



**Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board Meeting**

**May 22, 2013**

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

**Lodge at Santa Fe**

**Santa Fe, New Mexico 87506**

**Minutes**

---

**Meeting Attendees**

---

**Department of Energy**

- Geoffrey Beausoleil, Acting Site Manager Los Alamos Site Office
- Pete Maggiore, Assistant Manager Environmental Projects Office
- Lee Bishop, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO)
- Cheryl Rodriguez, DOE Environmental Projects Office
- Imelda Maez, DOE Environmental Projects Office

---

**NNMCAB Members**

1. Carlos Valdez, NNMCAB Chair
2. Manuel Pacheco, NNMCAB Vice-Chair
3. Adrian Chavez
4. Bonnie Lucas
5. Lawrence Longacre
6. Allison Majure
7. Joseph Viarrial
8. Nona Girardi
9. Stephen Schmelling
10. Joey Tiano
11. Bob Villarreal
12. Doug Sayre
13. Alex Puglisi

---

**Excused Absences**

1. Michael Loya
2. Brenda Gallegos
3. Angel Quintana
4. Deborah Shaw
5. Gerard Martinez

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

---

**Absent**

Lawrence Garcia

---

**NNMCAB Support Staff**

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

---

**Guests**

Erika Schwender, Buckman Direct Diversion  
Gary Durrant, Buckman Direct Diversion  
Scott Kovac, Nuclear Watch New Mexico  
Jeff Walker, Elvaido Environmental  
Dennis Roybal, Public  
Patti Jones, Los Alamos National Security  
Dave Cobrain, New Mexico Environmental Department

1 **Minutes**

2 **I. Call to Order**

3 The bi-monthly meeting of the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board  
4 (NNMCAB) was held on May 22, 2013 at the Lodge at Santa Fe in Santa Fe New Mexico. Mr.  
5 Lee Bishop the Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) stated that on behalf of the  
6 Department of Energy (DOE) the meeting of the NNMCAB was called to order at 1:23 p.m.

7 Mr. Bishop recognized Mr. Carlos Valdez the NNMCAB Chair. The Chair presided at the  
8 meeting.

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

---

11  
12 **II. Establishment of a Quorum (11 Needed)**

13 **a. Roll Call**

14 Mr. William Alexander conducted roll call as the members arrived. At the call to order  
15 13 members were present, establishing a quorum of the NNMCAB.

16  
17 **b. Excused Absences**

18 Mr. Alexander recorded that: Mike Loya, Brenda Gallegos, Angel Quintana, Deborah  
19 Shaw, and Gerard Martinez had excused absences for this meeting.

20  
21 **c. Absences**

22 Mr. Alexander recorded that Lawrence Garcia was absent.

---

23  
24 **III. Welcome and Introductions**

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

---

27  
28 **IV. Approval of Agenda**

29 The board reviewed the agenda for the May 22, 2013 NNMCAB meeting.

30  
31 Mr. Alex Puglisi made a motion to remove Draft Recommendation 2013-07 from the  
32 agenda for the May 22, 2013 meeting. He asked that it be moved to the July 31, 2013 board  
33 meeting agenda. Mr. Doug Sayre seconded the motion. The members discussed removing  
34 Draft Recommendation 2013-07 from the current agenda. Ms. Menice Santistevan noted  
35 that the draft recommendation could be added to the agenda for the July Combined  
36 Committee meeting or the July Board Meeting. The members voted 5 for and 6 against; the  
37 motion to remove the recommendation from the agenda failed.

38  
39 Mr. Douglas Sayre made a motion to approve the agenda as is; Mr. Joey Tiano seconded  
40 the motion. The agenda for the meeting was unanimously approved.

41  
42

1       **V.       Public Comment Period**

2               Mr. Valdez opened the public comment period at 1:30. With no members of the public  
3               wishing to address the board Mr. Valdez closed the public comment period.

---

4  
5       **VI.       Approval of Minutes**

6               The board reviewed the minutes from the March 20, 2013 NNM CAB meeting. By  
7               ongoing instruction from DOE Headquarters, the minutes were previously reviewed and  
8               certified by the NNM CAB Chair, Mr. Valdez. Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments from  
9               the board. Dr. Nona Girardi stated there was a typographical error on page 16 line 31 the  
10              word “shafted” should be “shafts”. She also noted an issue with the wording on page 17  
11              lines 1 and 2. Mr. Valdez responded that the lines would be reworded for clarity. Mr. Tiano  
12              made a motion to approve the minutes as amended; Mr. Stephen Schmelling seconded the  
13              motion. The board approved the minutes from the March meeting.

---

14  
15       **VII.      Old Business**

16              **a.       Written Reports**

17                      Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments on the written reports. With no comments  
18                      on the written reports, Mr. Valdez asked for a brief comment on the Mercury  
19                      Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) from the members who attended  
20                      the public hearing.

21  
22                      Mr. Bob Villarreal stated that four NNM CAB members attended the hearing at the  
23                      Crown Plaza in Albuquerque. He noted that very few people from the public attended  
24                      the hearing; however, there was great confrontation between the public and DOE. Mr.  
25                      Villarreal stated that during the hearing he felt it was not a good time to ask questions  
26                      due to the contentious nature of the conversation.

27  
28                      Mr. Manuel Pacheco noted that he felt the atmosphere at the hearing was very  
29                      polarized. He stated that he was disappointed with the fact that on the Mercury SEIS the  
30                      U.S. Government was already out of compliance; based on the fact that the ACT became  
31                      effective Jan 1, 2013 and the government as yet has no facility or operating funds  
32                      available. Mr. Pacheco noted that he would like the board to put together comments in  
33                      regards to the SEIS before the June 3, 2013 public comment deadline.

34  
35                      Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Bishop what the board could do in regards to developing a  
36                      recommendation or a written document for the Mercury SEIS.

37  
38                      Mr. Bishop responded that the board could develop a recommendation to be  
39                      submitted as part of the formal comment period. He noted that he had encouraged the  
40                      members to attend the hearing and that this was an opportunity for the board to  
41                      participate in the National Policies that DOE is currently working on. He stated that  
42                      comments in the form of a recommendation or official letter would be acceptable.

1 Mr. Tiano stated that he would support a recommendation that proposed using the  
2 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

3  
4 Mr. Valdez appointed an Ad-Hoc committee to draft a letter or recommendation for  
5 the board members to review at the June 12, 2013 combined committee meeting. Mr.  
6 Valdez appointed: Mr. Villarreal, Mr. Tiano, and Mr. Pacheco.

7  
8 Dr. Girardi asked if everything in the Mercury SEIS was within the scope of the  
9 NNM CAB.

10  
11 Mr. Bishop stated that the Mercury SEIS was within NNM CAB scope because it was an  
12 Act enacted by Congress, with responsibility of implementation given to DOE with flow  
13 down to Environmental Management Programs.

14  
15 **b. Report from Nominating Committee**

16 Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Schmelling to update the members on the report from the  
17 Nominating Committee.

18  
19 Mr. Schmelling stated that he had attempted to contact all the members either by  
20 phone or e-mail, and gather information on nominees. He noted that Mr. Valdez and  
21 Mr. Pacheco had stated that they would like to run for Chair and Vice-Chair respectively,  
22 and that there were no other nominations at this time.

23  
24 Ms. Santistevan stated that nominations could be made up until the date of the  
25 election; she also noted that the elections would be held at the July 31, 2013 board  
26 meeting in Los Alamos.

27  
28 Mr. Valdez noted that the election had been pushed up this year to accommodate the  
29 travel arrangements that would be necessary for the fall chairs meeting.

---

30  
31 **VIII. New Business**

32 Mr. Valdez announced that Congress had approved an additional 19 million dollars for  
33 work at LANL, with the possibility of an additional 21 million dollars from the National  
34 Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

35  
36 Mr. Valdez noted that Art Mascarenas had resigned from the board, and that the  
37 NNM CAB was actively recruiting to back fill the position.

38  
39 Ms. Santistevan stated that the next nomination package for positions being appointed  
40 in November was due the 28<sup>th</sup> of June.

41

1 Mr. Valdez stated that NMED Secretary David Martin had been replaced by Mr. Ryan  
2 Flynn. He also noted that at the national level, Dr. Ernest Moniz had been confirmed by  
3 Congress as the new DOE Secretary.  
4

5 Mr. Valdez stated that he would like to draft a letter from the NNMCAB to the New  
6 Mexico Congressional Delegation for their efforts in securing the additional money for LANL.  
7 He asked the members for their opinions on drafting a letter.  
8

9 Mr. Sayre noted that it would be a great idea and recommended that the NNMCAB take  
10 an action to compose a letter.  
11

12 Mr. Villarreal asked if there would be a limitation on the use of the new funds, and if any  
13 of the funds would be used for the 33 Shafts.  
14

15 Mr. Bishop responded that a total of 40 million dollars had been requested, noting that  
16 the 21 million dollars from NNSA is still pending. He stated that the 19 million dollars that  
17 had been reprogramed would be used for meeting the 3706 Campaign goals. Mr. Bishop  
18 also noted that the 21 million dollars in NNSA funds would be used for cleanup: Chromium  
19 plume, Canon De Valle, Monitoring Wells, and a small amount on the 33 Shafts  
20 environmental assessment.  
21

22 Ms. Allison Majure stated that she would be inclined to have language in the letter that  
23 states that "the NNMCAB appreciates you providing this funding that enables you to keep  
24 your promise."  
25

26 Mr. Valdez noted that it was DOE who made the promise, and to keep in mind the  
27 proposed letter was to the New Mexico Congressional Delegation, not to DOE.  
28

29 Ms. Bonnie Lucas stated that she could see where Ms. Majure was coming from, and  
30 noted that she felt the NNMCAB should make sure to word the letter in a diplomatic way.  
31

32 Mr. Puglisi agreed with Ms. Majure, stating that we are not meeting the Consent Order  
33 (CO) with the additional funds only a portion of it; however, we should thank the delegation  
34 for its effort in securing the additional funding.  
35

36 Mr. Pacheco noted that Ms. Majure had an excellent recommendation, and stated that  
37 the Congressional Delegation is a junior delegation and may not yet have a full grasp of the  
38 EM legacy waste cleanup. Ms. Pacheco also noted that with any contract the language  
39 always exists "as funding allows" so you will never really see the word promise.  
40

41 Mr. Valdez stated that he would work on composing a letter and send it out to the  
42 members for review.

---

**IX. Items form the DDFO**

Mr. Bishop stated that the position for Los Alamos Site Manager was open and currently being advertised. In the interim, Mr. Geoffrey Beausoleil the Site Manager for the Sandia Office would be the acting Site Manager for the Los Alamos Site Office.

Mr. Bishop noted that the first shipment of waste was sent to the Waste Control Specialists Facility (WCSF) near Andrews, Texas. The waste that was shipped was Class C Waste. He stated that the WCSF is the first facility that is above a Class A Disposal Site, which is available for use by the federal government that is not a federal facility

Mr. Bishop informed the members that the NNM CAB trip to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and WCSF scheduled for November had received approval from management.

He also stated that likely within the next year or so WIPP would need to stand down disposal operations, to make repairs to the disposal shaft which has started to bow-in. Mr. Bishop stated that he did not think that it would impact the 3706 campaign which is scheduled to be completed June 2014. It was noted that the stand down would not affect LANLs ability to process waste; however, it would create a back log of waste that would need to be shipped to WIPP once operations resume.

The NNM CAB took a 15 Minute Break

---

**X. Presentation****a. Presentation on Chromium Field Work**

Mr. Dave McInroy and Mr. Danny Katzman from LANL gave a presentation to the NNM CAB on the Upcoming Chromium Field Work. 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 is also available on the NNM CAB's YouTube Channel NNM CAB.

**b. Questions**

Mr. Schmelling asked if the chromium plume was expanding.

Mr. McInroy responded that the there is not enough data to support a conclusion that it's moving.

Mr. Sayre asked if there was chromium recorded in adjacent wells.

Mr. McInroy noted that there had been detections in all of the adjacent wells.

Ms. Majure asked about pumping well R-50.

Mr. McInroy stated that R-50 sits on the border between LANL and San Ildofonso, and LANL does not want to pull contamination towards the border.

1  
2 Mr. Katzman noted that LANL is going to utilize R-42 and R-48 to learn about the  
3 groundwater in the area and the pressures that pumping the wells will cause in the  
4 groundwater.

5  
6 Mr. Tiano asked how long it takes for water to get down to the regional aquifer.

7  
8 Mr. Katzman responded that as near as they have determined it takes sometime  
9 between 20 to 30 years.

10  
11 Mr. Tiano asked about the reinjection process.

12  
13 Mr. Katzman responded that the re-injected water can be used to manage the  
14 contaminated water, by pushing the water in the direction you want.

15  
16 Mr. Lawrence Longacre asked if it would hurt to leave the chromium contamination as  
17 is since it was in such a remote location.

18  
19 Mr. Katzman responded that the CO views all groundwater as a valid resource, and  
20 that is the stand point that LANL is taking on the chromium contamination.

21  
22 Dr. Girardi asked if the plan for treating the pumped water was to reduce it using the  
23 wetlands.

24  
25 Mr. McInroy stated that the water would be treated using ion exchange columns to  
26 remove the chromium, and holding ponds to store the water for testing to confirm that  
27 the chromium was removed; before the treated water would be land applied.

28  
29 Dr. Girardi asked if the aquifer that had the chromium plume goes into the Buckman  
30 well field or below it.

31  
32 Mr. Katzman responded that evidence suggests that there is no interaction between  
33 the chromium contaminated aquifer and the Buckman well field aquifer.

34  
35 Mr. Pacheco asked if that conclusion was based on elevation.

36  
37 Mr. Katzman noted that it is based on geochemical fingerprints of the aquifers, and  
38 studies on the pressures that pumping created in the groundwater formation. Mr.  
39 Katzman stated that even with the evidence suggesting that the well fields are  
40 separated LANL understands it's obligation to continue monitoring the Buckman well  
41 field.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

**XI. Update from Liaison Members**

**a. Los Alamos National Laboratory**

Mr. Jeff Mousseau gave an update on the Environmental programs, status of the 3706 campaign and Corrective Actions Program (CAP) "Environmental Programs Citizens Advisory Board Update". A hard copy of the update may be obtained at the NNMCAB website <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov> under presentations.

**b. New Mexico Environment Department**

Mr. John Kieling stated that he wanted to update the members on a few items that NMED had been working on with LANL. He stated that the permit modification for TA-63 that was submitted last year had undergone public comment with a majority of the comments coming from LANL. He noted that NMED would like to get the TA-63 facility moving forward.

Mr. Kieling informed the members that NMED had recently met with LANL concerning the work off on the 3706 campaign, and where the waste was coming from and going to.

He also noted that the state would be meeting later in the week with LANL concerning the chromium field work.

Mr. Kieling stated that NMED had issued certificates of completion for 12 sites, with an additional two submittals slated to be responded to in the next two to four weeks. He also noted that that during the week of May 13 – 17 NMED completed a RCRA inspection at LANL.

Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Kieling if he knew which state had a more favorable regulatory regime in managing mercury storage, Texas or New Mexico.

Mr. Kieling stated that at this time he could not answer that question, as he was not familiar with Texas regulations.

Dr. Girardi asked Mr. Kieling how he felt about mercury storage in New Mexico.

Mr. Kieling stated that if the application meets the regulatory requirements then we will move forward.

Mr. Puglisi asked why the facility is labeled as storage and not a disposal facility, as it appears there is not intended use for the mercury

Mr. Kieling responded that it was his understanding that there is a future intended use for the mercury.

**c. Environmental Protection Agency Region 6**

1 No Representative from EPA was present, as Rich Mayer was working in the areas  
2 recently hit by devastating tornados.

3  
4 **d. Department of Energy**

5 Mr. Pete Maggiore gave the update for DOE. He stated that the sequestered budget  
6 level was 173 million dollars; the budget under the Continuing Resolution was 188  
7 million dollars. He noted that the additional 19 million dollars from EM and the 21  
8 million dollars proposed from NNSA would bring the budget back up to 213 million  
9 dollars. The original budget proposal for FY'13 was 239 million dollars.

10 Mr. Maggiore stated that groundwater discharge permit for the Radioactive Liquid  
11 Waste Treatment Facility (RLWTF) was under review with NMED. He noted that this  
12 would be the first time the RLWTF would be placed under NMED water quality  
13 authority. Additionally he noted that a permit application had been submitted for the  
14 RANT facility.

15 Mr. Maggiore stated that he had been working with the Governor of San Ildefonso on  
16 the status of the chromium plume, and plans regarding the proposed field work.

17 Mr. Maggiore introduced the new acting Los Alamos Site Manager, Geoffrey  
18 Beausoleil.

19  
20 Mr. Beausoleil took the opportunity to speak to the members; he gave a brief  
21 background of his history working with the DOE.

---

22  
23 **XII. Consideration and Action on Draft Recommendations**

24 **a. Draft Recommendation 2013-04 "Update on Status of Submitted Recommendations"**

25 Mr. Valdez gave a short overview of Draft Recommendation 2013-04 and opened the  
26 floor for questions and comments on the recommendation.

27  
28 Mr. Longacre stated that it shouldn't be necessary to have a recommendation asking  
29 for a status. He noted that his aim in authoring Draft Recommendation 2013-04 was to  
30 have DOE periodically give the NNM CAB a status on recommendations that have been  
31 submitted by the board.

32  
33 Mr. Valdez stated that the NNM CAB could submit this as a recommendation or make  
34 it a standing agenda item in lieu of a formal recommendation.

35  
36 Mr. Schmelling stated that he thought it was a good idea but did not feel that we  
37 needed a formal recommendation.

38  
39 Mr. Valdez responded that currently a table is used to track recommendations, and  
40 the table could be updated on a bi-monthly basis.

41

1 Mr. Bishop stated that the recommendation table could be added to the DDFO  
2 portion of the agenda, and he would be more than happy to provide the update to the  
3 NNMCAB during the board meetings.  
4

5 Mr. Pacheco made a motion to have draft recommendation 2013-04 become a  
6 standing agenda item; Mr. Tiano seconded the motion. The members voted all in favor,  
7 the motion to have 2013-04 become a standing agenda item passed.  
8

9 **b. Draft Recommendation 2013-05 “Recommendation for LANL Clean-up”**

10 Mr. Valdez gave an overview of Draft Recommendation 2013-05 and opened the floor  
11 for questions and comments on the recommendation.  
12

13 Mr. Longacre stated that the revisions to Draft Recommendation 2013-05 that had  
14 been made with his approval, after his discussion with Mr. Valdez earlier in the month;  
15 now felt had changed the intent he was trying to convey. Mr. Longacre stated that at  
16 this time he felt this was no longer the recommendation he had authored, and wished  
17 to withdraw the recommendation from consideration.  
18

19 Mr. Valdez asked for a motion to kill Draft Recommendation 2013-05.  
20

21 Mr. Puglisi made a motion to disapprove the recommendation; Mr. Tiano seconded  
22 the motion. The members voted 6 for and 3 against; the motion to disapprove  
23 Recommendation 2013-05 passed.  
24

25 **c. Draft Recommendation 2013-07 “Realign Consent Order Priorities”**

26 Mr. Valdez gave an overview of Draft Recommendation 2013-07 and opened the floor  
27 for questions and comments on the recommendation.  
28

29 Mr. Puglisi stated that he was opposed to the recommendation as written. He noted  
30 his opposition was concerning the lines on renegotiation of the CO and the lines on risk  
31 based approach. Mr. Puglisi asked if he could get clarification on what risk based  
32 approach meant.  
33

34 Mr. Valdez responded that when he wrote the recommendation risk based approach  
35 was referring to human health and safety, and the environment.  
36

37 Mr. Puglisi responded that it was his understanding that risk based approach usually  
38 looks at the future use of a site, as an example residential use or industrial use. He  
39 noted that he thought that risk based approach had been proposed in the original CO  
40 and the NMED had rejected it at that time.  
41

1 Mr. Kieling responded that the current CO was a risk based approach, with the goal  
2 being to achieve residential standards.

3  
4 Mr. Puglisi asked about the timing on submitting the draft recommendation. He  
5 stated that he felt it was premature since the consent order was currently 30 months  
6 from completion, and the process for requesting extensions to the current CO seems to  
7 be working.

8  
9 Mr. Valdez responded that when he drafted the recommendation he was taking into  
10 consideration that the Framework Agreement had shifted the milestones in the CO. He  
11 noted that he felt that this was a good time for the parties to sit down and look at  
12 realigning the CO milestones.

13  
14 Mr. Tiano stated that if the NNM CAB passed the recommendation, the NNM CAB  
15 would be supporting the effort to renegotiate the CO, and he felt that would be a very  
16 powerful statement.

17  
18 Mr. Puglisi responded that he agreed it would be a powerful statement; however, he  
19 is not sure that he disagrees with the current content in the CO. He stated that changing  
20 it in a manner that the NNM CAB has no control over could jeopardize the interest of the  
21 citizens and municipalities in the area.

22  
23 Ms. Majure asked if renegotiation was the original intent of this recommendation.

24  
25 Mr. Valdez responded that renegotiation was not the intent of the recommendation;  
26 but rather to take a look at what's left in the CO and realign the time table using a risk  
27 based approach.

28  
29 Ms. Majure suggested that the recommendation be re written to articulate what  
30 milestones are expected to be realigned, and remove the broad based language that  
31 implies a complete renegotiation.

32  
33 Dr. Girardi stated that the wording of the recommendation made it unclear as to what  
34 the recommendation was asking to have renegotiated.

35  
36 Mr. Schmelling noted that he felt Ms. Majure's suggestion of postponing a vote on this  
37 recommendation until the wording could be revised was a good idea.

38  
39 Mr. Sayre made a motion to move action on Draft Recommendation 2013-07 to the  
40 July 12, 2013 Combined Committee meeting; Mr. Schmelling seconded the motion. The  
41 members voted all in favor. The motion to move action on Draft Recommendation  
42 2013-07 to July 12, 2013 passed.

---

**XIII. Additional Public Comment Period**

Mr. Valdez opened a second public comment period at 5:29 p.m.

Mr. Scott Kovac stated that on the question of the mercury storage, the Mercury SEIS stated that the storage would only be for 40 years. He noted that at this time he would withhold his comments on Draft Recommendation 2013-07.

Mr. Kovac noted that there are different types of extensions, for example there are extensions for projects that run into unanticipated complications, these would be good a good use of extensions. However maybe half of the current extensions are just two year extensions due to lack of funding needed to start the project.

With no additional public comment Mr. Valdez closed the public comment period at 5:31 p.m.

---

**XIV. Wrap-up and Comments**

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

Mr. Adrian Chavez noted that he was new to the board process; however, in his short tenure he has realized that the reason for the NNMCAB is to represent the Citizens of Northern New Mexico.

Ms. Bonnie Lucas thanked the members who attended the Mercury SEIS hearing and brought the information back to the NNMCAB.

Ms. Majure, Ms. Santistevan, Mr. Puglisi, Mr. Sayre, Mr. Schmelling, and Dr. Girardi thanked everyone for attending the meeting, and for setting up the tour of Buckman.

Mr. Pacheco thanked everyone for attending and felt that the meeting had been informative. He noted that the human element in meetings can cause complications, but at the end of the day if the members do what they're supposed to do the NNMCAB moves forward.

Mr. Bishop thanked everyone for attending the meeting; he thanked the members for their service and commitment to the board.

Mr. Beausoleil stated that though he has only lived in New Mexico for a short time he is just as passionate about protecting the state and Los Alamos as the rest of the members.

Mr. Mousseau thanked the board for its support in obtaining additional funding.

1 Mr. Kieling thanked everyone for their interest in what the NMED does, and for inviting  
2 him to the meeting

3  
4 Mr. Villarreal thanked everyone for attending the meeting, and setting up the tour of  
5 Buckman. Mr. Villarreal stated that he felt that the NNM CAB's current process for writing  
6 recommendations had failed Mr. Longacre.

7  
8 Mr. Tiano thanked Mr. Kovac for the way that he addresses the board and states his  
9 case. He noted that he had enjoyed the tour of Buckman, and thanked the staff for their  
10 work. He noted that members who are submitting recommendations should make every  
11 effort to attend the meetings where the recommendation is presented, and help work on  
12 tailoring those recommendations.

13  
14 Mr. Valdez thanked the members for attending, and the staff for organizing a great  
15 meeting.

---

16  
17  
18 **XV. Adjournment**

19 With no further business to discuss, Mr. Bishop adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

20  
21  
22 **Respectfully Submitted,**



23 **Carlos Valdez, Chair, NNM CAB**

24  
25 **\*Minutes prepared by William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach, NNM CAB**

---

26  
27 **Attachments**

- 28 1. Final NNM CAB Meeting Agenda for 05/22/2013
  - 29 2. Final NNM CAB Meeting Minutes for 03/20/2013
  - 30 3. Report from Carlos Valdez, NNM CAB Chair
  - 31 4. Report from Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
  - 32 5. Draft Recommendation 2013-04
  - 33 6. Draft Recommendation 2013-05
  - 34 7. Draft Recommendation 2013-07
  - 35 8. Presentation by DOE Update on Chromium Cleanup
  - 36 9. Update from LANL Environmental Programs Citizens Advisory Board Update
  - 37 10. Buckman Direct Diversion Project Tour Information Packet
-

1 **Public Notice:**

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

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