



Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board Meeting

November 13, 2024
1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Hybrid Meeting
The Lodge at Santa Fe
750 N St. Francis Dr
Santa Fe, NM 87501

The video for the November Board Meeting can be viewed on the NNMCAB YouTube Channel:

[NNMCAB November 2024 - YouTube](#)

Minutes

Meeting Attendees

Department of Energy

1. Jessica Kunkle, Manager, Environmental Management Los Alamos
2. Ellie Gilbertson, Deputy Manager, Environmental Management Los Alamos
3. Keith Grindstaff, Deputy Designated Federal Officer, Environmental Management Los Alamos
4. John Evans, Environmental Management Los Alamos
5. Allison Scott Majure, Environmental Management Los Alamos
6. Cheryl Rodriguez, Environmental Management Los Alamos
7. Kelly Snyder, Designated Federal Officer, Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board
8. Susan Wacaster, Environmental Management Los Alamos
9. Sean Lehman, Environmental Management Los Alamos

NNMCAB Members

1. Patricio Pacheco, Chair
2. Manuel L'Esperance, Vice-Chair
3. Eleanor Bravo
4. Danielle Duran
5. Christy Green
6. Sterling Grogan
7. Mark Hayden
8. Beverly Martin
9. Stephen McLaughlin
10. Arlina Sanford
11. Joseph Villegas

NNMCAB Staff/Support

1. Bridget Maestas, Executive Director
2. Menice Santistevan, Senior Advisor
3. Yolanda Valdez, Executive Assistant

Guests

1. Brian Clayman, N3B
2. Brad Smith, N3B
3. JohnDavid Nance, New Mexico Environment Department
4. Angela Martinez, Los Alamos National Laboratory
5. Elicia Williams, Environmental Management Los Alamos
6. John Gonsky, TetraTech
7. Michael Peterson, New Mexico Environment Department
8. Erich Evered, N3B
9. Caitlin Martinez, New Mexico Environment Department
10. Renee Martinez, Environmental Management Los Alamos
11. Scott Kovac, Nuclear Watch New Mexico
12. Amanda Caudillo, Environmental Management Los Alamos
13. Sarah Voorhees, Environmental Management Los Alamos
14. Jennifer Green, Los Alamos National Laboratory
15. Kristin Henderson, N3B
16. Vince Rodriguez, N3B
17. Joe Ritchey, Environmental Management Los Alamos
18. Catherine Juarez, Los Alamos National Laboratory
19. Kristen Van Horn, Los Alamos National Laboratory
20. Whitney LaMarche, TetraTech
21. Luciana Vigil-Holterman, Los Alamos National Laboratory
22. Rebecca Ortiz, Environmental Management Los Alamos
23. Thomas McCrory, Environmental Management Los Alamos
24. Timothy Goering, Los Alamos National Laboratory
25. Elena Fernandez, NMSU Program Manager EPA R6 EJ TCTAC
26. David Ableson, N3B
27. Stephanie Gallagher, Environmental Management Los Alamos
28. Eric Freeman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
29. Kyle Johnson, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
30. Jonathan Plaue, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
31. Theresa Bonelli, Environmental Management Los Alamos
32. Don Hawkins, TetraTech
33. Kelsey Shank, theEDGE
34. Wayne Barber, Exchange Monitor Publications
35. Ubaldo Gallegos, Environmental Management Los Alamos
36. Aubrey Pierce, Environmental Management Los Alamos
37. Christian Maupin, N3B

Minutes**I. Call to Order**

The meeting of the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) was held on November 13, 2024, in a hybrid format. Mr. Keith Grindstaff, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), Environmental Management Los Alamos Field Office (EM-LA) stated that on behalf of the Department of Energy (DOE) the meeting of the NNMCAB was called to order at 1:02 p.m.

Mr. Grindstaff recognized Mr. Patricio Pacheco, the NNMCAB Chair. Mr. Pacheco presided over the meeting.

The meeting of the NNMCAB was posted in the *Federal Register* in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

II. Establishment of a Quorum (Roll Call)

Mr. Pacheco conducted a roll call of board members and guests in person and on WebEx. At the call to order, eleven NNMCAB members were present or online, and a quorum was established.

III. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Grindstaff welcomed everyone to the meeting and pointed out the exits, in case of an emergency. He then introduced Ms. Jessica Kunkle, EM-LA Field Office Manager.

Ms. Kunkle thanked the Board for the opportunity to be present at today's meeting. She stated that she has been with EM-LA for four months and was previously employed with the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) for 15 years. Prior to coming to EM-LA, she served as the Deputy Associate Administrator for Infrastructure Lifecycle Management where she was responsible for maintaining, operating, and modernizing the base infrastructure across the Nuclear Security enterprise.

Mr. Pacheco welcomed everyone to the November Board Meeting in Santa Fe. Mr. Pacheco requested that individuals sitting at the table and board members online, introduce themselves. Mr. Pacheco noted that Ms. Kelly Snyder, Designated Federal Officer, Environmental Management- Site Specific Advisory Board (DFO EM-SSAB) was present online.

Ms. Snyder greeted the Board and stated that as the DFO, her role is to oversee the EM-SSAB program across the DOE Complex

IV. Approval of Agenda

The board reviewed the agenda for the November 13, 2024, meeting. Mr. Pacheco called for a motion to approve the agenda as presented.

Mr. Sterling Grogan made a motion to approve the agenda; Mr. Mark Hayden seconded the motion. The agenda was approved, as presented.

V. Old Business**a. Update from Chair/Vice-Chair****Mr. Pacheco, NNMCAB Chair**

Mr. Pacheco expressed his gratitude to EM-LA and N3B for holding a community forum at the SALA Event Center in Los Alamos. The forum discussed the progress that took place for Fiscal Year (FY) 24. He also expressed his gratitude to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) for their forum at New Mexico Highlands University in Las Vegas, NM.

b. Update from Subcommittee Chairs**Risk Evaluation & Management Subcommittee**

Ms. Beverly Martin stated that the Risk Evaluation and Management Subcommittee met on October 2, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. The meeting was held via WebEx. The DDFO, Mr. Grindstaff was in attendance. The Subcommittee discussed the Chromium Plume, Royal Demolition Explosives (RDX) Plume, and MDA C. The Subcommittee would like more information regarding all three. The Subcommittee will meet the first Wednesday of every other month at 1:00 p.m. via Webex.

Public Outreach Subcommittee

Mr. Joseph Villegas stated that the Public Outreach Subcommittee met on November 6, 2024. The subcommittee discussed adding a graphic to the website that explains the relationship between the different parts of LANL, DOE and their main contractors (i.e., NNSA->Triad, EM->N3B) and what their purpose is, creating a "DOE 101" Curriculum/Informational Development; set up educational offerings for Public Information Officers (PIO) in all communities, including DOE 101 and Work with EM/N3B to create "workforce information sessions" that include DOE 101 and other information based on actual work being done.

Consent Order Subcommittee

Mr. Hayden stated that he would be referring to the "Overview of Revisions to the 2016 Compliance Order on Consent" document. The Overview of Revisions can be found on the following link. [Overview of Revisions to the 2016 Compliance Order on Consent](#) Section 8 discusses the milestones and completion dates that are based on A and B campaign completion. The Subcommittee requests that the NNMCAB be provided the results and if the completion and milestones are not met, an explanation be provided as to why they were not met in five years. A request was made for an explanation of the new review times in Section 23 and in Section 25; an update on the chromium pressure wall dispute between the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) and DOE. Under Section 34, a review of the Consent Order is required every 10 years for efficacy and a request was made for information on when the 10-year review period began. Under Section 36, where it discusses stipulated penalties, a request was made for information on whether milestones were missed or identified. Under Appendix D, a request was made for information on what the review time frames are for the different documents listed, and under Appendix G has the pilot audit been established and what are the dates.

Update from EM SSAB Fall Chairs' Meeting

Mr. L'Esperance stated Ms. Martin, staff and himself attended the EM SSAB Chairs meeting, hosted by the Oak Ridge Advisory Board in September. The tour guide was very knowledgeable and provided the history of the site and its current operations. Mr. L'Esperance discussed his concerns about the exits out of the site, contamination of the surrounding water sources, unmitigated buildings, and the information provided by the other sites during the meeting round robin. Ms. Martin stated her interest in the caps for the MDAs.

Questions

Mr. Hayden asked if Mr. L'Esperance could provide a comparative analysis of the Oak Ridge and LANL sites.

Mr. L'Esperance stated that there is significant activity going on at the site and several structures are being demolished and rebuilt. The work is being done within close confines.

Mr. Hayden stated that the construction at Oak Ridge could be utilized as a model for construction taking place at LANL.

VI. New Business**a. Other Items**

Mr. Pacheco stated that the Work Plan for FY 25 is progressing but has not been completed.

Mr. Hayden requested the status of the recommendations submitted by the NNM CAB over the past 5 years and if an outline could be provided with information on each.

Mr. Grogan asked if the NNM CAB has the ability to provide input on the Work Plan.

Mr. Grindstaff stated that Headquarters changed the guidance on the Work Plan process. Work Plans are developed by EM-LA and then sent back to Headquarters for approval.

VII. Update from New Mexico Environment Department

Mr. JohnDavid Nance gave the update for the New Mexico Environment Department.

Consent Order – NMED and DOE signed the Settlement Agreement on August 30, 2024, in resolution to the litigation filed by NMED in 2021. The Settlement Agreement includes an agreement to complete the review of the pending certificates of completion and modifications to the Consent Order. The Revised Consent Order was signed by NMED and DOE on September 30, 2024. The Settlement Agreement and the Revised Consent Order are available on the NMED website.

Fully Executed Revised 2016 Compliance Order on Consent (Modified September 2024)

In the FY 25 proposed Appendix B schedule NMED is concerned with delays in multiple corrective action projects. NMED hopes that the Revised Consent Order which requires an expanded five-year schedule will help facilitate DOE's transparency regarding the funding concerns that are preventing the completion of cleanup work.

Groundwater – SIMR-3 is the next proposed groundwater monitoring well for completion. The goal of the well is to evaluate potential contamination on the Pueblo de San Ildefonso lands south of the injection locations. The Pueblo de San Ildefonso issued a determination on the type and number of monitoring wells. The determination stated that two single screen monitoring wells for each proposed dual screen location should be constructed. Conversations are continuing with the Pueblo de San Ildefonso and DOE to reach an agreement on the construction of SIMR-3.

NMED and DOE participated in an Independent Technical Review (ITR) of the Hexavalent Chromium project. The ITR recommended by the Radioactive & Hazardous Materials Interim Committee and the Government Accountability Office. The ITR has reviewed and will provide recommendations on the path forward for the Chromium Interim Measure (IM).

Chromium Interim Measures – NMED and DOE have participated in an ITR of the Hexavalent Chromium project. The ITR will review and provide recommendations on the path forward for the IM. NMED and DOE have received a draft document of the ITR. The two parties are currently in the process of reviewing the document for factual accuracy. Upon finalization NMED and DOE will jointly present the ITRs recommendations to the public.

In June of 2024, NMED sent a temporary authorization to resume partial IM operations and end the shutdown that began in April 2023. NMED has required commitment from DOE to alleviate concerning trends by expanding the IM treatment system as a condition of the temporary recommencement. DOE disagrees with NMED's requirements and has not proposed a compromise. DOE has acted on the temporary approval to resume partial IM operations by restarting injection into wells CrINs-3, 4 and, 5 which began on September 30, 2024. The restart includes extraction from wells CrEX-2, 4, and 5 and NMED will continue to monitor concentrations under this temporary authorization period.

Corrective Action Documents – NMED issued a Statement of Basis for MDA C and held a 60-day public comment period. Hearing requests were received from Triad, EM-LA, N3B, and Nuclear Watch New Mexico. NMED has scheduled an informal conference on January 15th to discuss scheduling a public hearing. NMED anticipates the hearing to take place in the first half of 2025.

Permit Related Activities – On March 25, 2024, the Environmental Protection Agency proposed amendments to the regulations for the open burning and open detonation of waste explosives. DOE has been re-evaluating the permit application with consideration to the proposed rule and NMED is continuing to wait for the submission of the revised application.

WIPP Update – Implementation of New Permit Conditions

The Legacy Transuranic (TRU) Waste Disposal Plan was submitted to NMED on November 4, 2024, and is currently in a 60-day comment period. Information can be found on the energy.gov website.

[U.S. Department of Energy's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant - Legacy TRU Waste Disposal Plan](#)

The last WIPP community forum for the year was held on October 24, 2024, in Las Vegas, New Mexico. The proposed FY 25 Audit schedule and Small Generator/ Storage Site Risk Assessment was received on October 8, 2024, and is currently being reviewed by NMED. The Repository Siting Annual Update Report is due by the end of calendar year 2024.

Shipment Update – Total shipments are 400. They have received 295 from Idaho National Laboratory, 39 from LANL, 57 from Savannah River Site, 10 from Oak Ridge National Laboratory, 4 from Argonne National Laboratory, and 1 from Lawrence Livermore.

a. Questions

Mr. Hayden asked if the ITR will be the final say in how the chromium plume cleanup will be handled or will mediation take place as is required in the Updated Consent Order.

Mr. Nance stated that the ITR began prior to the Revised Consent Order. The process would go through their recommendations and that will dictate how the process will move forward. Any future disagreements that are not covered under the ITR will go into the mediation process.

Mr. Grogan asked when the two conferences for MDA C will be taking place.

Mr. Nance stated that an informal conference would take place prior to the hearing. The date of the hearing has not been set but will take place in the first part of 2025.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if disputes or disagreements that arise out of the ITR are subject to the mediation provisions of the updated Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Nance stated that the issues being addressed by the ITR are from the Revised Consent Order. The ITR was a mitigation tool that was used prior to the Consent Order being revised. Any future disagreements will go through the mediation process under the Revised Consent Order.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the mediation process would be utilized if the ITR report provided a recommendation that DOE and NMED do not approve of.

Mr. Nance stated that if there is disagreement it will go into mediation.

Ms. Martin asked if the State is proposing complete removal of the waste from MDA C and if DOE is against it.

Mr. Nance stated that NMEDs proposed full excavation of the site and DOE is proposing an engineered cap and cover.

Ms. Elenor Bravo asked if the disputes are not settled in mediation what is the next step.

Ms. Caitlin Martinez stated under the Revised Consent Order a solution must be reached. If the dispute is technical, a technical expert will be enlisted, and the cost will be split between NMED and DOE.

VIII. Update and Look Ahead from N3B

Mr. Bryan Clayman, CH-TRU Program Manager presented the update for N3B. Mr. Clayman thanked the Board for giving him the opportunity to speak to them. Mr. Clayman stated that N3Bs work may be broken up into protecting water quality, cleaning up the land, and shipping waste off-site.

N3B met all 15 of the FY 24 Consent Order Milestones agreed upon by EM-LA and NMED. This involved the completed drilling of the Hexavalent Chromium Well R-76 and taking the initial samples. It also involved the development of drilling work plans for five additional

Hexavalent Chromium Wells that will be drilled in the future. Fieldwork and risk assessments were conducted in Aggregate Areas. Borehole vapor samples were taken at Material Disposal Area (MDA) A, and resumed soil vapor extraction at MDA L. Over 5,300 surface and groundwater samples were taken, and 5,000 stormwater protective measures samples were taken. The samples are in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.

The cleanup of DP Road was completed, the waste was shipped, and the land was turned back over to Los Alamos County. Work continues at Twomile Canyon, Potrillo/Fence Aggregate areas, Starmar/Upper Pajarito Canyon, Chaquehui, and Lower Pajarito Aggregate Areas. Vapor samples were taken at MDA A, G and T. Vapor extraction systems and vapor monitoring took place in MDA L and a report was created and submitted to NMED.

Hexavalent Chromium Interim Measures will continue in 2025, following the ITR report results. The drilling of a new monitoring well will be initiated near SIMR-3, and aquifer testing will be completed at Well R-42. Work will continue at Chaquehui and Upper Pajarito Aggregate Areas and a work plan will be developed and submitted to NMED for the Lower Sandia Canyon Aggregate Area. Paper sampling will be completed, and a report submitted to NMED for MDA T. Four rounds of sampling are required and N3B is currently in the middle of the sampling process. The report will include risk analysis and a key component supporting the Corrective Measures Evaluation Report.

CH-TRU completed 22 TRU shipments to WIPP. This included 50.3 cubic meters of Legacy Waste and 7.88 cubic meters of total TRU Waste. A total of 1,359 cubic meters of low-level and mixed low-level radioactive waste was shipped. The CH-TRU drill and drain are about to recommence, and a demonstration of the new Neutron Spectroscopy System took place this summer. One hundred and fifty-eight corrugated metal pipes (CMP) have been excavated and 130 have been segmented and placed into WIPP containers for shipment. The project is at 82% completion.

N3B is prepping for work at Pit 9. This will include the design of an enclosure over the pit, a separate drum ventilation enclosure, and a high material at risk glove box to be added to the existing permanent containment located in Dome 375. Administrative changes will also take place to the Documented Safety Analysis. Milestones for mixed low-level and low-level waste will continue to be maintained by shipping waste off-site within 180 days of generation. DOE's Documented Safety Analysis was received, and it will go into effect for Area G.

Questions

Ms. Martin asked what is done with the liquid that is extracted from the drums.

Mr. Clayman stated that it is first analyzed for Potential Hydrogen (pH) and then treated to get it in the non-corrosive band. It is then solidified and added back into the waste stream.

Ms. Bravo asked what is utilized to solidify the liquid.

Mr. Clayman stated that the drums are examined in a Real-Time Radiography unit and x-rayed for liquid pockets. When the pockets are located, the drum is punctured to release the water. The liquid is then solidified using Zeolite and put into a daughter drum.

Mr. Pacheco asked if water was being accepted at WIPP

Mr. Clayman stated that it is not. That is why it is treated and then solidified.

IX. EM-LA Update

Ms. Kunkle thanked the Board for the invitation to speak at the meeting and would be providing an overview of her top priorities. The focus will remain on ensuring that the legacy cleanup mission is completed in an effective, efficient, and safe manner. As a show of support for the workforce, regular site visits will take place over the next several months. Key positions will be created within the EM-LA organization to assist with recruitment, onboarding, and enhancement of the collaboration and productivity amongst the current team.

Chromium IM operations resumed partial operations on September 30th. Operations are currently on a 24/5 schedule and will change to 24/7 soon. During the restart, minimal maintenance was required, and all minor maintenance has been adjudicated.

The ITR report for the Hexavalent Chromium is expected to be released by the end of the calendar year. NMED and DOE will engage to coordinate the public rollout of that report. DOE anticipates that Dr. Inez Triay will provide the teams recommendations and answer questions from the public.

Ms. Kunkle stated that she will expand on the Class A and B Campaigns of the Revised Consent Order. A completion date will be established for Campaign A, but it is not required to fall within the five-year schedule. It is anticipated that a five-year schedule will be established first from which a campaign completion date will then be established. Campaigns that possess a completion date that extends beyond the five-year schedule will maintain a rolling five-year schedule.

Under the 2016 Compliance Order on Consent, EM-LA has only missed one milestone. Since that time EM-LA has demonstrated its commitment to meeting milestones. The Pilot Audit in Appendix G has not been initiated. Initiation will take place before September 29, 2025. DOE and NMED reached an agreement on Appendices A, B, and C for FY 25. The appendices were planned prior to the execution of the Revised Consent Order and do not fiscally align with the 2016 Revised Consent Order. NMED and DOE are working together to make the modifications to the FY 2026 appendices.

Strategic Vision received over 2,000 comments during its public participation period. EM-LA is optimistic that the first-round iteration of the Strategic Vision will take place in the beginning of 2025.

a. Questions

Mr. Hayden asked if a dispute arises, will the schedule be stopped until the dispute is resolved.

Ms. Kunkle stated that under the Revised Consent Order, dispute resolution is designed to move quickly. Upon joint appointment of an Independent Technical party, there is a 60-day resolution period.

Ms. Martin asked if it is under the purview of the NNMCAB to make a recommendation on MDA C.

Ms. Kunkle stated that the public comment period is still open and the NNMCAB does have the ability to provide feedback on that platform.

Ms. Maestas read the following statement from WebEx Chat from Ms. Snyder:

"The board can only make recommendations to DOE EM."

X. Presentation on "Ship Waste Off-Site: the CH-TRU Program"

Mr. Brian Clayman, N3B presented on "Ship Waste Off-Site: the CH-TRU Program." An electronic copy of the presentation may be obtained from the NNMCAB staff.

(Yolanda.valdez@em.doe.gov or bridget.maestas@em.doe.gov)

Mr. Clayman stated that he would be discussing above-ground, below-ground, and mixed low-level TRU Waste. He then provided an overview of TRU, low-level, mixed low-level, and non-radioactive waste streams, and the CMP project. The CMPs were originally brought from TA-21 and are now at Pit 29 in TA-54 for size reduction. Mr. Clayman then provided an overview of the work at Pit 9. He provided the history of the area and the challenges that have arisen. The path forward consists of designing ventilated enclosures, site prep, upgrades to existing domes, and permitting and compliance.

a. Questions

Ms. Bravo asked what is done with the waste not accepted at WIPP.

Mr. Clayman stated that drums lower than TRU waste are shipped to commercial disposal sites such as Energy Solutions in Utah, Waste Control Specialist in Texas, and Clean Harbors in Nevada.

Ms. Bravo asked if a state permit is required for the glove box.

Mr. Clayman stated that State of New Mexico permits are required.

Ms. Bravo asked if all sites require waste to be shipped off-site within 180 days or just LANL.

Mr. Clayman stated that EM-LA has a LANL specific 365-day mandate to maintain inventory.

Ms. Martin asked if there are currently 2,500 drums above ground, why are the CMPs being processed and adding to the current inventory and risk to the public.

Mr. Clayman stated that Legacy Waste requires a longer period of characterization and newly generated waste requires less. Newly generated can be shipped off-site at a higher rate because of that factor.

Mr. Grogan asked for a total of drums in Pit 8.

Mr. Clayman stated that the feasibility study has just begun so that information is not yet available.

Mr. Grogan asked where the newly generated non-TRU waste will be sent.

Mr. Clayman stated that if the waste is radioactive it will go to one of the three previously mentioned sites.

Mr. Villegas asked how the Tritium waste from TA-21 was treated.

Mr. Clayman stated that Tritium is water vapor so there is very little Tritium in the waste process.

1 Mr. Villegas asked what type of water is utilized for dust suppression.

2 Mr. Clayman stated that potable water and Durasoil are combined to create a gummy
3 substance that is utilized for dust suppression.

4 Mr. L'Esperance asked if the legacy waste kept above ground is being characterized
5 concurrent with the newly generated waste.

6 Mr. Clayman stated that they are being characterized concurrently.

7 Mr. L'Esperance asked if the CMP project was complete.

8 Mr. Clayman stated that the project is not complete. There is a total of 158 CMPs and
9 130 have been completed.

10 Ms. Green asked how non-retrievable waste is processed.

11 Mr. Clayman stated that non-retrievable means that when it was interred there was no
12 intention of it being retrieved. The first step is to do a feasibility study and make
13 recommendations. A path forward is then decided from there.

14 Mr. Hayden asked what EM-LAs relationship is with the Waste Control Specialists in
15 Andrews, Texas. What is stored at that location and how.

16 Mr. Clayman stated that EM-LA and N3B are clients. They can store low-level waste at
17 this location.

18 Mr. Hayden asked how much of the waste is sent to Waste Control Specialists and how
19 it is decided.

20 Mr. Brad Smith, President and General Manager of N3B stated the decision is made at
21 LANL. The process begins by putting the drums through the RTR Unit. It then goes
22 through the Central Characterization Program and is entered through the Acceptable
23 Knowledge database. Lastly, it goes through a certification process that will decide if it
24 meets the criteria for WIPP.

25 Ms. Martin asked if the waste from the CMP project could be considered newly
26 generated waste.

27 Mr. Clayman stated that it is titled newly generated waste because it is newly packaged
28 however, it is legacy waste.

29 Mr. L'Esperance asked if LANL has a low-level waste repository.

30 Mr. Clayman stated that LANL does not have a facility like the one in Oak Ridge.

31 Mr. Pacheco asked if the CMPs were not moved during inclement weather to prevent
32 leaching from the pipe or for worker safety.

33 Mr. Clayman stated that it is mainly for worker safety.

34 Ms. Green asked if there is a repository for past recommendations.

35 Ms. Maestas stated that they are located on the NNMCAB website. The website is
36 currently being updated and any specific recommendations can be requested by
37 contacting the NNMCAB staff.

XI. Public Comment Period

Mr. Pacheco opened the floor for public comment at 3:46 p.m.

Scott Kovac, Nuclear Watch New Mexico, signed up for public comment. Mr. Kovac thanked the NNMCAB members for their work on the difficult issues and Mr. Clayman and his team for the tour they provided of the CMP project. DOE is pushing for a dual screen well for SIMR 3, but only single screen wells are allowed at LANL. The NNMCAB should make a recommendation for funding for its website. The presentations need a location to be viewed. The waste in slide eight of Mr. Clayman's presentation consists of the current planned waste to be removed but over 800,000 cubic yards remain. The Feasibility Study shows a picture of the cover. Wheels should be put on the cover and rolled over to Pit 8 or 10 for excavation.

With no further public comment, Mr. Pacheco closed public comment at 3:50 p.m.

XII. Adjournment

Mr. Grindstaff stated the board meeting packet contains a copy of the NNMCAB Draft Board Meeting Schedule for 2025.

Mr. Hayden asked if the WIPP tour will take place.

Ms. Maestas stated that she is working with WIPP to reschedule the tour.

With no additional business to discuss, Mr. Grindstaff adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

Certified By:



Mr. Patricio Pacheco, Chair

***Minutes prepared by Yolanda Valdez, Executive Assistant, NNMCAB**

Attachments

- 1. Final NNMCAB Meeting Agenda for 11/13/2024**
- 2. Biography, Brian Clayman**
- 3. Presentation by Brian Clayman, "Ship Waste Off-Site: the CH-TRU Program"**
- 4. Project Update Los Alamos Legacy Cleanup Q4 2024**
- 5. Handout, NNMCAB 2025 Draft Meeting Schedule**

- 1 ***All NNMCAB meetings are recorded. The written minutes are intended as a synopsis of the meeting.**