



INL Site Environmental Management

C I T I Z E N S A D V I S O R Y B O A R D

Meeting Minutes

January 14, 2015

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Wednesday, January 14, 2015, at the Hampton Inn in Idaho Falls, Idaho. An audio recording of the meeting was created and may be reviewed by calling CAB Support Staff at 208-557-0843.

Members Present

Bob Bodell
Herb Bohrer
Keith Branter
Brad Christensen
Marvin Fielding
Harry Griffith
Kristin Jensen
Trilby McAfee
Betsy McBride
Willie Preacher
Bill Roberts
Cathy Roemer

Members Not Present

Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), Federal Coordinator, and Liaisons Present

Jack Zimmerman, Deputy Designated Federal Official (DDFO), U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Hoss Brown, CWI
Kerry Martin, State of Idaho

Others Present

Scott McMullin, DOE
Lorie Cahn, CWI
Curtis Roth, DOE
Erin Bognar, ICP
Susie Barna, Moxie Endeavors
Jean Holdren, ICP
Frazer Lockhart, Stoller
Erik Simpson, ICP
Brandt Meagher, ICP
Natalie Packer, ICP
Bruce LaRue, DEQ
Chris Henvit, Naval Reactors
Mark Clough, DEQ
Shannon Brennan, DOE
Roger Turner, Snake River Alliance
Luke Ramseth, Post Register
Rick Dale, AMWTP
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Tami Thatcher
Danielle Miller, DOE
Michelle Holt, Chamber of Commerce
Amy Taylor, Senator Risch
Julie Foster, Walsh Engineering

Leslie Jones, PST
Nolan Jensen, DOE
Preston Abbott, Canberra
Melissa Roth, DOE
Michael Connolly
Kathryn Hitch, Senator Crapo
Fred Hughes
Frank Webber, ICP
Patrick Zona
Mark Hutchison, NRF
James Wolski
Wayne "Russ" Hohns
Brett Bohan, DOE
Lori McNamara, Staff
Ann Riedesel, Staff
Bryant Kuechle, Staff

Action Items

Zimmerman/Badrov

Update on Test Area North bioremediation project Work Plan amendments (Griffith)

Zimmerman

Update on Building CPP-659 contamination event (Bohrer)

Zimmerman

Reference information for safe distance for hypothetical accident (Thatcher)

Zimmerman

Update/status report on WIPP (Bohrer)

Pence

Contact other Federal Coordinators and ask about Student involvement in other CABs (Griffith, Bohrer)

Bohrer

Talk to Nolan Jensen about land use discussion and new contamination found that is not included in the ROD (Thatcher)

Opening Remarks

Facilitator Bryant Kuechle started the meeting started at 8:00 a.m. He reviewed the agenda and noted the public participation period. He also reminded attendees about the process for public questions either during the meeting if time permits or via “comment cards.”

CAB Chair Herb Bohrer welcomed everyone to the meeting. He talked about encouraging people to attend the meetings as a good way to hear the latest information about the INL EM program. He asked CAB members to encourage others to attend meetings.

Jack Zimmerman (DOE-ID) also welcomed everyone and noted that this was his first official meeting as DDFO. He made a strong commitment to the CAB and is looking forward to the process.

Kerry Martin noted that the State is looking forward to good news about the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU). She’s also looking forward to hearing about the waste continuing to move out.

Hoss Brown (CWI) commented that he appreciates the opportunity to share updates about the safe progress of their team. 2014 was one of CWI’s safest years ever. IWTU is going well; they completed processing the simulant and are now in the planned outage. They continue to exhume waste at the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP), and have completed 0.51 acres of contractual requirements. At the Materials and Fuels Complex (MFC), they have completed grouting the annulus at the primary tank in the reactor building. CWI is preparing to treat some sodium at Building-766; that crew just passed their Management Self-Assessment.

Recent Public Involvement Activities

Jack Zimmerman reviewed recent public involvement activities. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

ICP Progress

Zimmerman provided a presentation on the status of cleanup at the INL site. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Herb Bohrer asked about the recovery in Building CPP-659 after a contamination event. According to Zimmerman, there was an event earlier in the year when they over-pressurized the HVAC system, which resulted in a release of contamination. No one received any exposure but several decontamination activities were required. Bohrer asked for more information about the event. Zimmerman agreed to provide an update on the event itself and the recovery activities at the next CAB meeting.

Harry Griffith noted that he had talked with an Arco Fire Department representative the day before, who mentioned a series of rotating power blackouts, some of which had affected the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP). Zimmerman responded that he was aware of only one. Brown commented that the power went out at several locations at AMWTP and the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) the day before. It lasted approximately 45 minutes. It originated from something at EBR-I, which caused a breaker near the old Pit 9 to trip. It happened early in the morning before many of the operations had started up. They were able to isolate the problem and implemented a corrective action.

Keith Branter asked about all the activity at AMWTP and what Idaho is planning to do for storage until operations resume at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Zimmerman responded that they are looking at other areas that may be used for additional storage. They have identified existing space that would allow for about 2 to 3 years’

worth of storage. They have also looked at new storage building options. They are also looking at additional above-ground storage at WIPP.

Bohrer asked about WIPP and if they are continuing to explore some onsite storage options. Zimmerman responded that they are not actively working on that option but if they do, Idaho would support that effort. Bohrer noted that the EM SSAB Chairs have been considering a recommendation on that option.

Bohrer also asked how much low-level waste (LLW) is shipped out of Idaho from AMWTP right now. Zimmerman said it is about 1,600 cubic meters. Martin said it is about 2 shipments each week.

Bohrer also asked for clarification about the certification of the box system and if it was a recertification of an existing system. Zimmerman responded that it is a new system for the large boxes. Bohrer also asked where the aerosol venting occurs. Zimmerman reported that the aerosol venting occurs in the box line.

Griffith asked about the new bioremediation amendments at Test Area North (TAN). Zimmerman clarified that they are looking at some other material that they believe may be more effective than the whey that they have been using. Griffith asked if it was some sort of organic product. Nicole Badrov (DOE-ID) noted that they are considering using emulsified vegetable oil as they believe they may get better results. Zimmerman noted that the project work plan is due for review in February and DOE could give an update at the next CAB meeting. Bohrer asked for clarification about how long the rebound test will last and any other remediation efforts that will occur in the next 5 years. Badrov noted that they will continue the rebound test and drill two additional wells for injecting the emulsified vegetable oil. Bioremediation efforts will continue in the hotspot area as well as pump and treat in the medial zone and natural attenuation in the distal zone.

Betsy McBride asked about the penalties that are now being assessed and what budget those come from. Zimmerman responded that the penalties come out of the cleanup funds because there is ultimately only one cleanup budget. He also noted that some of the penalties may be shared between the contractor and DOE.

Griffith asked if the sodium-bearing waste tanks (four tanks) cleaning project is on schedule. Zimmerman responded that the sodium-bearing waste tanks project is not on schedule due to delays with IWTU. Brown responded that they are looking at washing the one empty tank. It will still be available if they have to use it to substitute for one of the other tanks, but if they don't have to use it, then it is ready for closure. That would allow them to get a little ahead of schedule on that task.

Bohrer asked if the resin discharge has ever been done before. Zimmerman responded that it has been done before, but it has been about 10 years.

McBride asked what percentage of their requested budget the \$380M represents. Zimmerman responded that they received their full requested amount.

Beatrice Brailsford asked about reversing the suspension of sludge repackaging. Zimmerman responded that the repackaging activity is one of the bigger risks to meeting the 2018 completion date so they can't keep waiting. In addition, they have developed additional on-site storage options. The repackaging will be done in a series of campaigns so they can complete it as efficiently as possible.

Accelerated Retrieval Project Oversight

Mark Clough (DEQ) provided a presentation about State oversight of ARP. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Griffith asked if sludge drums tend to be just one type or if they are mixed with different types. Clough responded that typically the sludge types are not mixed in the same drums.

Willie Preacher asked about the targeted waste and the requirement to hit the minimum required volume acres. He asked why the other areas were not included in the plan to retrieve. Clough noted that the secondary areas are not as dense with the waste and therefore do not pose a significant risk. Clough confirmed that not all waste will be removed; some will remain as per the original agreement.

Griffith complimented Clough on the presentation and said it was one of the best presentations on ARP that the CAB has received.

Bohrer commented about the period before 2004 and the discussion about “all means all.” Bohrer believes that the process that led to this agreement addressed risk and saves the taxpayer money by not doing things that don’t mitigate risk. He feels that the decision is a rational agreement and meets the requirements. Bohrer feels that, from a citizen standpoint, this is a real success story.

Tami Thatcher appreciated the discussion and that worker risk was considered in the decision regarding what would be targeted waste. However, she believes that the cost and available space for retrieved waste were bigger drivers in the decision. She went on to note that it is difficult to determine what waste remains after the retrieval. Clough noted that the information is publicly available. He clarified that it is not a single document due to the complexity of the project, and noted that the documents are DOE documents. Kuechle noted that the CAB would get more information about where to find the requested information.

Roger Turner commended DEQ for their oversight on the project. He asked about the assays and assessments of the retrieved waste. He is concerned about the continued need to hold the waste in the packaging phase for the waste shipments. Turner asked if there is any plan for any of the oversight agencies to go back and test the waste that is in storage after a year or two while waiting for shipments to resume ensuring it is safely stored. Clough responded that there are no plans set right now to re-assay the drums that have already been assayed. Packaging transuranic (TRU) waste has a long, successful history. They believe these waste forms are stable long term in the drums. The oversight agencies continue to carefully monitor the drums to ensure ongoing safe storage. They will continue to monitor, but have no plans to re-assay.

Turner also asked about the other agencies and what their role is. Clough noted that EPA was heavily involved in the Record of Decision (ROD). He clarified that the Settlement Agreement is with the State. Clough does not believe that EPA does any independent sampling; they see the same data that the State does. Turner noted that in the RCRA agreements they allow for EPA to come provide oversight and verification and believes that they should be more involved. Zimmerman noted that he is not aware of any independent sampling but he noted that the EPA and the State of New Mexico also conducts oversight activities here and is involved in a number of verification activities at ARP.

Integrated Waste Treatment Unit Status

Curtis Roth (DOE-ID) provided an update on the status of the IWTU startup. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked who conducts the independent assessments. Roth responded that the independent review team includes representatives from DOE-HQ as well as subject matter experts in areas like operations, radiological controls, and engineering. Some are local and some are from outside the area. Roth also noted that the startup assurance plan identifies all issues and recommendations, and ensures they are addressed prior to full startup.

Preacher asked if they looked at sample constituents from the tanks they are going to process. Roth responded that the simulant material they used is similar to the actual tank contents. During this outage, they will now inspect the inside of the vessel to determine the results with those similar constituents.

Griffith asked for more information regarding what a shutdown looks like – how many people are there, what are they doing, etc. Zimmerman responded that the plant is down at ambient temperatures, access doors are being opened, and vessels are being accessed. Brown noted that there are probably about 65 Trades personnel plus 50 operators working different shifts plus 10 to 15 people on a maintenance crew. Brown commented that “it’s very well-choreographed with work scheduled down to the hour.”

Bohrer asked if they have been able to determine a flow rate. Roth responded that they are operating at 2 to 2.5 gallons per minute. At the end of the run they were able to operate at the maximum rate of 3 gallons per minute. Bohrer went on to ask about contract transition and if it occurs during the operational phase of this project. Zimmerman responded that DOE is evaluating options. They are considering an extension to CWI to finish the project if they are close to the end. They are looking at options to ensure continuity and safety of the project. Bohrer encouraged DOE to consider the impacts of previous transitions and how they could impact this project (and the fines associated with it). Zimmerman commented that they appreciate the CAB’s input on this and they want to make sure that they don’t impact any stable operations.

Brad Christensen asked if this is the start of the path forward and what is being shared with the public. He asked for confirmation that this was the first successful simulant run. Roth confirmed that it was the first successful simulant run and noted that the team is extremely happy about this and moving forward. Christensen asked if there will be another simulant run. Roth responded that there will be at least one more simulant run. There could be more if issues are identified during this outage.

Bohrer noted that he disagrees with the “yellow” indication on the dashboard regarding “effect on agreements.” Bohrer believes that it should be red.

McBride asked about the fines. She noted that DOE had asked for milestone extension in December. She wondered if it had been requested earlier would it have impacted the imposed fines and penalties. She asked further if the fines could have been avoided altogether if the waste were transferred to different tanks. Roth noted that you can’t just move the contents to another tank. Zimmerman responded that he didn’t know if they could have avoided fines or not. He commented that the state has demonstrated extreme patience with the project but this was the third time requesting an extension. The state has been kept well informed about the status. Zimmerman commented that he thought it was appropriate for them to hold DOE accountable and this is one of their tools. McBride asked for clarification about the option to move the contents to other tanks. Zimmerman noted that it is a technical option but it has significant costs – new modern tanks would have to be constructed for considerable expense and doesn’t do anything for final disposition just more compliant storage. Zimmerman noted that they are still waiting for quantitative results before they call this a full success story. That may also influence the state’s perspective.

Branter asked if the simulant run included testing the packaging process. Roth responded that they packaged hundreds of containers. He noted that when you run the simulant you still produce product – material that has to be removed from the process and packaged. They did it successfully through the run.

Bodell asked what happens next if the next simulant run is successful with no issues. Roth responded that they will start adding in the waste from the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC) tanks into the remainder of the simulant to start the processing.

Thatcher commented that a “bravo is in order for the team” working IWTU. She then questioned how plausible maintenance is on various components once operations have started. Roth responded that there are procedures in place and trained workers to complete any necessary maintenance on the systems once they are operational. He noted that many of the areas require extensive planning and detailed execution, but that necessary maintenance is feasible, although some maintenance activities may require shutdown of the facility.

Thatcher also asked what a safe distance is for a hypothetical accident such as would be considered for EPA compliant distances for a radiological release. Zimmerman noted that there are emergency plans already developed with that information. DOE committed to finding a reference for that information.

Brailsford asked what the role of the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board has been. Roth responded that he is the liaison for DOE-ID to the board so he interacts with them routinely and keeps them informed. Roth provides documents and other information in response to their queries. They have visited the site several times to monitor the project.

Land Use Recommendation Discussion and Deliberation

Bohrer reviewed the CAB discussions to date on the land use topic and noted that the CAB had not yet reached consensus on the topic. Bohrer would like the CAB to revisit the topic and see if they can bring the discussion to a close or form a subcommittee to develop a new recommendation.

Nolan Jensen (DOE-ID) reviewed the land use topic. DOE has 25 decisions that were identified in records of decision and are now being implemented. However, as they move forward new sites are identified, especially at the Advanced Test Reactor Complex (ATR) and at INTEC. As DOE has been discussing some new areas at ATR, they noted that some of the areas are near other areas with cleanup actions that have been completed that have left contamination in place (e.g., reactor basement). They questioned whether it made sense to clean up to the more rigorous “residential” standard knowing that it is adjacent to areas with contamination left in place. Recognizing that most of the cleanup at these facilities has been completed, DOE has questioned if it appropriate to acknowledge that some contamination will be left in place, and clean up the newly identified areas to the industrial standard rather than the residential standard. EPA and the State support having the CAB weigh in on the decision.

Bohrer asked about the record of decision for ATR and what standard was used. Jensen said all cleanup decisions have been based on as residential standard to date. The assumption DOE uses is that an area should be cleaned up so that “it would be at a safe level for a release to a residential standard by the year 2095.” Bohrer asked if this decision would change the ROD. Jensen noted that this would not impact sites already decided but it impacts any new sites that are identified within that area. The current process to make a change to a ROD is through an amendment if it is a fundamental change. For minor changes, they can prepare an “Explanation of Significant Difference.” An ESD does not go out for public comment.

Bohrer asked about the role of the CAB and if their opinion/recommendation would make a difference in DOE’s decision. Jensen noted that DOE values the CAB’s opinion and their input would be one of the factors DOE would consider in making a final decision.

Bohrer asked if the CAB supports making the decision on these two proposed sites, would it affect other sites as well. Jensen noted that it would just affect new sites and that they could give the CAB briefings on any new ESDs.

McBride asked for clarification if DOE could decide to clean up down to 4 feet rather than 10 feet without public input. Jensen responded that if the three agencies (DOE, EPA, State) agree that it is not a significant change, public input is not required per the regulations.

Zimmerman talked about the changing missions for the areas under consideration. Jensen talked about future land use options and missions at these sites and that they now have long-term missions.

Marvin Fielding asked if these changes would impact and possibly limit potential new buildings in the future. Jensen noted that if a new building were to be built, they would follow all of the existing requirements to ensure they were built in a safe area and safe manner.

Bodell asked if they use backfill to use areas that are excavated. Jensen responded that they would use clean fill to backfill the areas, whether down to 4 feet or 10 feet.

Bohrer clarified that DOE's proposal is centered on INTEC. If a new site was identified at INTEC this change would apply to any new areas not known today but identified later, but within the fence line at INTEC. Jensen noted that this is what DOE proposed, but there have been some questions about if that is the best delineation.

The following CAB members volunteered to serve on the subcommittee: McBride, Branter, McAfee, Christensen, and Bodell. McBride will chair the subcommittee. Kuechle reviewed that the subcommittee will meet and develop a recommendation for consideration by the CAB. Griffith recommended that the subcommittee reach out to each of the CAB members regarding their thoughts are on the topic.

Five-Year EM Review

Nicole Badrov (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on the Five-Year EM Review. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Bohrer asked if the CAB has an opportunity to formally comment on the review. Badrov noted that it is not a decision document but rather a regulatory report so the contents are prescribed. If there are any fundamental changes that come out of the review, then that would be put out for public comment. Badrov confirmed that the CAB won't see the results until they are released for the public in February 2016 and won't be expected to provide any formal comment.

Cathy Roemer asked what constitutes a "fundamental change." Badrov clarified that if a remedy is determined to not be working and is changed to a new remedy, then that would be considered a fundamental change.

Budget Overview

Mark Searle (DOE-ID) provided an overview of the INL EM budget. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked what prompted the "plus ups." Searle responded that they come from a variety of places – changes in mission, discussions with Congressional and DOE officials, committee discussions, and other changes.

Bohrer asked why they received an extra \$13M and what it would be used for. Searle responded that it would be used to help with processing mixed low level waste and shipping it offsite (which costs more). Another \$10M was earmarked to build additional storage space for TRU waste if needed. Both help address the WIPP shutdown.

McAfee asked about the extra \$20M for Fort St. Vrain. Zimmerman responded that it is to build additional safety features at the Fort St. Vrain facility. Bohrer asked if Fort St. Vrain is part of the INL EM CAB charter. Pence responded that it is not.

WIPP Update

Bohrer asked for an update on the WIPP recovery. Zimmerman reported that reopening WIPP by the 2016 deadline in the recovery plan is a priority for DOE. He also noted that it is on schedule. DOE agreed to provide an update at an upcoming CAB meeting.

Historic Overview of EM Program at INL

Brad Bugger (DOE-ID) provided a historic overview of the EM Program at INL. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

McBride asked about an old bench-scale incinerator for mixed waste. Bugger responded that the waste experimental reduction facility was built but it was later decided not to use incineration for mixed waste. He also noted that the original design for AMWTP included an incinerator but alternative methods were selected.

Bohrer commented that in the early 2000s there was one contractor at the site who was tasked with managing the site and developing a future mission for the site. In the early 2000s a decision was made to split the mission. Cleanup became the sole mission of the cleanup contractor who remained focused on completing cleanup and allowing the other contractor to focus on future missions. Bohrer believes that hindsight shows that this was a wise decision.

Student Participation in the INL CAB

Bohrer introduced the topic of wider public involvement in the CAB by encouraging some sort of student participation. It would help provide a wider perspective to consider. However, it might prove challenging to implement. He asked the CAB to think about what age group should be targeted, how could this be implemented, etc.

Griffith commented that he has been vocal about this in previous meetings and that he believes it is something the CAB should aspire to sooner rather than later. Griffith believes the target audience is probably high school level. He believes that including a student would likely mean targeting the region from Rexburg to Pocatello. Griffith thinks the focus should be targeting institutions (e.g., the school district or school) and likely math and science programs. He believes the schools will support this and that it will be more successful if a teacher or other official is found to serve as a champion. Griffith thinks the CAB should look at what other advisory boards are doing for student involvement.

Martin thinks student participation is a really good idea. She thinks high school level is probably the right level. She believes that the schools will support programs like this. She referenced the local “Phenomenal Physics” program, which might be used to help reach local science teachers and students.

McAfee knows a college freshman who was interested in coming to the CAB meeting but didn’t have time for this meeting. She said he plans to attend future meetings, but noted that the schedule was a challenge.

McBride agrees with Griffith regarding the target age group and his proposed approach to reach students. She also believes that this may help achieve the mission of making the briefings as user friendly as possible.

Fielding believes there would be potential interest from University of Idaho and Idaho State University students, especially with their nuclear engineering programs.

Preacher likes the idea of getting Tribal students involved. He thinks the CAB should encourage the students to come to a meeting as part of their science day.

Roemer agreed with the previous comments and thinks it is a good idea. She believes that it would be beneficial to the CAB and the students.

Branter believes high school and college level are the right targets. He also wondered about CAB members going into the schools and exploring student interest that way. He recommended considering taking some students on the upcoming INL tour.

Christensen agreed with everything that had been said and mentioned that the technical college might be a good target audience as well.

Jensen remembered her interest and excitement about topics in high school and that reaching out to students may be through an announcement at the high schools. She recommended an approach similar to the process that is used for recruiting new CAB members.

Roberts agreed with previous statements and thinks it is a good idea to reach out to the high schools. He recommended starting with local Idaho Falls schools as it would be easiest for them to attend.

Zimmerman noted that there are some good models to take a look at. He questioned whether it was an effort to add a student as a CAB member or whether just reaching out to students for more involvement. He is generally supportive of having a broader audience.

Bohrer noted some questions about the process and asked if audience had input. Preston Abbott (IF) recommended that students or individuals should have a long-term interest.

Badrov commented that when she was at ISU she participated in a citizen advisory panel for Simplot/FMC and it was a great experience. She recommended that the CAB target the college level. She doesn't believe that the high school level would be as interested long term.

Susie Barna noted that the local school districts required a senior project and this might be a good opportunity for the project.

Griffith noted that in terms of process: Board to classroom (board members go to classrooms), classroom to the board (get students here), projects (senior projects, internships), then board membership. He believes there is a process that could be put in place.

Bohrer noted that there are about 16 to 17 high schools in the area. He thinks the CAB could consider a rotation through the schools to invite by school for each quarterly meeting. He noted that coming to one board meeting probably doesn't accomplish much. With the strong presence of ISU and UI locally and their programs that are related to INL work, they may be a good target.

Martin commented that you have to have a key contact at the schools or the message will never get to the students. She noted that this community is so tied to the INL and that may provide a further level of interest, especially to get the program started.

McBride commented that thinking about this in terms of a public participation challenge, the CAB should be thinking about briefings and opportunity to sit at the table, and set up an opportunity to hear from that age group.

Roemer asked if Griffith was familiar with other advisory boards that have done this and if so, can we get information from them. Griffith and Bohrer noted that they believe other advisory boards, such as Oak Ridge and possibly Northern New Mexico, have student involvement.

CAB members all agreed that they would like to have some level of student involvement in the CAB. Pence volunteered to reach out to the other federal coordinators to see what level of student involvement they have. Bohrer thought that would be the most efficient way to get the information. Bohrer also volunteered to bring it up with the other SSAB Chairs. Griffith, Fielding, and Jensen volunteered to serve on a subcommittee to explore the possibility of student involvement. Griffith will chair the subcommittee.

Griffith asked DOE to consider if there is any financial support for this (e.g., covering travel costs for CAB members to attend the CAB meetings).

Pence noted that the INL contractor (BEA) has a strong STEM program that covers the high schools throughout a broad area of southeast Idaho.

Public Comment

Tami Thatcher commented that she had listened to the land use discussions before and noted that she has trouble understanding this new contamination that was found that is not included in the ROD – what is it (e.g., LLW) and in what quantities. She believes that trying to make a decision on this change seems absurd without knowing this additional information. She would like additional information about the waste that was discovered. Zimmerman asked what information the CAB would like. Bohrer would like to talk with Jensen to decide how to respond to DOE.



Herb Bohrer, Chair
Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board
HB/ar