4. Report from Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
5. Final NNMCAB Bi-Monthly Meeting Schedule for 2014
6. Update from LANL, Upcoming Hearings, Permits and Public Comment Periods, Tony Grieggs
7. Presentation by Pete Maggiore and Jeff Mousseau, MDA-G: Post TRU Waste Retrieval Proposed Remedy; A Path to Long Term Stewardship
8. Update from LANL, Environmental Programs, Jeff Mousseau
9. Update from DOE, FY'14 Budget, Pete Maggiore

Public Notice:

* All NNMCAB meetings are recorded. Audio CD's and Video DVD's have been placed on file for review at the NNMCAB Office, 94 Cities of Gold Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 87506. The written minutes are in the meeting.

* Requests for the Attachments section of these minutes may be requested for review from the NNMCAB Office by calling (505)989-1662.