



**Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board Meeting**

**March 20, 2013**

**1:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.**

**Marriott Pyramid Albuquerque North**

**Albuquerque, New Mexico 87109**

**Minutes**

---

**Meeting Attendees**

---

**Department of Energy**

Pete Maggiore, Assistant Manager Environmental Projects Office  
Ed Worth, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO)  
Lee Bishop, DOE Environmental Projects Office  
Christina Houston, DOE Environmental Projects Office  
Ray Wood, DOE Environmental Projects Office  
Tom Carver, DOE Environmental Projects Office  
Dave Nickless, DOE Environmental Projects Office

---

**NNMCAB Members**

1. Carlos Valdez, NNMCAB Chair
2. Manuel Pacheco, NNMCAB Vice-Chair
3. Nona Girardi
4. Stephen Schmelling
5. Art Mascarenas
6. Joey Tiano
7. Allison Majure
8. Adrian Chavez
9. Angel Quintana
10. Joseph Viarrial
11. Ralph Phelps
12. Deborah Shaw
13. Robert Villarreal
14. Lawrence Longacre
15. Douglas Sayre

---

**Excused Absences**

1. Nicole Castellano
2. Brenda Gallegos

3. Lawrence Garcia
4. Bonnie Lucas
5. Gerard Martinez
6. Alex Puglisi

---

**Absent**

1. Michael Loya
2. Nick Maestas

---

**NNMCAB Support Staff**

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

---

**Guests**

Patti Jones, Los Alamos National Security  
Bill Woldman, Office of US Senator Tom Udall  
Deanna Torres, Public  
Scott Kovac, Nuclear Watch of Northern New Mexico  
Chris Edgnu, EDI  
DeAnza Sapien, Regional Coalition of LANL Communities  
Bill O'Neill, Hudspeth & Associates  
Yasine Armstrong, Regional Coalition of LANL Communities  
Katie Richardson, Office of US Senator Martin Heinrich  
Jeff Mousseau, Los Alamos National Security  
Dan Cox, 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 March 20, 2013 at the Marriott Pyramid Albuquerque North in Albuquerque New Mexico. Mr. Ed Worth the 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 1:07 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 (13 Needed)****a. Roll Call**

Mr. William Alexander conducted roll call as the members arrived. At the call to order 13 members were present, establishing a quorum of the NNMCAB. Ms. Angel Quintana arrived at 1:26 p.m. and Ms. Allison Majure arrived at 1:56 p.m.

**b. Excused Absences**

Mr. Alexander recorded that: Nicole Castellano, Brenda Gallegos, Lawrence Garcia, Bonnie Lucas, Gerard Martinez, and Alex Puglisi had excused absences for this meeting.

**c. Absences**

Mr. Alexander recorded that Nick Maestas, and Michael Loya 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 March 20, 2013 NNMCAB meeting. Mr. Douglas Sayre moved to approve the agenda; Mr. Joey Tiano seconded the motion. The agenda for the meeting was unanimously approved as presented.

---

**V. Approval of Minutes for the January 30, 2013 meeting**

The board reviewed the minutes from the January 30, 2013 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 from the board. Mr. Lawrence Longacre stated that he would like to remind the board that the minutes are a legal document, and that they should reflect accurately what happened at the board meeting. He noted that he had a correction to the minutes, however could not locate the section, stating that he would get back to the board with the correction later. Mr. Valdez

1 noted that Mr. Longacre was correct and reminded everyone that the meetings are  
2 recorded. Mr. Manuel Pacheco made a motion to approve the minutes; Mr. Sayre seconded  
3 the motion. The board approved the minutes for the January 30, 2013 meeting.

---

4  
5 **VI. Old Business**

6 **a. Written Reports**

7 Mr. Valdez opened the floor for questions on the written reports.  
8

9 Ms. Menice Santistevan stated that the executive director's report noted some  
10 changes to upcoming meetings. Ms. Santistevan noted that the May meeting location  
11 had been changed to the Lodge at Santa Fe, and that the location for the Espanola  
12 meeting in November was now the Ohkay Conference center.  
13

14 Mr. Phelps stated that the Hill Top house was up for Auction in Los Alamos and  
15 is currently the scheduled meeting location for the NNM CAB July Meeting.  
16

17 Ms. Santistevan stated that the NNM CAB staff was aware of the Hill Top House  
18 auction and is currently looking for an alternative meeting location in the area.  
19

20 Ms. Santistevan also noted that the members should go over the NNM CAB  
21 Member contact list that was included in the meeting packet and notify the staff if any  
22 changes need to be made.  
23

24 **b. Waste Management Conference Report**

25 Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Ralph Phelps and Mr. Sayre if they would report to the  
26 board on the conference.  
27

28 Mr. Phelps stated that the conference was excellent since it attracts a large  
29 variety of individuals, and an opportunity to cover a wide range of waste related topics.  
30 He noted that at this year conference there was an emphasis on commercial nuclear  
31 waste. He also noted that this year there were more people from the Nuclear  
32 Regulatory Commission attending than in years past. One topic of interest was small  
33 nuclear reactors, as a source of clean nuclear energy. These reactors are designed to use  
34 some of the waste products as fuel for the reactor.  
35

36 Mr. Phelps asked Mr. Sayre for his input.  
37

38 Mr. Sayre responded that he appreciated the opportunity to attend the  
39 conference and interact with the individuals attending, especially the individuals from  
40 Canada. He noted that he hadn't realized that Canada had such a problem with disposal  
41 of radioactive waste. Mr. Sayre noted that the equipment that is on display at the  
42 conference, offered a unique opportunity to look into the available technologies. Mr.

1 Sayre also noted that one discussion that was of particular interest was on the Nevada  
2 Test Site, and that it was off the table as a high level waste disposal site.

3  
4 Mr. Valdez noted that Hanford has over 170 liquid waste tanks, of which 6 are  
5 leaking. He noted that Hanford is trying to get approval to move that waste to the  
6 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP); however, WIPP is not able to accept liquid waste,  
7 without some kind of re-permitting. The waste conference is an excellent place to gain  
8 knowledge in the waste arena to that end; Mr. Valdez noted that the NNMCAB would  
9 like to rework the budget to allow an additional board member to attend the  
10 conference next year.

11  
12 Mr. Pacheco asked if the Hazardous waste was regulated to the Canadian  
13 government or the private sector.

14  
15 Mr. Sayre noted that it was his understanding that the waste was regulated by  
16 the Canadian government.

17  
18 **c. Other Items**

19 Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments from Mr. Longacre, on his call for  
20 recommendations.

21  
22 Mr. Longacre stated that at the previous board meeting in January, he issued a  
23 challenge to the NNMCAB members to come up with recommendations before the next  
24 board meeting. Mr. Longacre noted that he had written three recommendations that he  
25 was sending over to Ms. Allison Majure for formatting; and submittal to the board. Mr.  
26 Longacre asked the chair how many recommendations had been received from other  
27 members.

28  
29 Mr. Valdez noted that there was one recommendation on the agenda; however  
30 he had not received any other recommendations that he was aware of.

31  
32 Mr. Valdez noted that the May meeting would be a full day meeting, with a tour  
33 of Buckman in the morning and the Board meeting in the afternoon.

---

34  
35 **VII. Public Comment Period**

36 Mr. Valdez opened the public comment period at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Valdez also noted that  
37 the NNMCAB was chartered to clean up legacy and Cold War era waste. No members of the  
38 public were signed up to address the board. Mr. Valdez closed the public comment period.

---

39  
40 **VIII. New Business**

41 Mr. Valdez opened the floor for new business.  
42

1 Mr. Sayre asked where the group would be meeting for the Buckman Tour.

2  
3 Mr. Valdez stated that the group would be meeting at the Lodge at Santa Fe, and noted  
4 that Ms. Santistevan would let the members know the exact time and place closer to the  
5 meeting.

6  
7 Dr. Girardi asked for information on the Los Alamos National Laboratory Tour.

8  
9 Ms. Santistevan replied that the tentative date for the tour was currently April 10<sup>th</sup>,  
10 noting that Los Alamos National Security (LANS) staff were checking on the availability of the  
11 date and would let the NNMCAB staff know.

12  
13 Mr. Valdez noted that Mr. Adam Duran had resigned from the NNMCAB, and that five  
14 new members had been appointed by DOE, bringing the number of members up to 23. He  
15 also noted that the NNMCAB was looking to increase the number of women on the board.

16  
17 Mr. Valdez stated that he had attended the Regional Coalition of LANL Communities  
18 (RCLC) meeting in Santa Fe on March 15<sup>th</sup>. He stated that the NNMCAB would be attempting  
19 to working closely with the RCLC to pass knowledge and experience between the two  
20 groups.

21 Mr. Valdez noted that due to sequestration the April Chairs meeting that was to be held  
22 at Hanford had been canceled. He stated that DOE was working on a webinar that would  
23 take the place of the meeting, noting that the webinar was tentatively scheduled for April  
24 25, 2013. He asked the members to please bring any questions they would like addressed at  
25 the webinar to the Chair; noting that the current topics on the agenda included: Public  
26 awareness in relation to water quality, the 33 Shafts, and the Framework Agreement.

27  
28 Dr. Girardi asked if the waste at the Hanford site would be a topic of conversation at the  
29 Chairs webinar.

30  
31 Mr. Valdez noted that he believed that it would be a major topic of conversation at the  
32 webinar.

33  
34 Mr. Bob Villarreal, asked where we stand on the issue of chromium, noting that it seems  
35 to be an issue at the national level. He also asked if it was feasible to treat the chromium in-  
36 situ.

37  
38 Mr. Worth stated the DOE/LANL are currently working on an interim action with the  
39 State to do a pump and treat, of the chromium contamination.

40  
41 Mr. Villarreal asked if the pump and treat would create chromium waste and if so how  
42 would that waste be treated.

1 Mr. Dan Cox stated that the pump and treat process would be using an ion exchange to  
2 treat the chromium and that there would be a primary waste stream resulting from the  
3 process.

4  
5 Mr. Villarreal noted that he would like to have more information on how the process  
6 was going to be handled.

7  
8 Mr. Valdez stated that the chromium contamination could be put on the Executive  
9 Committee agenda.

10  
11 Mr. Stephen Schmelling asked if the NNM CAB could get a presentation on the  
12 chromium plume and how it will be dealt with.

13  
14 Mr. Valdez noted that on April 25, 2013 the NNM CAB would be hosting an Open House  
15 for the Pojoaque Valley Student art work that is currently on display in the office.

16  
17 Ms. Santistevan stated that invitations to the event would be sent out to the members.  
18 She also noted that this was a great opportunity to increase our involvement with the  
19 public.

---

20  
21 **IX. Items from the DDFO**

22 Mr. Worth stated that this would be his last board meeting as the DDFO for the  
23 NNM CAB. He advised the members that the new DDFO for the NNM CAB would be Lee  
24 Bishop.

25 Mr. Worth stated that he would be giving the update for the Environmental Protection  
26 Agency (EPA). He noted that the EPA had an article noting that it was having issues with  
27 deliverables at Oak Ridge.

28 Mr. Worth noted that the enclosures that were used to do the excavation at MDA B had  
29 been removed, stating that the base course was being laid at the site, and that a small  
30 amount of waste was awaiting transfer. Mr. Worth also stated that a report to NMED  
31 confirming that the site was cleaned to residential standards was still in process. He  
32 estimated that the land transfer would likely occur in the FY'14 timeframe.

33 Mr. Worth also noted that Patti Jones would be taking over for Ms. Lorrie Bonds-Lopez.  
34 Ms. Jones would be working with the NNM CAB going forward.

35  
36 Mr. Longacre asked for information regarding the transfer of waste from Hanford to the  
37 WIPP site, he noted that he had seen an article regarding the subject in the Albuquerque  
38 Journal.

39  
40 Mr. Worth replied that WIPP was an option that was being looked at as a location for  
41 waste from Hanford.

1 Mr. Lee Bishop noted that he believed the intention was to submit a permit  
2 modification to the current permit, which would allow them to receive solidified waste from  
3 the Hanford site. He noted that a significant change to the permit would likely require public  
4 comment periods.

5  
6 Mr. Longacre stated that he had questions in regards to the transport of waste, over  
7 road ways; noting that the Hanford site was a large distance from the WIPP site and that the  
8 waste would likely have to be transported through multiple communities.

9  
10 Mr. Bishop replied that transport of waste to the WIPP site over the last 10 years had  
11 been completed without any major accidents. He noted that the drivers are subject to a very  
12 strict code regarding their ability to drive the trucks. Mr. Bishop stated that the waste would  
13 be transported along the approved routes that have long since been established.

14  
15 Mr. Longacre asked if the WIPP site was going to have the capacity to hold all of the  
16 waste that was currently being looked at for disposal at the site.

17  
18 Mr. Bishop responded that there was sufficient space to hold the amount of Transuranic  
19 waste (TRU) that was allowed in the original land withdrawal act. Currently we will need to  
20 wait and see what the volume of waste from Hanford would be.

21  
22 Mr. Longacre asked if it would be allowable to ask for an assessment on the amount of  
23 available space, and the current amount of space required for the disposal of the current  
24 inventory of waste, is there enough room.

25  
26 Mr. Bishop responded that would be a fair question once we know how much additional  
27 waste would be proposed. He noted that as of right now we do have sufficient room for the  
28 amount of waste that was applied for in the original land withdrawal act.

29  
30 Mr. Schmelling asked what is the current rate of shipments the WIPP site can receive  
31 and process.

32  
33 Mr. Bishop replied that the number of shipments that WIPP can receive in a week based  
34 on current funding is 16. He stated that previously when funding levels allowed WIPP could  
35 handle in excess of 30 shipments per week.

36  
37 Dr. Girardi noted that K-UNM had an interesting program on last week regarding the  
38 transport of waste from Hanford to WIPP. She suggested that members could listen to the  
39 program on the website or possibly read the transcripts. She noted that she thought it  
40 would be interesting background information for the members.

41  
42 Mr. Valdez moved on to the presentation of certificates.



1 Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Phelps to come forward to receive his certificate of appreciation,  
2 for his dedicated service to the NNMCAB.

3  
4 Mr. Phelps thanked the members for presenting him the certificate.

5  
6 Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Ed Worth to come forward and receive his certificate of  
7 appreciation for his dedicated service to the NNMCAB as the DDFO.

8  
9 Mr. Worth thanked the members for the certificate and wished everyone the best in  
10 their future endeavors.

11  
12 The NNMCAB took a 15 Minute Break.  
13

---

14  
15 **X. Presentations**

16 **a. Presentation on Results of Aerial RAD Survey**

17 Mr. Tom Carver from DOE gave a presentation to the NNMCAB on the Results of  
18 the Aerial Radiation Survey that was conducted of LANL. A hard copy of the  
19 presentation may be obtained at the NNMCAB website <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov>  
20 under presentations. A video of the presentation is also available on the NNMCAB's  
21 YouTube Channel NNMCAB.

22  
23 **b. Questions**

24 Mr. Pacheco asked if the flyovers were one flyover per overlay.

25  
26 Mr. Carver replied that yes it was one flyover per overlay.

27  
28 Mr. Phelps asked if the americium-241 was encapsulated or was it dispersed  
29 contamination.

30  
31 Mr. Carver noted that the americium-241 was in the waste at Area G.

32  
33 Mr. Bishop noted that the waste was in a containerized form.

34  
35 Mr. Sayre asked why the gross counts are normalized to 150 feet above ground.

36  
37 Mr. Carver responded that DOE to the requirements of the fly over, and the  
38 altitude that the plane must be at, the results must be normalized to what the dose  
39 rates are at ground level.

40  
41 Mr. Longacre asked why is there not a narrative on what LANL has done about  
42 the areas of know contamination.

1 Mr. Carver noted that the contamination was on LANL property and that  
2 currently it is not migrating off the site.

3  
4 Mr. Schmelling asked how high above the ground do you fly when the survey is  
5 conducted and do you make actual measurements at ground level for verification.

6  
7 Mr. Carver noted that the background surveys that are completed are used as a  
8 form of verification.

9  
10 Dr. Girardi asked if the higher areas of radiation in the town site were in the  
11 canyon bottoms.

12  
13 Mr. Carver replied that the higher levels were in the canyon bottoms.

14  
15 Ms. Majure asked what the cost of the survey was.

16  
17 Mr. Maggiore responded that the cost was around 50K.

18  
19 Ms. Majure asked if it would be 17 years before the next survey was conducted.

20  
21 Mr. Maggiore noted that would depend on the value of the information, he  
22 suggested that the NNM CAB discuss the issue and determine if it was information that  
23 should be looked periodically.

24  
25 **c. Presentation on Status of the 33 Shafts**

26 Mr. Dave Nickless and Mr. Dan Cox from DOE and LANS gave a presentation to  
27 the NNM CAB on the Status of the 33 Shafts at Material Disposal Area (MDA) G. A hard  
28 copy of the presentation may be obtained at the NNM CAB website  
29 <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov> under presentations. A video of the presentation is also  
30 available on the NNM CAB's YouTube Channel NNM CAB.

31  
32 **d. Questions**

33 Dr. Shaw asked if the decay rate was altered by packaging.

34  
35 Mr. Cox replied that the packaging has no effect on the decay rate of the  
36 material.

37  
38 Mr. Villarreal noted that with innovative thinking LANL can learn how to do this,  
39 working through each type of waste from the easiest to the most difficult. He also noted  
40 that if WIPP shuts down there won't be any place to move the waste to, and what do we  
41 do if the waste starts to leak. That would complicate the issue.

1 Mr. Cox responded that as time goes by there will be less dose to the works that  
2 would be handling the waste.

3  
4 Mr. Schmelling asked if there were any milestones in place for when the  
5 decisions would be made.

6  
7 Mr. Nickless responded that there is a schedule for when the NEPA process and  
8 other project decisions will be executed.

9  
10 Mr. Schmelling asked if the NNM CAB could get access to the schedule.

11  
12 Mr. Nickless stated that the NNM CAB could have access to the schedule.

13  
14 Mr. Schmelling asked what the cost of a NEPA study would be.

15  
16 Mr. Nickless replied that the cost of the NEPA study would run about 500K; risk  
17 modeling would be an additional 500K.

18  
19 Mr. Schmelling asked if LANL was monitoring the site.

20  
21 Mr. Cox responded that there are 16 monitoring wells around AREA G.

22  
23 Mr. Bishop noted that the materials in the 33 Shafts are in solid form and the  
24 Shafts are all capped, LANL does not believe that there has been any water infiltration  
25 into the shafts.

26  
27 Mr. Schmelling asked how long would it take for the decay rate to reach zero.

28  
29 Mr. Bishop replied that the rule of thumb is that seven half-life's and the decay  
30 rate reaches zero.

31  
32 Mr. Schmelling asked if fission products are considered TRU waste.

33  
34 Mr. Nickless responded that fission products are not TRU waste by itself which  
35 would make them remote handled TRU waste.

36  
37 Ms. Majure asked what the original intent was, were the 33 shafts intended to  
38 be retrievable, is removing the waste cost effective.

39  
40 Mr. Cox noted that any waste placed in the ground after 1970 was supposed to  
41 be placed in a retrievable state, Pit 9 is a good example of this.

1 Mr. Bishop noted that in the 70's and 80's there was no waste acceptance  
2 criteria to work to, with this in mind items that were packaged then no longer meet the  
3 requirements to be disposed of at WIPP.  
4

5 Dr. Girardi asked what are the advantages of digging the 33 Shafts up and  
6 disposing of them at WIPP. Secondly, what other areas of contamination at LANL would  
7 need to be removed or contained if LANL was shut down in 150 years.  
8

9 Mr. Cox responded that there were not a lot of advantages to moving the waste  
10 in the 33 Shafts. To answer the second question significant amount of material in Area G  
11 will remain in Area G that 63 acres will never likely be turned over to the public.  
12

13 Mr. Longacre asked why are we still grappling with the question of why, how,  
14 when, should we remove the waste after 70 years.  
15

16 Mr. Cox replied that in 1979 the problem was created, and the 33 Shafts were  
17 the best available option at the time.  
18

19 Dr. Shaw noted that the delay could be attributed to the changes in the laws  
20 over the years, and the availability of the funds to complete the work.  
21

22 Mr. Bishop thanked Mr. Cox and Mr. Nickless for the presentation.  
23

---

24 **XI. Items From Liaison Members**

25 **a. Los Alamos National Laboratory**

26 Mr. Cox filled in for Mr. Jeff Mousseau. Mr. Cox stated that the number one  
27 priority was groundwater; the second priority is the 3706 campaign. He also noted that  
28 the pace for the 3706 campaign would remain at its current level pending approval of  
29 the budget. The numbers for the end of the month put the 3706 campaign about 100  
30 cubic meters ahead of schedule.

31 In terms of ground water the chromium work will be progressing. Right now LANL is  
32 working on the treatment skids and that effort will continue.  
33

34 Mr. Valdez asked for the status of the CMRR  
35

36 Mr. Cox responded that he knew that the CMRR had been funded at a minimal  
37 level but that was all the information that he had regarding the status of the CMRR.  
38

39 Mr. Valdez asked for an update on the MOX  
40

41 Mr. Bishop responded that the final EIS was issues in March; however that does  
42 not constitute a decision from DOE.

1 Mr. Valdez asked for information on the Greater than Class C

2  
3 Mr. Bishop responded that the final EIS for the Greater than Class C is scheduled  
4 to be release in Late Spring.

5  
6 **b. New Mexico Environment Department**

7 No representative from NMED present

8  
9 **c. Environmental Protection Agency**

10 Update given by DDFO Mr. Ed Worth

11  
12 **d. Department of Energy**

13 Mr. Pete Maggiore updated the NNM CAB on the current status of the budget.  
14 He noted that the current Continuing Resolution (CR) expires on March 27<sup>th</sup>. He stated  
15 that it was his understanding that the House and Senate had passed a budget that  
16 would place the budget for the remainder of FY'13 at the Sequestered CR level. Mr.  
17 Maggiore informed the members that DOE HQ was looking at reprogramming options to  
18 free up money. LANL appears to be a priority for the Office of Management and Budget  
19 (OMB), to receive additional funds if possible.

20 Mr. Maggiore noted that a letter had been sent from NMED Secretary Dave  
21 Martin to Mayor David Coss of Santa Fe regarding the budget for the cleanup, the  
22 budget number suggested in the letter was 255 million. The letter suggests options that  
23 can be taken depending on the budget outcome.

24 Mr. Maggiore also noted that the FY'14 budget was due to be announced on  
25 April 8, 2013.

26  
27 Mr. Valdez noted that Hanford had just laid off 235 individuals, what is the  
28 prospect for LANL.

29  
30 Mr. Maggiore responded that part of that would depend on the budget level;  
31 however, he noted that LANL had taken steps in the previous year with the Voluntary  
32 Separation Program, and internal budget controls to place it in a better position for the  
33 upcoming FY's. Mr. Maggiore also noted that at this time it was not possible to rule out  
34 the possibilities of furloughs and layoffs.

35  
36 Ms. Majure asked how DOE works with appropriations, do we have lobbyists.

37  
38 Mr. Maggiore replied that there was an internal process at DOE that passes the  
39 numbers over to OMB.

40  
41 Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Maggiore for an Update on the Chromium Plume.  
42

1 Mr. Maggiore responded that a Corrective Measures Evaluation would need to  
2 be submitted to the state and approved. Mr. Maggiore noted that for the chromium  
3 plume LANL is working on an interim measure, using a pump and treat and ion  
4 exchange. The takeaway message is that LANL is doing everything it can in order to  
5 accelerate the cleanup.

6  
7 Mr. Valdez asked is Mr. Maggiore had any information on pre-permitting.

8  
9 Mr. Maggiore replied that there was a meeting at the NNM CAB office regarding  
10 the permitting, and currently DOE was in the process of evaluating if that was a valuable  
11 forum in the process.

12  
13 Mr. Villarreal asked if there were two or three chromium plumes.

14  
15 Mr. Maggiore responded that he was only aware of one plume.

16  
17 Mr. Villarreal asked if there was any hydrologic communication between the  
18 east and west sides of the Rio Grande River.

19  
20 Mr. Maggiore replied that hydrologic communication between the two sides  
21 would be addressed in the proposed NNM CAB briefing on the chromium plume.

22  
23 Mr. Bill Woldman from Senator Udall's office stated that the Senate had passed  
24 the budget, and that the House was currently in debate. He also noted that the House  
25 had more flexibility in defense budget, and the Senate has more flexibility in other areas  
26 of the budget.

27 Mr. Villarreal asked if the waste from Hanford would be subject to the same  
28 rigorous level of tests that the original wastes in the current permit were subjected to.  
29 Noting that the study was a 10 year study that LANL performed on the waste it would be  
30 sending to WIPP.

31  
32 Mr. Bishop replied that one way to regulate waste is by point of origin; He  
33 speculated that the waste from Hanford would not be in a liquid form but would need  
34 to be solidified. Noting that during the solidification process the pH could be altered.  
35 Mr. Bishop further noted that the proposed waste transfer was in the very early stages.

---

36  
37 XII. Consideration and Action on Draft Recommendation 2013-02

38 Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments on Draft Recommendation 2013-02  
39 "Recommendation to Review Material Disposal Areas at LANL, in addition to Technical Area  
40 54 for Risks Associated With Fires".

41  
42 Dr. Shaw noted that she was in favor of the recommendation.

1 Mr. Villarreal noted that the concern he had with the recommendation was that it did  
2 not describe the type of waste that was being addressed by the recommendation.

3  
4 Mr. Worth noted that the MDA's across LANL have a variety of wastes stored in  
5 different configurations, from trenched to shafts, and drums.

6  
7 Mr. Longacre stated that the danger of fire to the LANL should be moot. There is not a  
8 single site at the LANL that could not be protected from fire. If you cut down all the trees  
9 and the brush and the slash and everything then you're not bothered any more. I don't  
10 know why LANL keeps milking the fires the point is moot.

11  
12 Mr. Worth responded that we would be happy to tell you what we have done to protect  
13 the area from fire.

14  
15 Mr. Bishop responded that it was not as simple as cutting down all the trees, without  
16 the vegetation in place the erosion caused by the summer storms could cause the  
17 contamination to migrate. There are also spotted owl sites habitats and cultural sites that  
18 need to be considered, so it is not as simple as just removing all the fuel sources.

19  
20 Dr. Girardi noted that the recommendation asked LANL and DOE to address questions  
21 that are coming up now. Dr. Girardi also noted that cutting down the vegetation especially  
22 the large established ponderosas does not have a benefit with fire suppression and is likely  
23 to cause erosion.

24  
25 Ms. Majure noted that she had some small changes to the recommendation, such as  
26 item one performs a review should possibly be changed to compiles a review. Also should  
27 we list the MDA's that should be part of the review?

28  
29 Mr. Worth noted that the NNMCAB should add hazardous or radiological waste to the  
30 list to cover all the bases.

31  
32 Mr. Pacheco moved to accept the recommendation with amendments, Mr. Phelps  
33 seconded the motion. The motion to approve and submit recommendation 2013-02 passed  
34 unanimously.

---

35  
36 **XIII. Public Comment**

37 Mr. Valdez opened the public comment period at 6:06 p.m.; he invited Mr. Scott Kovac  
38 to address the board.

39  
40 Mr. Kovac stated that he would like to thank Mr. Cox and his workers for all their hard  
41 work. He stated that he had a difference of opinion on the importance of the Consent  
42 Order. He noted that the CO called for all the TRU waste at MDA G to be removed. The

benefits of the Framework agreement are questionable. Mr. Kovac noted that whatever the length of time it takes to remove the waste no length of time is too long. Depending on how you add it up there are approximately 700K cubic meters of waste in unlined trenches at MDA G, perched between a rift and a dormant super volcano. The laboratory and NMED have been working on a Corrective Measures Evaluation for MDA G that CME is currently on revision 4. We guess that NMED may lean toward Cap and Cover, in agreement with LANL. Mr. Kovac noted that there are examples for removing the waste, MDA B is an example of 6 acres of waste being removed. LANL can remove the waste if they want to. Mr. Kovac stated that he would encourage the NNM CAB to remove the waste from the 33 Shafts.

Ms. DeAnza Sapien noted that the RCLC was interested in a cooperative relationship with the NNM CAB. She asked that the NNM CAB please let the RCLC know how they could help in the future. Ms. Sapien also invited Carlos and the members to attend the RCLC meetings.

Mr. Valdez noted the RCLC can lobby while the NNM CAB cannot. Mr. Valdez closed the public comment period at 6:15 p.m.

---

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

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

Mr. Adrian Chavez noted that he had learned quite a bit today, and thanked everyone for the opportunity to serve on the board.

Ms. Majure noted that she had learned what TRU waste meant beyond Uranium on the periodic table, and thanked everyone for the work that they do.

Mr. Tiano, Mr. Villarreal, Mr. Sayre, and Mr. Viarrial thanked everyone for their hard work and noted that it had been a good meeting.

Mr. Schmelling, Dr. Girardi, noted that the presentation on the 33 Shafts was good, and thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

Mr. Pacheco noted that he had hoped for more public involvement at the Albuquerque meeting. He also stated the he hoped that the US government would get their act together on the budget concerns, so the NNM CAB could continue its mission.

Ms. Santistevan thanked everyone for attending the board meeting. Stating for the members the dates for the next meeting and reminding the members of the LANL tour that was being scheduled for April.

Mr. Worth thanked everyone for attending.



Mr. Bishop noted that he was happy to be back, and was looking forward to working with the members for years to come.

Mr. Phelps thanked everyone for the privilege of serving on the board. He noted that going forward the NNM CAB might consider having another meeting like the special meeting that was scheduled early in 2012. He also urged the NNM CAB leadership to look for new platform for the recommendations going forward for 2013 that would take advantage of all the new expertise.

Mr. Longacre had no comment.

Mr. Valdez thanked the members for their hard work.

---

**XV. Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, Mr. Worth adjourned the meeting at 6:28 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 03/20/2013
2. Final NNM CAB Meeting Minutes for 01/30/2013
3. Draft Recommendation 2013-02
4. Report from Carlos Valdez, NNM CAB Chair
5. Report from Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
6. Waste Management Conference Trip Report from Ralph Phelps, NNM CAB Member
7. Presentation by DOE Aerial Rad Survey
8. Presentation by DOE/LANL on the 33 Shafts

---

**Public Notice:**

**\*All NNM CAB meetings are recorded. Audio CDs and Video disks have been placed on file for review at the NNM CAB 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 from the NNM CAB Office by calling (505)989-1662.**