

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



Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board Meeting

November 12, 2015

1:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Cities of Gold Conference Center

Pojoaque, New Mexico 87506



Minutes

Meeting Attendees

Department of Energy

1. Doug Hintze, Manager, DOE EM-LA Field Office
 2. Lee Bishop, Co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer
 3. Michael Gardipe, Co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer
 4. David Nickless, Department of Energy Environmental Management Los Alamos Field Office
 5. Brian Hennessey, Department of Energy Environmental Management Los Alamos Field Office
-

NNMCAB Members

1. Doug Sayre, NNMCAB Chair
 2. Stephen Schmelling, Chair EM&R Committee
 3. Angelica Gurulé, Chair WM Committee
 4. Ashley Sanderson, Vice-Chair EM&R Committee
 5. Michael Whiting, Vice-Chair WM Committee
 6. Manuel Pacheco
 7. Mary Friday
 8. Carlos Valdez
 9. Joey Tiano
 10. Angel Quintana
 11. Max Baca
 12. Irene Tse-Pe
 13. Alex Puglisi
-

NNMCAB Student Representatives

1. James Valerio
-

NNMCAB Excused Absences

1. Nona Girardi
2. Joshua Madalena
3. Gerard Martínez y Valencia
4. Tessa Jo Mascareñas

- 1 5. Danny Mayfield
- 2 6. Joseph Viarrial
- 3 7. Carla Abeyta
- 4 8. Rod Sanchez
- 5 9. Diahann Lopez-Cordova
- 6 10. Michael Valerio
- 7 11. Mona Varela
- 8 12. Alyssa Schreiber
- 9 13. Ashlee Herrera

10

11 **NNMCAB Absences**

12 None

13

14 **NNMCAB Support Staff**

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

18

19 **Guests**

- 20 1. Suzanne Valerio, Public
- 21 2. Steven Horak, PT&C, LLC.
- 22 3. Toni Chiri, National Nuclear Security Administration, Los Alamos Field Office
- 23 4. Roger Snodgrass, Los Alamos Daily Post
- 24 5. Jocelyn Buckley, Los Alamos National Security
- 25 6. Kevin Tafoya, SCP-OEA
- 26 7. Gilbert Gutierrez, SCP-OEA
- 27 8. Floyd Archuleta, Portage, Inc.
- 28 9. Scott Kovac, Nuke Watch New Mexico
- 29 10. Dave French, Los Alamos National Security
- 30 11. Shannon Farrell, CH2M Hill
- 31 12. Sean Stanfield, Canberra
- 32 13. Frazer Lockhart, SN3
- 33 14. John Stroud, Nuke Watch New Mexico
- 34 15. Felicia Aguilar, The Lakeworth Group, LLC.
- 35 16. Amy Jordan, Neptune and Company
- 36 17. John Tauxe, Neptune and Company
- 37 18. Elizabeth. Miller, Santa Fe Reporter
- 38 19. Kristine Cornils, DMI
- 39 20. Carolyn Bateman, PT&C, LLC.
- 40 21. Racquel Benedict, PT&C, LLC.
- 41 22. John McCann, Los Alamos National Security
- 42 23. Lindi Douglass, Regional Coalition of LANL Communities

- 1 24. Roy McKinney, Portage, Inc.
- 2 25. Kevin Reid, TPMC
- 3 26. Allison Scott Majure, New Mexico Environment Department
- 4 27. Secretary Ryan Flynn, New Mexico Environment Department
- 5 28. Katie Roberts, New Mexico Environment Department
- 6 29. Andrea Romero, Regional Coalition of LANL Communities
- 7 30. Joni Arends, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety
- 8 31. Anna Hansen, Green Fire Times
- 9 32. Katie Gallegos, PT&C, LLC.
- 10 33. Mark Oswald, Albuquerque Journal North
- 11 34. Adam Barras, PT&C, LLC.
- 12 35. Rick Ulibarri, Los Alamos National Security
- 13 36. Steve Veenis, Los Alamos National Security
- 14 37. Jordan Arnswald, National Nuclear Security Administration, Los Alamos Field Office
- 15 38. Madeleine Faubert, National Nuclear Security Administration, Los Alamos Field Office
- 16 39. Bob Dodge, Public
- 17 40. Kelly Hunter, Waste Control Specialists
- 18 41. Jay Coghlan, Nuke Watch New Mexico
- 19 42. Danny Katzman, Los Alamos National Security
- 20 43. Jeanne Green, Public
- 21 44. Marilyn Hoff, Public
- 22 45. Kenneth Grumski, Waste Control Specialists
- 23 46. Jim Felty, Sigma Science, Inc.
- 24 47. Brian Crone, Congressional Fellow at Congressmen Ben Ray Lujan's Office
- 25 48. Robert Zulick, PT&C, LLC.

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

1 **Minutes**

2 **I. Call to Order**

3 The Special Meeting of the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB)
4 was held on November 12, 2015 at the Cities of Gold Conference Center, Pojoaque, New
5 Mexico. Mr. Lee Bishop, Co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer (CDDFO) stated that on
6 behalf of the Department of Energy (DOE) the meeting of the NNMCAB was called to order
7 at 1:13 p.m.

8 Mr. Bishop recognized Mr. Doug Sayre, the NNMCAB Chair. Mr. Sayre presided at the
9 meeting.

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

12 **II. Establishment of a Quorum (13 Needed)**

13 **a. Roll Call**

14 Mr. William Alexander conducted roll call as the members arrived. At the call to
15 order, 11 members were present. Mr. Alexander recorded that the following members
16 arrived after the call to order, Ms. Irene Tse-Pe arrived at 1:35 p.m. and Mr. Max Baca
17 Arrived at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Alexander recorded that Ms. Angel Quintana departed at 2:30
18 p.m. Mr. Alexander recorded that a quorum was not present at the meeting.

19 **b. Excused Absences**

20 Mr. Alexander recorded that the following members had excused absences: Dr.
21 Nona Girardi, Mr. Joshua Madalena, Mr. Gerard Martínez y Valencia, Ms. Tessa Jo
22 Mascareñas, Mr. Danny Mayfield, Mr. Joseph Viarrial, Ms. Carla Abeyta, Mr. Rod
23 Sanchez, Ms. Diahann Lopez-Cordova, Mr. Michael Valerio, Ms. Mona Varela, Ms. Alyssa
24 Schreiber, and Ms. Ashlee Herrera.

25 **c. Absences**

26 Mr. Alexander recorded that no members were absent.

27 **III. Welcome and Introductions**

28 Mr. Sayre welcomed the members and the public to the meeting. He asked for
29 introductions from the board members and attending guests.

30 **IV. Approval of Agenda**

31 The board reviewed the agenda for the November 12, 2015 meeting, Mr. Sayre opened
32 the floor for questions or comments.

33 With no quorum present the Board was not able to approve the agenda, the meeting
34 proceeded with presentations only.

35 **V. Presentations**

36 **a. New Mexico Environment Department**

37 Secretary Ryan Flynn, NMED and Katie Roberts, NMED; gave a presentation to the
38 NNMCAB on "Possible Revisions to the 2005 Order on Consent (CO) for Los Alamos
39 National Laboratory Cleanup." An electronic copy of the presentation may be
40

1 obtained from the NNMCAB website; <http://www.energy.gov/em/nnmcab>. Video of
2 the presentation is also available on the NNMCAB's YouTube Channel (NNMCAB).

3
4 **b. Questions**

5 Mr. Pacheco asked what the date of enforcement was for the 2005 Consent Order.

6
7 Secretary Flynn responded that the CO enforcement date was March 1, 2005.

8
9 Mr. Pacheco asked what the standards for Corrective Measures Evaluations (CME)
10 were based on, and how will the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED)
11 engage the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on the CO revision.

12
13 Secretary Flynn responded that the methods that are outlined in the CO were
14 current to EPA guidelines at the time; however, changes to the guidelines would be
15 taken into account. Additionally, noting that NMED has primacy over the Hazardous
16 Waste Program in New Mexico and EPA will not be party to CO discussions.

17
18 Mr. Schmelling asked what the time frame is for completing the revision of the CO.

19
20 Secretary Flynn responded that NMED had hoped to complete it by the end of the
21 year; however, the Settlement Agreement needs to be completed before NMED can
22 move on the CO revision. Additionally, noting that it could take up to 18 months to
23 complete the revision if a public hearing is necessary.

24
25 Mr. Schmelling asked if there was an end date for completion of the cleanup in the
26 new CO.

27
28 Secretary Flynn responded that it would be reckless to select an end date until
29 NMED knows what corrective measures will be necessary. At this point the
30 evaluations are not completed, so remedies have not yet been selected, noting that
31 NMED does not currently have an end date.

32
33 Mr. Puglisi asked if there would be interim dates for each campaign rather than an
34 overall completion date.

35
36 Secretary Flynn stated that an annual work plan process may be one direction that
37 NMED could take for setting dates in the revised CO. Noting that the plan would likely
38 cover 3 years at a time not just a single year.

39
40 Mr. Puglisi asked if the new CO would be following a Superfund Model.
41

1 Secretary Flynn noted that there is different language in RCRA and CERCLA;
2 however, both use a similar structure for cleanup: determine if there is a problem,
3 derive nature and extent, and determine and implement a cleanup approach.
4

5 Mr. Valdez asked how the 1.2 Billion Dollar number for cleanup was derived.
6 Noting that without a remedy selected he was not sure how a budget could be
7 derived.
8

9 Secretary Flynn responded that the figure was not generated by NMED, but by
10 DOE. He noted that he put that information out there for the benefit of the public.
11 Secretary Flynn noted that he did not think there was any real basis behind the
12 number, it was derived by the planning process that DOE uses for Life Cycle Base Line.
13 Additionally, noting that the number is not definitive or accurate at this time because
14 the CMEs are not yet complete.
15

16 Ms. Friday noted that she likes the idea of not having a specific date. She asked if
17 when the revised CO is signed, would it have dates placed in it.
18

19 Secretary Flynn responded that dates would be updated in the revised CO. He
20 noted that until the final remedy selection, any dates that are put in may possibly
21 change. Secretary Flynn noted that DOE does; however, have a baseline that requires
22 that the facility have an end date.
23

24 Ms. Gurulé asked if DOE/NMED could provide the NNM CAB with: estimated cost to
25 complete; risk to the public; estimated time for cleanup; deadline for completion, for
26 each campaign.
27

28 Secretary Flynn responded that he hoped that DOE would be providing that
29 information in their presentation today.
30

31 **c. Department of Energy**

32 Mr. Doug Hintze, DOE, EM-LA; gave two presentations to the NNM CAB: "History of
33 Work Completed at Los Alamos National Laboratory" and "Executing Legacy Cleanup
34 at Los Alamos National Laboratory." An electronic copy of the presentation may be
35 obtained from the NNM CAB website; <http://www.energy.gov/em/nm cab> Video of
36 the presentation is also available on the NNM CAB's YouTube Channel (NNM CAB).
37

38 **d. Questions**

39 Mr. Hintze noted that there were 14 proposed campaigns and that the
40 approximate cost listed for the campaigns was a comparison between the 14 different
41 campaigns, not an actual cost. Additionally, noting that this cost was a best guess

1 based on the knowledge of the Subject Matter Experts and historical cost. Below is the
2 list of cost for each of the 14 campaigns.

- 3 1. Chromium Interim Measure - \$50 million
- 4 2. Chromium Final Remedy - \$150 million
- 5 3. RDX Interim Measure & Final Remedy - \$35 million
- 6 4. TA-21 Major Acceleration - \$25 million
- 7 5. General's Tanks (MDA-A) - \$100 million
- 8 6. Historical Properties - \$10 million
- 9 7. MDAs A & T - \$125 million
- 10 8. Pajarito Canyon Watershed - \$10 million
- 11 9. Ancho & Chaquehui Watershed - \$10 million
- 12 10. Water Canyon Watershed - \$10 million
- 13 11. Remaining SWMUs - \$30 million
- 14 12. MDA-C - \$50 million
- 15 13. MDA-AB - \$50 million
- 16 14. Area G Closure MDAs G, H, L - \$225 million

17
18 Mr. Valdez asked who are the players that are going to work on the CO revision, will
19 there be employees from NMED, DOE, HQ, and will there be a budget person.

20
21 Mr. Hintze responded that there will be a smaller core group of technical experts,
22 and likely employees from HQ, LANL, NMED, and EM-LA. Additionally, noting that he
23 does not have an exact number at this time.

24
25 Mr. Valdez asked why not ask for additional funding in the local budget request why,
26 only ask for \$189 million.

27
28 Mr. Hintz responded that the Integrated Priority List is an internal process and has a
29 set dollar amount. He noted that the department cannot tell the public the exact
30 number that was asked for at the local level, noting that the President's budget request
31 number is what is released to the public.

32
33 Secretary Flynn noted that there is an executive order that requires the local sites to
34 submit a budget for the money required to complete the work; however, submit a
35 budget that will pass and address expectations.

36
37 Mr. Valdez asked if the campaign list was in priority order.

38
39 Mr. Hintze stated that the list was not in a priority order, noting that the list could be
40 prioritized by, schedule, cost, risk, and land release.

41
42 Mr. Schmelling asked what the next steps would be in the process for the campaign
43 approach.

44

1 Mr. Hintze stated that the first decision that needs to be made is if the campaign
2 approach is the approach to take. Additionally, noting that today's information is the
3 first approach into what the possible campaigns could be and what direction the CO
4 should take.

5 Mr. James Valerio asked if the schedule for each campaign was meant to be
6 compared only between the campaigns as listed.

7
8 Mr. Hintze responded that yes, both schedule and cost were meant to be compared
9 only against the information provided for the campaigns today.

10
11 Ms. Gurulé asked if the campaigns covered all the scope that the NNMCAB needs to
12 address.

13
14 Mr. Hintze responded that yes the campaigns cover all the scope under the CO;
15 however, it is not all of the scope that the Environmental Management Office is
16 responsible for.

17
18 Mr. Puglisi asked if the campaigns need to happen individually or if some of the
19 campaigns could occur simultaneously.

20
21 Mr. Hintze responded that yes based on available resources campaigns could
22 possibly be completed simultaneously.

23
24 Mr. Puglisi asked what needed to be done to for the 2005 CO to bridge the gap
25 between a new CO.

26
27 Secretary Flynn responded that the 2005 CO stays in effect until a new CO is signed,
28 stating that there is no regulatory action that needs to be signed to continue the 2005
29 CO.

30
31 Mr. Baca asked how much money congress allocates annually for cleanup.

32
33 Mr. Hintze responded that he can't say for the Department of Defense only for the
34 Department of Energy and that number is \$5.9-\$6 Billion.

35
36 Mr. Baca asked if that number had been increasing or decreasing over the last 5
37 years.

38
39 Mr. Hintze responded the ARRA was the high point and since then it has been
40 decreasing. Additionally, noting that planning has the budget as flat with a 1% increase
41 yearly.

42
43 Mr. Baca asked if the local office could possibly get additional funding from Congress
44 for cleanup at Los Alamos.

45
46 Mr. Hintze responded that he was committed to fighting within his channels to move
47 cleanup at Los Alamos forward. Noting that he is not allowed to lobby Congress for
48 funding.

1
2 Mr. Baca asked who would finally make the decision on what the priority list is for
3 the campaigns.
4

5 Secretary Flynn responded that NMED would ultimately make the decision on what
6 the priority list is.
7

8 Mr. Baca asked about the unfunded liability for the 35% to the pension fund.
9

10 Mr. Hintze responded that he would hope that money would be moved to cleanup,
11 once the unfunded liability is complete.
12

13 Mr. Baca asked where the \$70 million was going to fund the campaign approach this
14 year.
15

16 Mr. Hintze responded that the campaign approach is a proposal and is currently not
17 funded. Additionally, noting that since cleanup is not being done as campaigns
18 currently, he doesn't know how to answer that.
19

20 Mr. Baca asked if there would be scalable penalties in the revised CO.
21

22 Secretary Flynn responded yes that is in the current document and would be in the
23 new document also. Additionally, noting that DOE's current policy is to use cleanup
24 funding to pay any fines that are assessed.
25

26 Ms. Friday asked for clarification on how much of the \$189 million dollars is available
27 for cleanup.
28

29 Mr. Hintze responded that we are not asking you to work on budget formulation,
30 only to prioritize the scope of the campaigns.
31

32 Mr. James Valerio asked would the stipulated penalties in the 2005 CO still be
33 actionable while the new CO is written.
34

35 Secretary Flynn responded that violations that have already accrued if the Settlement
36 Agreements are executed then we would not assess penalties for past violations;
37 however, it would be determined by how the Settlement Agreements are handled.
38

39 Mr. Sayre asked what the next step in the process is.
40

41 Secretary Flynn responded that the Settlement Agreement needs to be completed.
42 Noting that after that is complete the next step will be to sit down and look at changes
43 to the 2005 CO. Additionally, noting that public meetings and feedback would be
44 needed to accomplish that.
45
46

1 **VI. Public Comment Period**

2 Mr. Sayre opened the floor for public comment at 4:00 p.m. He invited Mr. Scott Kovac,
3 Nuke Watch New Mexico, to address the Board.
4

5 Mr. Kovac thanked everyone for attending today's meeting. He noted that we are here
6 today because the 2005 CO had an end date, noting that a lot of permits only last 10 years.
7 Mr. Kovac stated "how does the revised CO have a day like today." He noting that there was
8 no reason that the schedule in the 2005 CO could not have been updated along the way, it
9 doesn't seem that difficult to add projects and time to the schedule. He noted that the
10 schedule was never meant to be fixed in place. Mr. Kovac noted that he would like to stand
11 up for the deliverables schedule, how else do you show that the work has been completed.
12 The reports and plans are the deliverables, are we talking about getting rid of all the reports
13 and plans which offer transparency for the work that is being done? We need to know
14 exactly what the campaign approach is. Mr. Kovac noted that you have to make certain
15 assumptions for the schedule, as long as you know what those assumptions are you can
16 have an end date. Mr. Kovac asked what will be done on other campaign areas while a
17 campaign is being focus on, there needs to be some monitoring done on the other areas.
18 Mr. Kovac additionally noted that there was nothing wrong with the schedule in the 2005
19 CO.
20

21 Secretary Flynn responded that this was the first time that this topic was being
22 introduced, noting that he would suggest that NMED is not suggesting throwing out the
23 schedule, or the reports and plans. He noted that the difference between deliverables and
24 campaigns, is that the deliverables approach does not have a concerted effort for taking the
25 next step in the cleanup process. He noted that the current process does a lot of
26 investigations and then just sits there, DOE never has to take the next step. Secretary Flynn
27 noted that the campaigns would focus on an area and work from investigation to clean up,
28 and then moving on to the next project. Additionally, noting that NMED does not intend to
29 get rid of the procedural requirements that are in the 2005 CO for determining an
30 appropriate cleanup process.
31

32 Mr. Sayre invited Ms. Joni Arends of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety (CCNS). To
33 address the Board.
34

35 Ms. Arends noted that "CCNS was formed in 1988 to address community concerns
36 about transportation of waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)." Ms. Arends noted
37 that in the late 80's and early 90's she was involved in the beginnings of setting up the
38 NNM CAB, and noting that she appreciated the NNM CAB's work.

39 Ms. Arends stated that she would like to point out that this was not a NMED public
40 meeting under the Hazardous Waste Act or RCRA. She noted that the topics discussed here
41 need to be discussed at the evening meetings to allow full access to the public.
42

43 Ms. Arends stated that she would like to focus on the chromium plume and focus on the
44 process. She noted that CCNS believes that due to the complexity of the problem, the
45 chromium issue needs to have a full Environmental Impact Statement completed. Ms.
46 Arends pointed out that NMED's approval of the Chromium Work Plan had documented
47 uncertainties in the proposed plan to remediate chromium migration. Ms. Arends stated
48 that more time is needed to have the required information to protect our sole source
drinking water aquifer that provides the region's drinking water. Ms. Arends noted the

1 CCNS's concern is that if this project is not done properly there is a potential to contaminate
2 the regional aquifer with chromium and perchlorate. Additionally, noting that the chromium
3 plan does not address the perchlorate plume. Ms. Arends stated that the draft
4 environmental assessment also states that DOE needs to apply for an air permit, stating that
5 they have not applied for that permit yet, in addition to permits required from the State
6 Engineers Office. She noted that in order for the public to provide comment on the
7 cumulative impact of this proposal, we need the permits and a full Environmental Impact
8 Statement. Ms. Arends noted that her request to the NNMCAB was that they draft a letter
9 to DOE noting that a full Environmental Impact Statement is needed.

10 Ms. Arends noted that the required information on the project had not been distributed
11 appropriately to the required individuals that are listed on the distribution list for
12 assessments. Ms. Arends noted that the distribution list is 10 pages long and that not
13 everyone had been notified that was on that list. Ms. Arends stated that she believes that
14 DOE needs to begin this process all over again and follow the National Environmental Policy
15 Act regarding notification.

16
17 Mr. Sayre invited Mr. Jay Coghlan of Nuke Watch New Mexico to address the board.

18
19 Mr. Coghlan noted that according to the DOE presentation, the pension fund is an
20 astounding 35%, he noted that his question was which employees that contribution was for:
21 LANL, DOE, Cleanup persons in general?

22
23 Mr. Hintze responded that the LANL pension is self-funded and that the contributions
24 are for the contract employees, not the Federal employees.

25
26 Mr. Coghlan stated that he had never met Mr. Hintze so he was treating him strictly as a
27 DOE Official. Noting that frankly, he regards DOE as an incredibly unrealistic department,
28 and DOE is asking the public to be realistic with cleanup assumptions for Los Alamos. He
29 noted that he liked to point out that DOE has been on the Government Accountability
30 Offices high risk list for 25 consecutive years, noting that their only company is the
31 Department of Defense. Stating that the DOE has a constant track record of blown
32 schedules and cost. Mr. Coghlan noted that he works mostly on weapons issues and stated
33 that DOE is spending approximately \$30 -\$40 million per bomb on the B61-12 to create the
34 first nuclear smart bomb, while telling us that we can't spend more than \$160 million or
35 four bombs worth on the LANL cleanup, noting, basically he was rejecting DOE's call to be
36 realistic. Mr. Coghlan stated that his biggest fear is that through the revised CO, NMED is
37 giving up being in the driver's seat, noting that when he hears that there may be annual
38 planning in the revised CO, but annual planning over projects for the next year or two, I
39 want NMED dictating what is done. We can't have DOE saying this is what I think we can do,
40 it can't be that way. Mr. Coghlan stated that he knows for a fact that the point of the 2005
41 CO was to make DOE/LANL go to Congress to get the necessary funding. He noted that
42 where NMED has fallen down, is that they need to enforce the penalties. Additionally,
43 noting the NMED gave over 100 extensions in the 2005 CO and that undermined the
44 milestone schedule and eviscerated the CO. Mr. Coghlan also noted that the last campaign
45 ended in disaster, with the closure of a multi-billion dollar disposal facility, the WIPP.
46 Additionally, noting that it was arguably because corners were cut in order to expedite the
47 waste removal from LANL. Mr. Coghlan noted that he was not against getting rid of the TRU
48 waste; however, the campaign ended in disaster while other cleanup work was postponed.

1 Mr. Coghlan stated that he was going to reserve judgment on the new campaign approach.
2 He additionally stated that there needs to be milestones in the new CO.

3 Mr. Coghlan stated that Nuke Watch New Mexico believes that RCRA requirements are
4 incorporated in the existing CO and that they must stand. He noted that they would be
5 pushing for the public participation requirements in the existing CO.
6

7 Secretary Flynn responded that NMED wanted to get out and get the public information,
8 noting that NMED has not yet made real progress on a revised CO. He stated that NMED
9 absolutely intends to have public meetings, this is really just the beginning of the process for
10 revision of the CO. Additionally, noting that NMED will not only be using the NNM CAB and
11 Regional Coalition of LANL Communities for meeting but also Public Meetings and Non-
12 Government Organizations. Secretary Flynn stated that he agreed that NMED does need to
13 be in the driver seat as they are the regulator for the LANL on this issue. Secretary Flynn also
14 stated that NMED did give extensions under the old CO; however, noting that NMED had
15 not been lax or lenient in enforcement of the 2005 CO.
16

17 Mr. Sayre invited Ms. Marilyn Hoff a member of the public, to address the Board.
18

19 Ms. Hoff stated that she wanted to say that I really don't like the description in the
20 proposal for Material Disposal Area G, Cap and Cover. Stating it's like "opening up a cancer
21 patient stating you have a really bad disease, and here is how I'm going to cure it I'm going
22 to sew you back up again." Ms. Hoff noted that she absolutely does not support Cap and
23 Cover, there needs to be a much more thorough cleanup of the area. Ms. Hoff stated that
24 we need to fire Bechtel, we need to get Los Alamos controlled by local people that are living
25 with the horrible pollution that LANL is creating. Bechtel is a crooked organization that is
26 taking our money and is somewhat responsible for what happened with WIPP. Additionally,
27 stating that we need someone local that cares about our neighborhood and cares about
28 cleaning it up so it is a livable neighborhood.
29

30 With no additional public comment, Mr. Sayre closed the public comment period at 4:43
31 p.m.
32

33 **VII. Adjournment**

34 Mr. Sayre thanked everyone for attending the meeting and turned the meeting over to
35 Mr. Bishop, CDDFO.
36

37 Mr. Bishop adjourned the meeting at 5:44 p.m.
38

39 **Respectfully Submitted,**



40 **Doug Sayre, NNM CAB, Chair**

41 ***Minutes prepared by William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach, NNM CAB**
42

1 **Attachments**

- 2 1. **Final NNM CAB Meeting Agenda for 11/12/2015**
 - 3 2. **Presentation by New Mexico Environment Department "Revised Consent Order."**
 - 4 3. **Presentation by Department of Energy "Accomplishments"**
 - 5 4. **Presentation by Department of Energy "Executing Legacy Work"**
-

6
7 **Public Notice:**

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

11
12
13
14
15