



Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board Meeting

March 13, 2013

2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

NNMCAB Conference Room

Pojoaque, New Mexico

MINUTES

Meeting Attendees

U.S. Department of Energy:

1. Ed Worth, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO)
 2. Lee Bishop, DOE Environmental Projects Office
 3. Christina Houston, DOE Environmental Projects Office
-

NNMCAB Members:

1. Carlos Valdez, NNMCAB Chair
 2. Joey Tiano, Waste Management Committee Chair
 3. Arthur Mascarenas, Waste Management Committee Vice-Chair
 4. Joseph Viarrial, Environmental Monitoring & Remediation Committee Vice-Chair
 5. Robert Villarreal
 6. Bonnie Lucas
 7. Ralph Phelps
 8. Allison Majure
 9. Nona Girardi
 10. Stephen Schmelling
-

NNMCAB Support Staff:

Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach

Guests:

Allan Chaloupka, Public

I. Call to Order

The monthly meeting of the Environmental Monitoring and Remediation (EMR), and Waste Management (WM) committees was held on March 13, 2013 at the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) office in Pojoaque, New Mexico. Mr. Joey Tiano, Waste Management Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:14 p.m. and presided over the meeting.

II. Approval of Agenda

The Combined Committee (CC) reviewed the agenda for the March 13, 2013 meeting. Mr. Carlos Valdez made a motion to approve the agenda as presented; Mr. Ralph Phelps seconded the motion. The agenda for the meeting was unanimously approved as presented.

III. Approval of Minutes

The CC reviewed the minutes from the February 13, 2013 meeting. Mr. Valdez made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Mr. Phelps seconded the motion. The CC unanimously approved the February 9, 2013 minutes.

IV. Old Business

Mr. Tiano moved to discussion of the CC work plans, as part of the mid-year review. He stated that he would lead discussion on the WM committee work plan, and that Mr. Joseph Viarrial would lead the discussion on the EMR Committee work plan.

Mr. Tiano read the WM work plan to the CC and asked that members make comments as appropriate, during the review process.

Mr. Valdez asked questions in regard to section 1 of the work plan, on the status of the Technical Area (TA) 21 transfer to base programs.

Mr. Ed Worth stated that the enclosures at TA-21 had been knocked down and that base course had been placed on the site. He noted that there was a small amount of waste to be awaiting disposition. Additionally he stated that DOE still needed to complete a survey of MDA B for radiation, before transfer of the land to the county could be completed.

Mr. Valdez asked for status on the water tanks.

Mr. Worth stated that the water tanks would be demolished; however, when would depend on availability of funds.

Mr. Tiano continued on to section 2, TA-54.

Mr. Lee Bishop stated that section 2 part d. should refer to Remote Handled Waste not High Level Waste.

Mr. Tiano moved to section 3, Priority 1 from Fiscal Year (FY) 10.

Mr. Phelps noted that the title of the section should be restated rather than referring back to the FY'10 work plan.

Mr. Tiano continued to section 4, TA-49.

Mr. Valdez asked if any work had been done at TA-49 this FY.

Mr. Worth noted that this FY there had not been any work at TA-49; however, a complete investigation on the site had been submitted to the state approximately 2 years ago, and DOE could give the NNMCAB a briefing in the future.

Mr. Tiano moved on to section 5, Budget.

Dr. Girardi noted that consideration of FY'12 budget should be FY'14.

Mr. Tiano moved to section 6, Consent Order (CO) Deliverables.

Mr. Bishop suggested that the Framework Agreement (FWA) in addition to the CO should be considered in the WM work plan.

Mr. Valdez asked what the FWA meant for other CO Deliverables.

Mr. Worth stated that some of the CO Deliverables had been extended; however, the CO Deliverables that the State felt were most important were still on the schedule, and had not been extended.

Mr. Tiano moved to section 7, ongoing priorities.

Mr. Bishop recommended that Long Term Stewardship be noted.

Mr. Tiano finished reading the WM work plan. The members did not have any comments on sections 8, 9, or 10. Mr. Tiano asked Mr. Viarrial to begin the review of the EMR work plan.

Mr. Viarrial asked if the Committee members had any changes to the EMR work plan.

Mr. Valdez asked if there were any groundwater issues at TA-54 or TA-21.

Mr. Worth noted that he was not aware of any groundwater issues at either of the TAs.

Mr. Stephen Schmelling asked if there was a possibility of an update on monitoring around the 33 Shafts.

Mr. Worth proposed that an individual from LANL could provide a briefing to the NNMCAB on the subject of monitoring wells at TA-54.

Ms. Allison Majure asked for a presentation on the Intellus system.

Mr. Worth stated that he would put that on the list for presentations to provide for the NNMCAB.

Dr. Girardi asked if there was any legacy waste located at the PF-4.

Mr. Bishop responded that in PF-4 some of the plutonium material located in the Vaults was determined to be in excess to the Program. He noted that as funding allows the material has been moved to TA-54 for processing and disposal at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) site.

Mr. Tiano asked if there were any additional comments on the EMR work plan.

Mr. Schmelling noted that under Surface water item "f" the chromium groundwater plume was listed; he suggested that this should be under the groundwater section.

Mr. Worth noted that the chromium had started as a surface water Issue.

Mr. Tiano asked for additional questions, with no additional questions from the members
Mr. Tiano moved to the next item on the agenda.

V. New Business

A. Compile Questions for 33 Shafts.

Mr. Tiano opened the floor for discussion.

Dr. Girardi stated that the NNMCAB needed to know more about monitoring at the site and if any contamination was migrating off site. She also noted that cost of removal vs. cost of monitoring should be questioned.

Mr. Valdez suggested that the members take time before the Board meeting on March 20th to consider the questions that they would like to ask during the meeting.

B. Compile Questions for Cate Alexander.

Mr. Worth noted that Cate would not be able to attend the March 20th Board meeting due to budget constraints.

Mr. Tiano noted that questions for Cate Alexander would need to be scheduled for a later date.

VI. Update from Executive Committee

Mr. Valdez stated that the Executive Committee had met with Pete Maggiore, Lee Bishop Dan Cox, and David Nickless from DOE/LANS to discuss the 33 Shafts. The Executive Committee showed the DOE/LANS representatives a current list of questions and advised them that the Board members would likely have additional questions at the March 20th board meeting.

VII. Update from DOE

Mr. Worth noted that he would be leaving at the end of the month for a new assignment at Oak Ridge. He stated that Mr. Bishop would replace him as the DDFO, and that Ms. Christina Houston would still be the alternate DDFO.

Mr. Worth noted that the MDA B land transfer over to the county would likely occur in FY'14.

Mr. Worth also noted that at the March 20th board meeting Tom Carver would be giving a presentation to the NNMCAB on the results of an Aerial Radiological survey conducted at LANL.

Mr. Bishop discussed the possibility of using the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Facility in Idaho. He noted that LANS was looking at the possibility of using the airtight shredder at the facility to shred boxes rather than have to repack them at TA-54 into WIPP compliant disposal containers. He stated that there was a possibility of saving time in the disposal schedule, if the shredder could be used to process the 40 metal boxes that need to be disposed.

Mr. Schmelling asked what would happen to the waste once it was shredded at the facility in Idaho.

Mr. Bishop replied that Idaho would repackage the shredded waste and ship it directly to the WIPP site.

Mr. Art Mascarenas asked how much the shredding process would cost LANS.

Mr. Bishop responded that the cost was under negotiation, noting there is the possibility that LANS would only need to pay for shipping. However the cost model that Idaho uses would likely make it less expensive even if LANS had to pay the full cost.

Mr. Schmelling asked what the impact of sequestration had been.

Mr. Worth stated that travel had been impacted. He also stated that there is a potential for NNSA Federal employees to be furloughed for some period of time; however, EM funded individuals most likely would not be furloughed. Additionally he noted that the upcoming date in March for a budget to be passed could also have an effect on operations for the remainder of the FY.

VIII. Presentation on 3706 Campaign at Area G

- A. Mr. Lee Bishop gave a presentation to the NNMCAB on "Project Plan, Status and Lessons Learned for the LANL 3,706 M³ TRU Waste Campaign". A copy of the presentation may be requested by contacting the NNMCAB office at (505) 989-1662, or on the NNMCAB website at <http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov/7-presentations/presentations.htm>.

B. Questions

Mr. Bob Villarreal asked if the domes were fire proof or fire resistant.

Mr. Bishop responded that the domes were fire resistant by code; he also noted that all of the fiberglass encased boxes are in the one dome that has a fire protection system.

Ms. Majure asked are WIPPs packaging requirements for disposal among the most stringent.

Mr. Bishop responded that WIPP disposal containers must meet Nuclear Quality Assurance-1 standards for Quality Assurance, further stating that the cask the containers are shipped in is the most robust container in production.

Ms. Bonnie Lucas asked as it stands right now Mr. Bishop do you have an opinion on if the 33 Shafts should be removed

Mr. Bishop responded that remote handled waste would pose a risk for the workers and would need to be balanced against the actual impact of removing the waste. The actual effect on the inventory would be less than 1%. He also noted that it is important when starting the NEPA process that individuals not be pre-decisional, as that would affect the outcome of the NEPA process itself.

Ms. Lucas stated "that almost leads me to believe that 1% isn't that much."

Mr. Bishop responded that it may be reasonable for a decision maker to say that the cost of removal doesn't weigh appropriately to the benefit of removal.

Mr. Villarreal asked if every drum had venting plugs.

Mr. Bishop replied that there was a small population of old drums that still need to be vented, but that anything that ships to WIPP is vented. He also noted that the vent is a HEPA vent.

Mr. Schmelling asked how the volume of newly generated TRU compares to old.

Mr. Bishop responded that LANL is one of the only long term generators of TRU waste. He noted that the new TA-66 facility was sized based on current need. The facility was permitted to hold 1200 drums, but will only be used to actively store 800 drums. The remaining 400 drum capacity to be used as additional storage should the need arise.

IX. Public Comment

Mr. Tiano opened the floor for comments from the public at 3:50 p.m.

Mr. Allan Chaloupka noted that item “d” in section 2 of the WM work plan was completed in FY’11 when the ARRA funds were expended and the MDA B project was transitioned to Base Programs. Mr. Chaloupka also noted that the presumptive remedy for MDA T and MDA A is to leave them in place. Additionally, he suggested that the committees look at TA-21 DP west slabs and the possibility of TRU waste generated from the site.

Mr. Chaloupka stated that there were still approximately 25, 000 square feet of demolition to be completed at TA-21, in addition to the soil at DP west and land transfer to the county. He also noted that when the funds were shifted over to the waste arena, the well near the Generals Tanks that was to be part of the groundwater monitoring network at TA-21 was left incomplete.

Mr. Tiano closed public comment at 3:57 p.m.

X. Adjournment

Mr. Valdez noted that the next scheduled CC meeting was on April 10th; however, there is a possible LANL tour scheduled for April 10th. He asked for thoughts from the members.

Mr. Schmelling noted that a LANL tour would be beneficial.

Ms. Santistevan noted that the tour would be good for new and old members, as LANL does change from time to time.

Mr. Valdez stated that the NNMCAB would focus on the LANL tour in lieu of the CC meeting for April.

Mr. Villarreal noted that the NNMCAB should discuss the correct and incorrect use of the word (contaminant), at a future meeting.

With no additional comments Mr. Tiano adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

William Alexander
Technical Programs and Outreach