



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

February 17, 2016

The Idaho National Laboratory (INL) Site Environmental Management (EM) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) held its quarterly meeting on Wednesday, February 17, 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
Kristin Jensen
Talia Martin
Trilby McAfee
Betsy McBride
Bill Roberts
Cathy Roemer

Members Not Present

Harry Griffith

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

Brad Bugger, Substitute for Jack Zimmerman, DDFO, U.S. Department of Energy Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID)
Bob Pence, Federal Coordinator, DOE-ID
Hoss Brown, CH2M Washington Group Idaho (CWI)/Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP)
Dave Richardson, Idaho Treatment Group (ITG)/Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP)
Susan Burke, State of Idaho
Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Daryl Koch, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

Others Present

Luke Ramseth, *Post Register*
Clark Jones
Syd Withers, ICP
Bill Barker
Ben Roberts, DOE-ID
Mike Hart
Mark Hutchison, NRT
Rick Dale, ICP
David Smith, City of Idaho Falls
Danielle Miller, DOE-ID
Teresa Perkins, DOE-ID
Christ Henvit
Brandt Meagher
Scott Reno, ICP
Tami Thatcher
Elamin Almchi, DOE-ID
David Bland, Spectratech PM
Kenneth Alkema
Kelly Gallows, MEI
Andrea Gumm, Facilitator
Ann Riedesel, Staff

Leslie Jones
Trent Riggs
Ken Whitham, DOE-ID
Nicole Badrov, DOE-ID
Joel Case, DOE-ID
Kerry Martin, ID-DEQ
Scott McMullin, DOE-ID
Susie Barna, Maxie Endeavors
Amy Taylor, U.S. Senator Risch
Nyles Johnson
Frank Webber, ICP
Howard Forsythe, ICP
Jeff Miller, DOE-ID
Time Safford, DOE-ID
Erik Simpson, ICP
Richard Cullison
Tom Mason
Mark Brown, DOE-ID
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Jordan Davies, Staff

Opening Remarks

Facilitator Andrea Gumm started the meeting at 8:00 a.m. She reviewed the agenda and noted that there would be two public participation periods – one at 12:15 p.m. and one at 4:00 p.m. She reminded attendees of the process for public questions both during the meeting, time permitting, and via “question cards.”

CAB Chair Herb Bohrer welcomed everyone to the meeting. He noted that the meeting was scheduled in February rather than January in order to better coincide with the timing of the next DOE budget. DOE-HQ has requested that all CABs provide input on the budget priorities. The budget was recently released and the CAB will have a presentation and discussion about it later in the meeting. Bohrer added that the board would try to accommodate as many questions as possible following the presentations. He encouraged attendees to invite friends to CAB meetings because they provide a good opportunity to learn more about DOE activities. Bohrer introduced Talia Martin, who represents the Shoshone Bannock Tribes in the position previously held by Willie Preacher.

Brad Bugger (DOE-ID) attended the meeting representing Jack Zimmerman, who was out of town. He welcomed Martin to the board. Bugger stated that the new contractor was announced for the ICP Core contract. He noted that the protest period lasts until February 29, so as a result DOE cannot go into specifics about the contract at this time. Assuming there is no protest, the new contractor will begin transition activities on March 1 and take over on June 1. DOE has notified the current contractors that their contracts will be extended through the end of May to ensure a smooth transition. DOE will bring the new contractor to the April CAB meeting and provide more details then.

Susan Burke (State of Idaho) welcomed attendees and commented that she is looking forward to the meeting and the updates.

Daryl Koch (DEQ) noted that CWI has been on site for 10 years and that they have done a good job. He hopes that many of the current employees will continue on with the new contractor.

Dennis Faulk (EPA) commented that Hanford did not do well in the new budget. He also stated that he is interested in hearing the 5-year review presentation as it is a great way to gauge how the remedies are working.

Hoss Brown (CWI) commented that he’s looking forward to the meeting. He stated that CWI hasn’t had any recordables or first aids since curtailment. He said 4.06 acres have been exhumed out of the 5.69 acres required at the ARPs. CWI is continuing to operate ARP V, processing drums that AMWTP provides. CWI received the RCRA permit for ARP VII, so they can process debris from AMWTP in ARP VII. The readiness review will be in the next couple of weeks and CWI will begin processing waste around March 1. CWI hired about 20 new employees for the new ARP VII project. Brown stated that CWI is making good, safe progress at INTEC and noted that RH-TRU waste repack is continuing to operate at CPP-666. Brown said CWI employees are focused on working safely with the new contractor and are looking forward to helping ensure a smooth transition.

Dave Richardson (ITG) noted that their safety record has returned to where it has historically been, and that they are currently over one year without lost time and approaching a million and a half hours without a lost time injury. He stated that ITG has put a lot of focus on getting everyone back engaged and on ensuring that safety is the top priority on the project. ITG has increased crew size, and employees are continuing progress in retrieval at almost double the pace at the waste face. ITG has also reinstated cargo retrieval. Richardson noted that they are seeing increased integrity issues as they work in the last cell, which is slowing the process down and causing workers to be very methodical in dealing with the contamination issues they are seeing in

the waste containers. The treatment facility is ahead of goals on legacy waste production and characterization of unknown containers. ITG is working on the infrastructure improvement project. Richardson said that all in all, ITG is doing well and is standing by to assist the new contractor in a seamless and safe transition.

Recent Public Involvement Activities

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

CAB member Betsy McBride thanked DOE for revising the report's title. She asked about the emission change public comment period and wondered how the schedule can be better integrated with the CAB meeting schedule so the board can provide public comment during the established comment periods. She noted that it would be helpful to have a briefing on topics that are open for public comment so CAB members can have a discussion and provide formal input. She asked Bugger for suggestions on how to improve it. Bugger commented that they may be able to work with the regulators for more advance notice so they can get the comment periods scheduled in coordination with a CAB meeting. Faulk noted that they face the same issue at Hanford and to help resolve it, they consider whether it is a time sensitive topic or if it can be scheduled to coincide with the CAB meetings. He encouraged the agencies to consider the timing and opportunity for CAB input when scheduling public comment periods.

Idaho Cleanup Project Overview

Bugger 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/>.

McBride asked how the AMWTP chart would change if it reflected only waste that had been shipped rather than shipped and stored waste. Ben Roberts (DOE-ID) responded that the chart notes when the Waste Isolation Pilot Plan (WIPP) closure occurred and that prior to that point, the chart only reflected waste shipped. The line would be flat if it was still reflecting just shipped.

Bohrer noted that during the last contract transition at AMWTP there was a big impact to production. He asked what is being done to help mitigate impacts and meet the 2018 milestone. Roberts responded that the current dip in production is primarily due to completing some treatment facility upgrades, but the expectation is that once the new equipment is on line, production should improve. DOE is paying close attention to transition and trying to minimize any impacts.

CAB member Brad Christensen asked how long it will take to ship the 8000 m². Roberts responded that it is a difficult question to answer because they don't know what pace WIPP will resume operations. It is anticipated that WIPP will start up slowly. AMWTP has the capability to ship up to 25 shipments per week but WIPP will not likely be support that rate.

Bill Roberts asked what is meant by "criticality" and why DOE didn't know about this issue. Bugger responded that a criticality is an unplanned nuclear reaction (too much fissile material in one place in a certain configuration can result in an unplanned fission reaction). DOE conducts safety analyses to understand what could cause a criticality. The analyses indicate that it is still safe, but the packaging was unexpected. The container was packaged approximately 40 years ago, so they don't clearly know why the mistake occurred but they are managing it today.

Koch noted that they are still excavating in ARP VIII and have only constructed the foundation for ARP IX. At this point they have already retrieved and packaged over 95 percent of the 7,485 cubic meters goal,

although they not reached the 5.69 acres requirement. They are way ahead of the curve to meet the goal and anticipate retrieving more transuranic waste than originally required in the agreement.

Brown noted the outstanding safety performance of the team working on the EBR-II demolition. They haven't had a recordable injury in two years. They are doing an exceptional job and he is extremely proud of them.

Integrated Waste Treatment Unit Update

Joel Case (DOE-ID) provided an update on the IWTU project. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Bill Roberts asked when the plant would be operational. Case responded that it is tough to predict, but they are looking at April for the next simulant run. Roberts commented that he appreciates the simulant runs and what is learned from them. Case responded that they continue to learn from the outages and improve the processes for when the system is in operation.

McBride asked a series of questions: 1) How is DOE adjusting the budget in other places since IWTU is behind schedule and over budget; is this project impacting cleanup in other places? 2) Is it anticipated that the facility could be used for treatment of other waste beyond the Settlement Agreement waste? 3) Assuming there are other places where they treat reprocessing waste, what was the design enhancement that was being reached for when it was decided to use this process (e.g., reduced emissions, elimination of incineration, etc.)? 4) The Idaho Attorney General has asked for either a date certain or an indication that NEPA conditions are starting to be considered for alternatives; is there an alternative under consideration? Case responded that their focus is to get the plant up and running in a safe and efficient manner and meet the Idaho Settlement Agreement milestone. McBride commented that the press is indicating that there is a Plan B being considered. Bugger stressed that, as an agency, all of DOE's focus is on this plant and getting it up and running. Case addressed the selection of this treatment, noting that it is a thermal unit and that they selected an option that could meet the requirements. The treatment was proposed by two of the three bidders. It was also based on a processing system that processes power plant waste in Erwin Tennessee; it's a little different, but similar. Case noted that the facility is designed also for packaging of high level waste; it was originally designed as a treatment and packaging facility so it has a potential for additional uses. The facility was designed for reutilization, mainly geared for HLW processing, including the tank cleaning waste. Case noted that through underruns on other projects, CWI has been able to cover the costs.

Bohrer noted that this process was one that CWI proposed with fairly aggressive milestones. It has cost substantially more than originally planned. With the contract transition, is CWI going to walk away without any liability? What did DOE gain by taking on this liability? What cleanup work that CWI planned on doing didn't get done because of funds spent on IWTU? Case responded that he is not aware of cleanup scope has been impacted because CWI has successfully underrun on other projects. They could have possibly spent that money on other projects, but there is no guarantee that that money would have been spent at ICP. Bohrer asked if all the CWI stretch goals had been met? Case didn't know.

CAB member Cathy Roemer noted that it had been previously reported that it costs about \$4M per month to run the IWTU project. She asked for a general breakdown on how those dollars are spent. She also asked how many people are involved on a monthly basis on the project. Case responded that most of the costs at this point are labor dollars because most of the equipment and construction is complete. There are approximately 200 to 300 people on staff. Once IWTU begins operating, the staff number will reduce to 100.

Christensen asked why the calciner process can't be used for this. Case responded that it is a different waste stream which would cause a lot of problems in the calciner process. Christensen also asked how much simulant will be run before operations commence. Case responded that it is based on formal criteria on operability and maintainability.

Bohrer noted that he appreciates the caution that they are using but stated there must be an idea of a critical path schedule. What are the key events that need to happen for startup? Case responded that it will include reviewing the data from the last simulant run (after this week), assuming no issues, the next simulant run, then evaluating the results and having an outage. A successful simulant run should process 60,000 gallons of simulant over a 20-day campaign. It usually takes about a month for a good simulant run. DOE is looking at a September timeframe for possible waste introduction.

CAB Vice-Chair Keith Branter asked if the key personnel who have been present since the start of IWTU will be staying through to the next contract. Case responded that it is part of the new contract transition discussions.

Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board Report

Mark Brown (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety (DNFSB) report. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Roemer asked about the process for how DNFSB obtains their information – is it site visits, information submitted, etc. How do they get their information? She also asked for confirmation if they are independent from DOE. Brown responded that yes, they are independent from DOE. He also noted that they obtain information in a variety of ways, including site visits, requests for information, etc. They also have site representatives at the larger facilities; Hanford has two, Idaho doesn't have enough DNFSB to justify having a site rep, but we do have a technical representative that visits periodically to monitor activities at Idaho projects. Roemer asked about their objectivity. Brown noted that because they are independent from DOE they are objective and focused primarily on the technical aspects, but also the safety culture.

Martin asked if the review board reps can come in at any time and provide input or at set times in the schedule. Brown responded that the DNFSB charter is to evaluate DOE's operations and facilities and make recommendations. They can come in and make recommendations at any time. They have an established process they go through to develop and submit recommendations. Then it is up to the department to evaluate the information and determine if they need to act on those recommendations. The vast majority of the time, DOE acts on the recommendations. Martin asked if additional reviews and recommendations are expected. Brown responded that DOE has very strict processes in place to evaluate whether they need readiness assessments and other reviews.

Nuclear Regulatory Commission Contract

Ken Whitham (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about the new Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) contract. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Whitham introduced David Bland, Spectra Tech's Project Manager. Bland said he is looking forward to being in Idaho and outlined the team, which includes Areva and Wastren Advantage, Inc.

McBride asked if the Idaho facility will replace the CPP-666 pool. Whitham responded that the Idaho Spent Fuel Facility is designed to address the fuel in Idaho, repackaging it for shipment. Whitham noted that 666 is supposed to be emptied by 2023, which they are working on. It does not currently have a mission after 2023.

McBride asked if the Navy is going to send any more waste to Idaho. Whitham responded that the Navy doesn't send waste to CPP-666 now and has no plans to do so in the future.

Branter asked if it includes all the ES&H services or if they buy them from the other contractors. Whitham responded that Spectra Tech is self-contained for the most part. Branter asked specifically about dosimetry. Whitham responded that dosimetry services will be purchased from BEA through the ICP Core contract. Spectra Tech will contract with the ICP Core contractor on the Three Mile Island (TMI) work to ensure site stabilization agreements are met, etc., The ICP Core contractor will do the bulk of the work at TMI with Spectra Tech functioning in the role of the oversight.

Tami Thatcher asked about the status of the Idaho Spent Fuel Facility. Whitham responded that it is an NRC licensed facility. It is designed enough to maintain the license; currently at CD-0. Thatcher asked if there is a timeframe for construction. Whitham responded that it is still in the conceptual stage. It was originally planned to be a privatized facility but a decision was made not to proceed forward.

Beatrice Brailsford asked for clarification on slide 4 regarding the scope. Whitham clarified that is part of the new ICP Core contract scope; it has not been completed. Brailsford also asked if it is normal to have eight shipments in a quarter. Whitham responded that it is based on the production cycle. Brailsford asked for a ballpark annual figure. Whitham didn't know but took an action to get that information.

WIPP Update

Bugger (DOE-ID) provided an update about the WIPP facility. The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Burke asked when the stakeholder workshop will be held. Bugger responded that it will be held Friday, February 19, in Carlsbad, New Mexico and is open to the public. They will walk attendees through the integrated baseline, explaining the steps that must be taken to reopen.

Roemer asked about the reduced respiratory protection requirements. Bugger responded that it is largely due to the work they've done in radiological risk reduction. They are applying the fixative so airborne radiation is affixed to the walls and ceiling keeping workers from inhaling particles. Roemer asked about how it makes it easier. Bugger responded that wearing a respirator includes a number of restrictions, which limits the ability to perform. Roemer also asked about the EOC, specifically how it integrates with the local emergency response. Bugger noted that he is not familiar with WIPP's exact relationship but in Idaho, our EOC works closely with local officials. He assumes that WIPP has a similar relationship.

McBride asked where the regulators fit in the timeline. Ben Roberts responded there are several permit-related activities that must be completed before they can move forward with some of the capital asset projects. They are prerequisites to getting into waste emplacement. Bugger and Roberts noted that the milestones for regulatory approval are included in the integrated baseline.

Bohrer noted that the key interest of the board is when Idaho can resume shipping. How long will the ramp up take? Bugger responded that when they restart operations, it will be at a much slower pace than what we are accustomed to. Every site would like to have shipping priority, but those details have not yet been determined. There has also been a lot of speculation about the waste acceptance criteria as a result of the chemical compatibility study. Those criteria will affect Idaho's ability to ship, and how quickly we ship. Again, no decisions have been made at this point.

Marvin Fielding asked if there are any anticipated changes to the waste acceptance criteria that could affect waste that has already been certified. Bugger responded that it is under discussion now. The goal is to minimize the impact on the generator sites as much as possible while ensuring the safety of WIPP.

Brailsford noted that any kind of robust operations at WIPP are dependent on the new ventilation system. She wondered if DOE had a sense of when that ventilation system will be upgraded. Roberts responded that it will be several years before that system is in place. DOE doesn't believe it will be any sooner than 2021.

Thatcher noted that one of the issues from the accident investigation report is that the assumed amount of TRU waste in a single barrel was higher than predicted. Is that something that can be applicable in Idaho? Roberts noted that it wasn't as much an issue of waste in the container but the amount released. He noted that in Idaho, we go through a very thorough characterization process of our waste, and believes we have a good understanding of the material in any given drum. He can't speak to Los Alamos' process. He also noted that the Idaho processes are audited in several different arenas.

CAB Discussion of WIPP Recommendation Regarding Surface Storage

Bohrer reviewed a letter that the SSAB Chairs drafted and submitted to EM-1 regarding storage at WIPP. The letter started out as a discussion about whether storage facilities should be built at each of the individual sites or at WIPP. There are positives and negatives associated with each position. Bohrer noted that the CAB has had a number of briefings on WIPP and the accident investigation report and recovery. Within the complex, Idaho, SRS, Hanford, and Los Alamos are the major contributors of waste shipped to WIPP. All of the SSABs are interested in WIPP and when operations will resume.

Bugger and Roberts confirmed that Idaho has adequate storage for our inventory. It includes storage locations at RWMC and at INTEC. Roberts does not believe storage will be an issue for Idaho.

McBride asked if New Mexico agreed to expand above-ground interim/temporary storage, shouldn't we be pushing for DOE to get it shipped out of Idaho? Faulk responded that yes, that would ideally be the position, but he doesn't believe that they will build above-ground storage. They are focused on reopening the facility, not building new facilities.

Bohrer noted that the CAB has been discussing this for the past several meetings, primarily because it was unknown what additional storage was available, especially at other sites. However, it now appears that the lead time associated with permitting and constructing these facilities discourages further consideration.

Koch noted that it has not stopped operations in Idaho, so he doesn't believe constructing above-ground storage would make sense.

McBride asked what happens if the waste acceptance criteria changes. Are we proceeding at risk? Bugger responded that we would much prefer to have the waste exhumed and repackaged rather than leave it in place. There is some risk that it will have to be repackaged but it is in a much safer state.

Christensen commented that the gap between the SSAB letter and the response is with regard to the timeline for bringing WIPP back online. We have a timeline, but it is a two year timeline from the event, start to finish. That's the failure there. Bohrer confirmed the length of time is a concern to the board, but noted that at least now there is something on paper, against which the performance of the department can be measured

Bill Roberts added that he appreciates that there is now a plan.

CAB member Kristen Jensen asked about the different facilities that have waste that needs to be shipped, and wondered if they will be fined by the state and local governments for not meeting milestones. Burke commented that for the State of Idaho, the requirement for the removal of TRU waste is twofold: 1) 2000 cubic meters running average over three-year period (which is currently not being met); 2) all the TRU waste must leave Idaho by 2018. The impact of not meeting those milestones is that no spent fuel can come into the state; there is no monetary fine. She believes that other states have requirements under their site treatment plans, but is not aware of any other states that require penalty payments.

Supplemental Environmental Projects

Teresa Perkins (DOE-ID) provided a presentation about DOE's Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs). The presentation is available on the INL Site EM CAB website: <http://inlcab.energy.gov/>.

Roemer asked for some examples of what might be acceptable for emergency planning and preparedness. Perkins responded that it would all be part of the negotiation.

Martin asked if DOE ever goes back to evaluate the effectiveness of a project with SEPs. Perkins responded that as part of project closeout, they verify that what was proposed was accomplished, but there is no obligation to go back after that.

Bohrer noted that SEPs are a topic of discussion at many SSAB meetings and are used at sites around the country. He noted that the SSAB members wanted to ensure that people are aware of the program and take advantage of it. Perkins noted that one of the requirements is that the SEPs cannot be applied to required projects (e.g., complete more cleanup at Idaho).

Dennis commented that sometimes it is cheaper to pay the fine, which is unfortunate. Perkins noted that in several cases contractors have used the Western States Project as a way of applying money where it is beneficial to the state.

Brailsford asked for clarification on what the whole enforcement action was for the SEPs. Perkins responded that there is a consent order that involves payment of a financial penalty in addition to the SEPs. Perkins also noted that in addition to the penalty there a number of stipulations including the requirement to come into compliance. Brailsford asked if a 50-50 split of fine actually paid and SEPs is a typical split. Perkins noted that the EPA policy has a formula that is used to determine what the allowable split is between SEPs and direct payment; the DEQ process is more flexible.

EM Budget

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

McBride stated that the House has already announced that they will not consider the President's budget and will not hold hearings and will not have the budget director testify. She asked if one should just skip the administration stuff and go straight to their congressman. How does an administrative agency adapt when that's been the pronouncement? Miller commented that there is a lot of political jockeying that goes on. Unless Congress passes a bill, there is no funding. Bugger specified that they are saying they won't consider the President's budget but they can develop their own and submit it to the President. McBride asked who DOE submits their budget request to. Miller responded that they submit it to Office of Management and Budget. Congress can use that information or they can make their own budget.

Bohrer asked about the 2018 milestone and whether the settlement agreement CH-TRU waste must be shipped or ready to ship to WIPP. Miller responded that the best case is that it is shipped. For the contract some fee is withheld until it is actually shipped. The goal is to meet the 2018 date.

Bohrer asked if the high level list is their priority list. Miller responded yes, at a high level. Bohrer asked why the SDA is a lower priority than transferring fuel from wet to dry storage. Bohrer noted that we have SDA milestones and said he doesn't understand the driver behind the current prioritization. Miller responded that the SDA projects are ahead of schedule so they aren't as high on the priority list. Bugger asked if the priorities listed were in a ranked order. Miller responded that they are generally in rank order, but they are not hard and fast. In the past we separate it into two parts: making progress and minimum safety (infrastructure, keeping the lights on, etc.). Bohrer commented that it's not really a priority list, but more of a list of how they think they can best justify their money. Bohrer stressed that if it was a priority list he would infer that low priorities would suffer if the budget was cut. The priority of a project should not be lowered simply because it is doing well. Subordinating it to something else in a list is a signal that it doesn't deserve the attention that it might actually deserve. Miller noted that would be good feedback from the CAB. We are doing the budget for two years out, and it is hard to anticipate what will be happening then. As we approach execution, there are times we can affect the decision. A few years ago things were shut down for a bit at SDA. Because we had savings in other areas, and got plussed up by Congressmen Simpson, we were able to get that going. There is some flexibility, but there are some things we have to work on. Miller assured the board that SDA is a priority.

McBride asked if Miller is giving a briefing or if he is asking the board to agree or disagree. If we agree with Herb, do we tell you or do we tell Simpson? Bohrer interjected to note that one of the specific things that DOE has tasked the CAB with is to specifically respond to DOE with the CAB's input on their budget priorities. This presentation is part of the process for the CAB to understand what DOE's budget priorities are so the CAB can respond appropriately. The CAB will develop a response. Miller noted that DOE is hoping for input by March 18. Miller also noted that they are working on their current priorities list and they can use the CAB input in developing the new priorities.

Gumm asked if there are other times during the year that would be helpful for budget updates. Miller responded that this is the best time.

Bohrer asked if the draft Integrated Priority List is available. Miller noted that it is in development right now. He also wasn't sure if it is available for public release. Miller recommended that the CAB rank the priorities how they see them and provide that input to DOE.

Faulk commented that these priorities have been our priorities for years. He also believes they are the right priorities. Looking back about five years, Idaho had a plus up of about \$50M and had to come up with a plan of what they could do with that money. He recommended asking for a similar plus up and making the case for what we could do with that investment.

Bohrer noted that the CAB wrote a letter last year that talked about the budget priorities. Zimmerman's top three priorities last year were IWTU, buried waste retrieval and TRU waste shipments (AMWTP). Bohrer didn't know if those have changed. He expressed concern that wet to dry storage has popped up on the priority list and said he believes it's a worthwhile project but not a top priority. Bohrer would like DOE-ID to explicitly state what they believe are the top three priorities.

McBride commented that during the budget call last year, Zimmerman said that buried waste retrieval was his number one priority and he was basing it on potential risk.

Faulk noted that EM is getting plussed up this year and that the President's budget was \$6.1B this year. The trend is going the right way, we just need to get the money allocated to the right places.

Thatcher noted that on page 6 it says "all buried waste." She asked for clarification. Bugger clarified that it should say "targeted" buried waste.

Five-Year Review

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

Bohrer asked about CFA 08 asbestos – the requirement was to do the surveys but they were removed. He asked Badrov to explain the control process. Some actions are supposed to be in perpetuity, but in five years that system was compromised. What is the justification for that and what ensures that those actions are in fact managed properly. Badrov noted that they have a Long-Term Stewardship database to track and manage the information and requirements. We have all the contaminants of concern, inspection requirements, etc. For this particular case, it was decided years ago based on annual radiological surveys that were extremely low, that we didn't need to perform those annual surveys, that they could be every five years. We have an institutional control operations and maintenance plan that sets forth all of the requirements and all of the facilities and from that we produce a report and somehow that just got dropped. Bohrer wanted assurance that "somehow it got dropped" doesn't happen again. Badrov responded that is one of the purposes of the five-year review to oversee and ensure that required actions occur as necessary.

Faulk elaborated that they make decisions throughout the next five years, and is sure they had a conversation about reducing the annual surveys, but that the decision simply wasn't documented appropriately. He noted that the five-year review team is very diligent. Faulk noted that EPA had a lot of energy on the TAN groundwater cleanup. Faulk apologized for not including the CAB in that discussion. EPA worked through the issues with DOE. Faulk noted that EPA tries to avoid caps because they then have to be monitored forever.

Bohrer asked what happens to this review now. Faulk responded that it is a DOE product that is submitted to EPA which then adds it to a database that tracks cleanup actions nationally. It becomes a big deal when they move a cleanup remedy from protective to non-protective.

Bohrer asked for confirmation that the EPA concurred with the findings and recommendations in the five-year review that DOE-ID just completed. Faulk confirmed that the EPA concurs.

Brailsford touched on the asbestos, and asked what would encourage either DOE or EPA to change the remedy and go back in to remove the asbestos. Badrov responded that they would have to do a ROD amendment. Faulk added that when they realized they had asbestos, they had to review if the remedy still met the asbestos remedies. According to Badrov, it does meet the asbestos requirements. Badrov also noted that they knew asbestos was there, but it wasn't identified as the icy driver. The icy driver was cesium 137. Brailsford asked if the remedy would have been different if they'd had the same info. Faulk responded no, probably not in this circumstance.

McAfee asked what the different amendment was for the TAN well. Howard Forsythe (TAN Groundwater Project Manager, CWI) responded that the amendment was changed to remove one of the side effects of the amendment they were using before. It is a lactoil (a lactate with an emulsified oil) that enhances the bacteria breakdown of the TCE. McAfee asked for clarification as she thought they used the emulsion oil previously.

Forsythe responded that no, they were using whey lactate before. Badrov specified that they have not used EVO in the past.

Badrov also clarified for Brailsford that on the cover there are four feet of clean fill in addition to 2.5 feet of reactor shield blocks that create that barrier site on that asbestos.

Thatcher noted that an important part of the five-year review is looking at the institutional controls and how long those controls need to be in place. It is unclear what time period is being considered for institutional controls. Problems were found in this review and they were not described in a clear manner.

EM Budget Recommendation Discussion

Bohrer opened a discussion about next steps for developing a recommendation from the CAB on the EM Budget. He noted that he would like to understand Jack Zimmerman's perspective on the priorities and suggested forming a subcommittee to meet with him and then develop a recommendation by March 18.

Roemer asked how that process would proceed. Bohrer responded that Ann Riedesel & Bob Pence could work with Zimmerman to set up a meeting with him to review his priorities (and possibly provide a summary to review in advance). Pence reviewed the process that the CAB used last year, with a subcommittee of the CAB who met via teleconference to discuss priorities with Zimmerman and draft a letter. Pence recommended a similar process this year.

McBride asked if it should be a subcommittee or the full committee.

Roberts noted that he would like to know what DOE's priorities are and the rationale and then the CAB can weigh in. Bohrer concurred.

Bugger noted that Zimmerman will be happy to meet with the CAB to discuss, but also noted that the CAB shouldn't discount Miller's presentation which can be a starting point for the discussion.

Bohrer suggested scheduling a full CAB meeting (via teleconference) assuming time permits for the budget discussion (with required public notifications). The CAB does not want to have a discussion until they have heard Zimmerman's priorities. A tentative date the week of March 7, but even as early as March 3, was agreed upon. Bugger took an action to work with Zimmerman's schedule and then CAB Support Staff will schedule the meeting, submit the notice and ads and get the conference call set up.

McBride noted that Faulk encouraged the CAB to consider what actions would be included if additional funds were available and include those priorities in a budget discussion. Bohrer concurred that the CAB should include that in the conversation with Zimmerman.

Pence encouraged the CAB to provide input to DOE in a recommendation. He noted that DOE takes that input very seriously.

Public Comment

Tami Thatcher referenced a 2003 report that found that women are twice as vulnerable to radiation as men and children are even more vulnerable than adults. It has implications and she was curious whether EPA has to adopt the standards and then impose them on DOE or how the process works. Thatcher recommended the CAB request a presentation on airborne radioactive contamination from DOE. She doesn't believe that airborne emissions are being reported.

She stated that her understanding is that the new contractor for cleanup will be adopting the radioactive scrap and waste facility at MFC. The board may want a presentation on that facility as well.

Conclusion

Bugger concluded the meeting.

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