# INL Site Environmental Management

CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

# Meeting Minutes

June 23, 2016

List of Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| AMWTP | Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project |
| ARP | Accelerated Retrieval Project |
| ATR | Advanced Test Reactor Complex |
| CAB | Citizens Advisory Board |
| CCP | Central Characterization Project |
| CERCLA | Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, also referred to as superfund |
| CPP | Chemical Processing Plant |
| CWI | CH2M-WG, Idaho |
| DDFO | Deputy Designated Federal Officer |
| DFO | Designated Federal Officer |
| DMR | Denitration/mineralization reformer |
| DOE | Department of Energy |
| DOT | Department of Transportation |
| DSA | Documented Safety Analysis |
| EM | Office of Environmental Management |
| EM SSAB | Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| ICP Core | Idaho Cleanup Project Core |
| INL | Idaho National Laboratory INTEC Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center |
| INTEC | Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center |
| ITG | Idaho Treatment Group |
| IWTU | Integrated Waste Treatment Unit |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| NE | Office of Nuclear Energy |
| NRC | Nuclear Regulatory Commission |
| NRF | Naval Reactors Facility |
| RCRA | Resource Conservation and Recovery Act |
| RH-TRU | Remote-handled transuranic waste |
| RSWF | Radioactive Scarp and Waste Facility |
| RWMC | Radioactive Waste Management Complex |
| TMI | Three Mile Island |
| TRA | Test Reactor Area |
| TRU | Transuranic waste |
| WAC | Waste Acceptance Criteria |

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Thursday, June 23, 2016, at the Hilton Garden Inn in Idaho Falls, Idaho. An audio recording of the meeting was created and may be reviewed by calling CAB Support Staff at 208.557.7886.

**Members Present**
Bob Bodell
Herb Bohrer
Keith Branter
Brad Christiansen
Marvin Fielding
Harry Griffith
Talia Martin
Trilby McAffee
Betsy McBride
Cathy Roemer

**Members Not Present**
Kristen Jensen
Bill Roberts

**Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO), Federal Coordinator, and Liaisons Present**
Jack Zimmerman, DDFO, U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Fred Hughes, Fluor Idaho/Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP)
Susan Burke, State of Idaho
Ted Livieratos for Daryl Koch, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (I-DEQ)

**Others Present**
Ann Riedesel, ICP
Zannita Pongah, Tribes
Curtis Roth, DOE-ID
Ken Alkema
Mark Hutchison, NRF
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Mike Hart, Partnership for Science and Technology
Mark Jewett, ICP
Peggy Davis, ICP
John Law, ICP
Teresa Perkins, DOE-ID
Tom Dieter, ICP
Tami Thatcher
Danielle Miller, DOE-ID
Elamin Almahie Yousif, DOE-ID
Richard Craun, DOE-ID
Andrea Gumm, Facilitator
Kelly Green, Staff
Travis Meyers, ICP
James Wolski
Erik Simpson, ICP
Clark Jones
Julie Huntsman
Kerry Martin, I-DEQ
Brad Bugger, DOE-ID
Mike Swain, ICP
Chris Henvit, Navy
Debby Myler, ICP
Ben Roberts, DOE-ID
Kirt Marlow
Steve Davies, ICP
Lori Howell, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Stan Baldwin, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Amy Taylor, U.S. Senator Risch
Benjamin Leake, DOE-ID
Jordan Davies, Staff

## Opening Remarks

Facilitator Andrea Gumm started the meeting at 8:00 a.m. She reviewed the agenda and noted there would be two public comment periods – one at 11:15 a.m. and another at 2:45 p.m. She reminded attendees of the process for public comments during the meeting, time permitting, or via "question cards."

Bohrer welcomed everyone to the meeting. He noted there is a new member on the CAB, Jim Huston, and referenced his long list of experience. He welcomed Huston to the Board and said his experience will provide much value to the CAB. Bohrer commented that CAB members toured Site facilities the previous day, and said he believes the transition went well and that Fluor Idaho has hit the ground running. Bohrer added that he was impressed with what he saw at the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Plant (AMWTP) and the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC).

Jack Zimmerman (DOE-ID) commented that Fred Hughes of Fluor Idaho is new to the CAB meetings and asked him to introduce himself.

Fred Hughes (Fluor Idaho) commented that he is the Program Manager for Fluor Idaho, the company over the Idaho Cleanup Project Core contract (ICP Core). Transition was completed on June 1 and they immediately sprung to action. He looks forward to working with the CAB moving forward.

Zimmerman also asked Jim Huston to introduce himself.

Jim Huston commented that he is glad to join the CAB. He has a background in nuclear engineering, with experience across the globe from South Africa, to Ireland and China. He noted that after being away for over 50 years, it was great to return to Idaho. He is looking forward to working with the CAB and helping to represent the community.

Zimmerman echoed Bohrer's and Hughes' comments regarding the transition. Both DOE and Fluor Idaho were well prepared and this transition was the smoothest he has seen despite the complicated consolidation of the Idaho Treatment Group (ITG) and CH2M-WG Idaho (CWI), Zimmerman said. He noted that Fluor Idaho produced more in one week in the treatment facility at the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Plant (AMWTP) its second week than the last five years. The workforce, between the buried waste and the above ground waste, has integrated and pulled together very effectively and quickly.

Susan Burke (State of Idaho) reiterated that the tour was productive and went well. She commented that the transition from ITG/CWI to Fluor Idaho seems to have been performed seamlessly. DEQ is looking forward to WIPP reopening so the many barrels awaiting shipment can finally leave Idaho.

Ted Livieratos (DEQ) commented that he is filling in for Daryl Koch. He noted he works in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) program on Idaho National Laboratory (INL) projects.

## Recent Public Outreach Activities

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

CAB member Betsy McBride asked if the May 18 Explanation of Significant Differences for injection wells at the Advanced Test Reactor Complex (ATR) pertained to the well with the tetrachloroethene (PCE) Zimmerman responded no, this area is near ATR, and essentially consists of French drains that were at one

time associated with an activity with low levels of contamination. Following an evaluation of the D&D period, they concluded action must be taken. The area is small and the work very low risk.

## Idaho Cleanup Project Overview

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

Bohrer asked for the status of the new waste acceptance criteria (WAC) for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in Carlsbad, New Mexico. Zimmerman responded that DOE-ID has not yet seen the new criteria as tests are still being performed to check for reactivity that could impact the WAC. It is expected that the bulk of the waste drums Idaho has processed will meet the new criteria, although there may be outlier drums that require retreatment. Some additional effort will be necessary to ensure Idaho's drums satisfy the new WAC.

Bohrer also asked if WIPP is on track to resume operations by the end of this calendar year. Zimmerman confirmed that the Plant is expected to restart by the end of the year. Brad Bugger (DOE-ID) clarified that the goal is to begin waste emplacement by the end of 2016, not necessarily shipping. It is still unclear when generator sites may proceed with shipping.

Bohrer commented that CWI's and ITG's safety performance has been separated on past reports and asked if, under Fluor Idaho, all safety performance will be merged. Zimmerman confirmed it will be merged.

Bohrer asked how the areas targeted by the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP) were selected. Zimmerman responded that they were chosen according to the performed risk assessment; they are the high risk areas that contain mobile and hazardous constituents.

Burke commented that cleanup progress at the ARPs is significant. The sludge reprocessing allowed a Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) activity to take place in a CERCLA facility. The state, DOE and the contractor working together to make use of an unused structure to accept the drums and process the waste is noteworthy. The large objects are also RCRA treated in a CERCLA facility. To move boxes showing large masses to another facility for treatment is a significant and efficient process. It has made for a better cleanup process all around. Zimmerman added that it was a great example of working with the State to find more efficient ways to treat the waste. There were cost benefits, too. This regulatory agreement allowed them to repurpose the facility. This kind of cooperation is rare and DOE appreciates the State enabling them to do this.

Bohrer referred to the contamination event at ARP VII on May 10, 2016 and asked how many contamination events the ARPs have seen. Zimmerman responded that he does not know the number. Bohrer noted that the risk of these contamination events is high with the amount of activity requiring sophisticated respiratory equipment, and commended the radiological and safety workers' performance. Zimmerman expressed his appreciation for Borher's comments and echoed his recognition of the ARP employees' excellent record.

Huston commented that he has spent many years observing people working in contaminated areas and agreed that the low contamination record is remarkable. Huston also noted the continuity of the effort through the Fluor Idaho transition. Zimmerman agreed that the workforce's safety performance is excellent and assured the Board that they are taking precautions to ensure this type of contamination event does not happen again.

CAB member Betsy McBride asked Zimmerman to speak to preparations for Navy remote-handled transuranic (RH-TRU) waste. Chris Henvit (Naval Reactors) responded that the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC) houses spent nuclear fuel that was shipped there prior to terminating the

reprocessing activities. The Navy is in the process of returning that fuel to the Naval Reactors Facility (NRF) to place it in dry storage. A small quantity of that material is believed to meet the acceptance criteria to be packaged and shipped to WIPP, which is more economical for the taxpayer. It is currently stored in the water basins at INTEC, but is slated to be processed in the 2018 timeframe.

The CAB chair opened the discussion to questions from members of the public. Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, asked Henvit if the transuranic (TRU) waste is part of fuel assemblies. Henvit confirmed, yes. Brailsford asked what a Brokk is. Zimmerman responded that Brokk is the tradename for a robotic arm that opens, segregates and repackages waste. Brailsford asked him to expand on his earlier comment that ATR has not produced as much spent fuel as planned. Zimmerman responded that they are operating less than they thought they would a year ago.

## Integrated Waste Treatment Unit Update

Zimmerman provided an update on the IWTU project. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

CAB member Trilby McAffee asked how the sodium-bearing waste was created. Zimmerman responded that much of the high-level liquid waste was generated from fuel reprocessing activities conducted at INTEC from the 1960s through about 1990. Most of that high-level liquid waste was treated by the calcine facility and turned into a solid waste form. DOE-ID believes the treated sodium-bearing waste may meet the criteria for disposal at WIPP as TRU waste and is working through that process. Had it remained operational, the calcine facility may not have been able to treat this particular waste due to the sodium aspect. McAffee asked for confirmation that the formula has changed to treat this waste. Zimmerman responded that this waste has been in storage for several decades; the calciner was closed in the late 1990s.

Bugger elaborated that when DOE made the decision to discontinue reprocessing in the early 1990s, every component of the process (e.g., cells and piping) was thoroughly washed with acid to eliminate contamination before it was closed. Sodium-bearing waste is the concentrated leftovers of that cleaning process.

CAB member Brad Christensen asked how many weeks it will take to process the waste at IWTU once the facility is up and running. Zimmerman responded that current processing projections are slightly higher than 1.6 gallon/minute throughput. However, with formation of bark in the Unit, the math is not necessarily straightforward. The goal is to run for 90 days at that rate before shutting down to perform maintenance. DOE hopes to process the waste in 18 months.

CAB member Cathy Roemer asked if Fluor Idaho's expectation is as expedient looking on this particular project as the others within their scope. Zimmerman responded that Fluor Idaho has brought in an excellent team and they've begun formulating their phased plan of approach.

Roemer asked which areas of expertise Fluor Idaho brings to the project that have not yet been put forward. Zimmerman responded that Fluor has operational experience with fluidized beds. Additionally, some of the experts that have been brought in recently will continue with Fluor.

Bohrer asked Zimmerman to confirm that once they start hot operations, they will have to periodically shut down and clean the system. Zimmerman confirmed, and explained that they are unable to eliminate the bark entirely, but are working to make it manageable. Bohrer commented that this is a significant change from the intended purpose of the facility. Zimmerman responded that there are remote capabilities to perform maintenance as well as a built-in nitric acid wash system, which was included in the base design so hardened

materials could be dissolved and redirected to the waste feed tank to be reprocessed back into the facility. They are looking into other ways to clean the vessel, such as thermal shock. Bohrer asked if they will enter the hot cells or vessels once the facility is operational. Zimmerman said no.

McBride asked if DOE regrets having waited to begin Hazen testing until the Inspector General suggested it. Zimmerman responded that they evaluated it 12 to 18 months ago but were not prepared to go down that path at the time. Once they completed the first simulant run just over a year ago, they realized there were some weaknesses, namely pertaining to the bark, that they must go back to address. McBride asked if the Hazen testing is producing useful information. Zimmerman responded that initial runs formed quite a bit of bark material so they were stopped prematurely. As they begin to influence that process, he expects they will obtain valuable information from the pilot tests. The denitration/mineralization reformer (DMR) is not designed as a test bed, so when the bark forms they cannot collect a real-time sample to identify the constituent and its solution.

CAB Member Keith Branter referenced the contract change and asked if DOE will conduct new contractor and DOE readiness reviews before starting up. Zimmerman responded no. The criteria stipulate that if they have not been operational for one year they must do a readiness review. The documented safety analysis (DSA) is continuing to be implemented.

Huston asked if the instability in the bed is related to bark formation and what type of instability is occurring. Zimmerman confirmed they believe the instability is related to the bark formation. As the bark forms on a temperature sensor, it causes a differential reading that ultimately drives them to a shutdown.

Bohrer asked Zimmerman to speculate at what point Phase IV might begin. Zimmerman responded that he is unwilling to speculate at this time. Bohrer asked how long Phase II will last. Zimmerman answered the facility is at least 60 to 90 days from a full-scale simulant run.

## Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Update

Brad Bugger (DOE-ID) provided an update about the WIPP Facility. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

Burke referenced the new WAC and asked who will make the determination and perform the work for waste outside WIPP. Ben Roberts (DOE-ID) responded that it will return to the certified program that generated the waste. The Central Characterization Project (CCP) does that for most of the complex with the exception of AMTWP. In that case, Fluor Idaho will do it. Everything they have in the waste handling building from Idaho is from AMWTP; there is no RH-TRU there.

Bohrer asked how much waste they have in the waste handling building. Roberts responded that they have approximately 20 shipments, or about 250 containers. Bohrer then asked if changes to the WAC require a RCRA permit requirement modification and when they will have a draft of the new criteria. Roberts responded no, and said they have a first draft approved, which will become effective July 5. DOE-ID will be able to begin recertifying the waste only after they complete all new requirements as well as the generator site technical review, probably in September or October.

Bohrer asked about Idaho's strategy to influence the formulation of shipping plans to come out of the National TRU Waste Corporate Board. Zimmerman responded that Idaho has 20,000 drums certified and ready to go, more than any other site. By default, DOE-ID will likely get a significant number of shipments in the long run. However, the first year will be uncertain. Savannah River, for example, has only eight shipments and has equipment that Idaho might benefit from if they were finished. It might be advantageous

to allow them to ship first. There is another board meeting in August to more clearly define national priorities.

Huston asked if the process reviews are paper or physical. Roberts responded that it will initially be a paperwork exercise to look at the chemicals and constituents. If they find issues in that paper review, there may be additional steps. Huston asked if DOE-ID has figured out its process for handling a physical review. Roberts responded no as their response will be tailored to each specific waste stream that has an issue. He speculated that they will not have to do any rework on the containers currently waiting to ship.

Roemer referenced the DSA and asked if they could elaborate on the new DOE Standard 3009-2014. Zimmerman responded that Standard 3009-2014 is the guide that dictates how safety bases are developed and accident analyses performed, and which results drive implementation of controls. Roemer also asked what was missing from the 120 safety management program procedures that were recently revised. Zimmerman responded that they performed a new DSA that must be implemented and in this case, was fairly significant as the margin of safety had eroded over time. The new DSA reestablishes a much wider safety margin. It also addresses emergency management and the RadCon program.

CAB member Talia Martin referenced the chemical compatibility evaluations that use the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) approved methodology. She asked how DOE will avoid physically sorting through every container if the new WAC requires it. Roberts responded that the EPA-approved methodology is a method under RCRA that instructs waste managers how to analyze their waste for potential interactions between chemical constituents. It involves evaluating the acceptable knowledge data for each particular waste stream (the history of the waste, how it was generated, what chemicals were used, and how it has been treated over time) and comparing constituents for potential interactions under the RCRA-provided criteria. It is not a physical test that is performed.

## Future of the Cleanup Program

Fred Hughes (Fluor Idaho) provided a presentation about the future of the cleanup program. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

Bohrer referred to slide 33 and asked where the operators are on the IWTU organization chart. Hughes responded that Craig Olsen is the new project manager for IWTU. The operators, operations, control room and engineers report to him. The Chief Engineer, Joe Giebel, is responsible for Engineering. Leo Thompson, though technically reporting to Mike Swain, really reports to Craig Olsen. It is a seamless team between the operations, engineers and the IWTU focus team.

Zimmerman asked Hughes to clarify the box colors on the chart on slide 33. Hughes responded that the colored boxes relate directly to the phases discussed on the previous slide. The white boxes show the structure once those phases are complete.

Roemer asked if there were any significant changes to employee wages and/or benefits. Hughes responded that Fluor looked at both benefit programs and ultimately decided not to change anything in 2016. During the summer, they will look at options to gain improvements in those benefits. There was no change in salaries, unless an individual was selected for a higher position, in which case they were recognized with a salary adjustment.

Roemer asked Hughes to elaborate on the specifics of the economic development, education and community contributions Fluor intends to make. Hughes responded that a small board will consider funding requests made by local development agencies and said Fluor supports scholarships and the education of its

employees. The company also offers support to local schools, charities and other organizations. Hughes commented that he does not intend to leave a penny on the table from this budget.

The CAB chair opened the discussion to questions from members of the public. Brailsford asked what the contract is worth. Hughes responded $1.2 to $1.3 billion. Tami Thatcher, Idaho Falls, referred to the Radioactive Scrap and Waste Facility (RSWF) and asked what happens after the Experimental Breedor Reactor-II (EBR-II) fuel is packaged and emplaced there. Zimmerman responded that EBR-II fuel is the responsibility of the Office of Nuclear Energy (NE). It is currently processing some EBR-II fuel to extract uranium and it is expected this fuel will go through that same process. Hughes commented that it will ultimately be retrieved from the RSWF. Thatcher asked if anyone is monitoring the area. Hughes responded that the RSWF is currently a BEA facility.

## Public Comment Session #1

Tami Thatcher, Idaho Falls, commented that appropriate attention is placed on material being put in barrels, but asked why DOE-ID allows the use of propane appliances in its facilities when WIPP long ago recognized the hazards of doing so.

Thatcher also noted errors in environmental monitoring and said she believes these instances call for more attention.

Thatcher then referenced the data for drinking water at RWMC, Central and INTEC. She commented that the cleanup side does well providing this information, but said the rest of the Site does not. Annual environmental reports are very inconsistent and pointing to existing reports is unsatisfactory.

## EM's Management of Spent Nuclear Fuel at Idaho

Rick Craun (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about EM's management of spent fuel at Idaho. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

Before Craun began, Bohrer commented that his presentation on spent fuel and Benjamin Leake's on transportation, to follow, are beneficial to the CAB as they will provide informative background information relevant to frequently discussed topics.

Following Craun's presentation, McBride asked where the spent fuel will be sent. Craun responded that the spent fuel will either go into interim storage or be sent to the final repository. McBride then asked if there is a team at INL involved in planning for interim storage. Craun responded that the Spent Fuel Storage Working Group, headed by Deputy Assistant Secretary Ken Picha, is examining options for how to meet not only Idaho's but all of DOE's commitments. Several people from Idaho, both from NE and EM, are on that working group. McBride asked if the Idaho team is only concentrating on a national plan, or if they are thinking about interim storage in Idaho. Craun responded that the material in Idaho is currently in dry storage, but the goal is to get it to a national repository and out of Idaho by 2035.

Bohrer asked what the long term plan is for the fuel pool in Chemical Processing Plant 666 (CPP-666). Zimmerman responded that they are working on a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Office of NE. Once the fuel pool is emptied, EM will no longer have a need for it. ATR newly generated fuel might, so it is really an NE problem to solve. A definite plan is required by 2020. Bohrer asked how much it costs to maintain CPP-666. Craun responded that he believes it is $10 to $11 million a year and committed to sending the Board the actual number.

Bohrer asked how Idaho came to house Peach Bottom fuel. Board member Huston responded that Peach Bottom Unit 1 was a high temperature, gas cooled reactor with a graphite moderator. Cooperation between the Atomic Energy Commission and General Atomic Company Laboratories sparked the arrangement for Peach Bottom fuel to be brought to Idaho for long-term storage. Peach Bottom did not have a storage facility. Zimmerman confirmed that Huston's account was correct. Peach Bottom was Fort St. Vrain's predecessor. Nearly five decades ago, the government, through the Atoms for Peace initiative, made some guarantees to companies investing in nuclear power.

McBride asked Craun to clarify if "all spent fuel" (slide 5) or "all legacy spent nuclear fuel" (slide 14) must be removed from Idaho by 2035. He responded all legacy spent nuclear fuel.

Bohrer asked about technical challenges that may affect meeting the shipment date of 2035, assuming the repository is available. Craun responded that the biggest challenge is understanding the criteria for the repository where it is going. Bohrer asked if they have a place to repackage fuel. Zimmerman responded that they currently do not. DOE-ID is considering several options for this purpose. Bohrer also asked about the lifetime of storage facilities like Three Mile Island (TMI) and Peach Bottom. Craun commented that the lifetime of TMI-II is 50 years; 2019 will mark 20 years so it has another 30 years to go. He noted that he does not know the lifetime of Peach Bottom storage facilities.

The CAB chair opened the discussion to questions from members of the public. Brailsford asked about the origin of Shippingport spent nuclear fuel, which is stored in Idaho. Craun responded that he did not know.

## DOE-Idaho Transportation

Benjamin Leake (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about the DOE-Idaho transportation program for waste. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: inlcab.energy.gov.

McAffee asked why infectious substances do not need to be placarded. Leake responded that they are not placarded due to the community concern element and because placards can make those pathogens a target during transportation.

Christensen asked who ships the waste out of Idaho. Leake responded that the waste generator is responsible, in this case Fluor Idaho. They generally subcontract the actual driving, however. Christensen also asked if they drive in teams. Leake confirmed that they often drive in teams, are subject to the same Department of Transportation (DOT) training requirements and must be American citizens. Roberts added that drivers go through background checks, screenings and review of driving records. In some cases, security clearances are required. Additionally, Type B shipments, like TRU waste shipments, are monitored via satellite as they make their way to the repository. Drivers are allowed to stop only at specific ports of entry and they go through inspections at each port in every state by the state police. They are heavily monitored and tracked as they make their way across the country.

Bohrer asked for further explanation of the system of transporting waste from Idaho to WIPP. Roberts responded that transuranic waste has very stringent requirements for shipment. Regardless of which class each shipment falls into under the DOT, all shipments of transuranic waste in the western states are required to ship in a Type B cask, an agreement DOE made with the Western Governors Association when WIPP first opened. There are designated routes they are allowed to take, checkpoints they must hit, safe havens and specific areas where they are allowed to park. Each shipment is tracked by satellite from the control room in Carlsbad, New Mexico. Leake added that DOE even requires route monitoring for low-level waste destined for Nevada.

Bohrer commented that one of the hurdles of bringing TRU waste from other sites to AMWTP for certification and treatment is the transportation process. Currently, the only way to transport transuranic waste is by using the TRUPACT container, and that requires that the waste already be certified.

Roemer asked if they ever encounter state regulations that are stricter than federal regulations. Leake responded no.

Roemer also asked what the local response or protocol is in collaboration with the drivers of the truck and DOE to address incidents. Leake responded that drivers would be interfacing with local state police to address any issues. A national response center run by the Coast Guard responds to all hazardous transportation incidents. Roberts added that the primary reason for the satellite monitoring of shipments is that they can call the appropriate responders if there is an accident or unexpected deviation from the designated route.

Zimmerman added that pre-incident planning is extensive. Drivers are not allowed to deviate from the route.

Kerry Martin (I-DEQ) commented that Idaho State police inspect every shipment that leaves the INL before it goes. She noted there is not a regional response team in Twin Falls and suggested she and Roemer discuss that further following the meeting.

The CAB chair opened the discussion to questions from members of the public. Stan Baldwin, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, commented on the Type B cask incident in which a drum fell off a truck outside of Blackfoot, rolled across the highway and almost hit a house. He asked why the casks are cylindrical and questioned whether it might be more appropriate if they were square. Leake responded that the next generation of TRUPACT containers will be square but said he has not been involved in the specifics of that design.

Bugger looped back to Herb's earlier question regarding contamination events at ARP. There were two skin contamination events at ARP, one in 2008 and one in 2009, as well as a shoe contamination event in 2009 and the skin/clothing event discussed earlier in the meeting. There have been four contamination events at ARP in the last eight years. Zimmerman added that while four is a very small number, it seems even smaller when contextualized within the twenty to thirty thousand entries into the contaminated area made each year. The rate is incredibly low. Bohrer agreed that the level of performance is remarkable and said the Site workforce should be proud.

## Discussion of EM SSAB Chairs Recommendations

Bohrer began the discussion by reinforcing that the Board does not vote on recommendations; rather, it aims to achieve consensus.

Bohrer explained that the EM SSAB Chairs recommendation regarding Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) has been discussed several times during recent INL Site EM CAB meetings and noted that the Board received a presentation on SEPs during the February meeting. He commented that the recommendation encourages DOE EM to pursue SEPs in lieu of fines and penalties for the benefit of communities surrounding Department sites. Bohrer asked the Board to state its consensus and the CAB members unanimously agreed with the EM SSAB Chairs recommendation regarding SEPs.

Cathy Roemer asked if there are as many restrictions once the money is received as there are in the process of fining the projects and enforcing the regulations. Bohrer responded that the fine goes to the State and they

approve the SEPs the money goes toward. Liveratos added that DEQ has SEPs already established, so when money comes in it is immediately allocated to one of those specific projects.

Huston asked Bohrer to elaborate on the last of the seven common categories of SEPs: Renewable energy. He commented that renewable energy work is generally performed by private developers for profit and often involves selling energy to areas outside the local community. Bohrer responded that he can ask that question. Huston noted that he does not object to the recommendation but would like clarity on the scope of the term.

McBride commented that the city of Boise is in the process of building a solar energy plant, so renewable energy is not always commercial.

Herb commented that unless any Board members had objections he would submit their consensus to DOE. The Board agreed.

Bohrer moved on to the Chairs recommendation regarding EM SSAB funding. He provided a brief summary and noted that the Chairs believe it is important that the SSAB be funded at an adequate level to provide recommendations and advice to DOE-EM. This recommendation merely encourages continuation of the process. He asked if there were questions or comments on the recommendation. There was no opposition from the Board.

Bohrer moved to the final EM SSAB Chairs recommendation up for consideration: Community investment as a factor in the proposal review process. He commented that the Chairs all agree that cleanup contractors should invest in the local communities in which they work rather than sending all profit back to their companies' headquarters. However, he registered concern that funds for these community investment projects cannot be mandated by DOE unless DOE agrees to pay for them. Encouraging such investment is acceptable, but DOE cannot require it.

McBride commented that it seems inappropriate for the Federal government to require private businesses to make contributions and noted that a company's addition of jobs to the community is in itself a large contribution.

Huston agreed with McBride and commented that it is offensive if it implies that DOE is ordering a private organization to do something that crosses the line of government. It is, however, quite fair to point it out as best practice.

CAB member Talia Martin agreed with McBride and Huston. She commented that "community" is a loosely defined term that does not always include tribes, which often consider themselves as local or sovereign governments. The gray area is concerning. Martin noted that she would like to see the positive encouragement on contractors to give to communities, stakeholders *and* sovereign governments.

Branter agreed with McBride and wondered what level of contractor the community investment factor would roll down to.

Christensen added that these investments are no longer a gift to communities once they are required.

Bohrer concluded that the Board did not achieve consensus on the Chairs recommendation regarding community investment as a factor in the proposal review process.

## Public Comment #2

Tami Thatcher, Idaho Falls, referenced CERCLA documents for TRA and commented that the Record of Decision states there is already tritium and hexavalent chromium in the aquifer but that no other contamination type is expected to exceed background levels. Gross alpha exceeding the Federal drinking water maximum contamination limit has recently been detected in the aquifer. Both the five year reports and the State make no mention of this.

Thatcher added that she does not believe the replacement for RWMC is properly accounting for the total amount of americium. She requested help in finding the most recent documents that address this.

## Further discussion of EM SSAB Chairs Recommendation regarding SEPs

Bohrer revisited the Chairs recommendation regarding SEPs. He noted that he received additional information from Susan Burke during the break. She pointed out that the process for managing SEPs is a state program; it is not in DOE's discretion to decide how that happens. She also noted that it will never be a one for one: If a SEP is used, the fine will likely be higher. Bohrer commented that he believes the Board should rethink its consensus on this recommendation until they learn more about state policy.

Gumm asked if the CAB agreed that they should hold their consensus until more information is provided by DEQ. All members agreed.

Bohrer confirmed the only recommendation the Board will send forward with consensus is the recommendation regarding EM SSAB funding. He committed to taking these concerns to the EM SSAB Chairs meeting in late August.

## Conclusion

Zimmerman concluded the meeting.

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