



**IDAHO NATIONAL ENGINEERING AND
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY
CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD**

SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

July 19-20, 2005

**Held at:
Ameritel Inn
645 Lindsay Blvd.
Idaho Falls, ID**

These minutes were approved and certified by:

David Kipping

David Kipping, Chair

8-15-05

Date

Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board Summary Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 19, 2005

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Members: David Kipping (Chair), Larry Knight (Vice Chair), Seth Beal, John Bolliger, Dick Buxton, Karen Corrigan, D.H. "Doc" DeTonancour, Georgia Dixon, Paul Faulkner, William Flanery, Annemarie Goldstein, and Willie Preacher (the Shoshone-Bannock representative to the Board).

Ex-Officio Members: Rick Provencher (Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office [DOE-ID]), Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho), and Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA).

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

David Kipping, CAB Chair, Opening Remarks

Kipping welcomed the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board (CAB). He commented that the CAB's tour of the site facilities to be decontaminated and decommissioned was very informative. He provided a status of the procurement of a new contract for CAB support. He noted that a committee of the National Academies of Science is reviewing cleanup and closure of high level waste tanks and will be in Idaho for a tour and meeting July 25-26. He reported that Arthur Randall's nomination as a new CAB member was approved, and he will be at the next meeting.

Rick Provencher, DOE-ID, Opening Remarks

Provencher welcomed the group. He noted that DOE has been busy over the last two months. Two major contracts were transitioned. The Secretary of DOE also visited Idaho to review clean up activities as well as activities related to the mission of the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) CH2M Washington Idaho (CWI) has methodically and effectively taken steps to understand their clean up challenge. There are a lot of innovative ideas. They are focused on buried waste and sodium bearing waste. A major effort is development of a project baseline due from CWI at the end of September. A significant CWI accomplishment was emptying Building CPP-651 of special nuclear material so that security costs can be reduced. At Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Facility (AMWTF), Bechtel has ramped up its shipments from 6 to 16 shipments a week and is working to increase shipments to 25 a week.

Kathleen Trever, State of Idaho, Opening Remarks

Trever observed that this is a time of transition from a contracting standpoint and for DOE management. While change brings opportunities for innovation, it is important to keep things on the right track. Two areas of interest to the governor are clean up at the Subsurface Disposal Area and progress on treatment of the remaining liquids at the tank farm.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, Opening Remarks

Faulk welcomed the CAB. He noted it is a very important time for clean up. The new contractor is bringing new ideas and it will be important to choose those that will work. There is a lot of progress at the site. EPA is focusing on removal of the sludge from CPP-603 and is excited about the progress. EPA is also interested in how DOE will manage waste generated from new missions. EPA is interested in having DOE move away from low level waste disposal in unlined trenches. The baseline to be submitted by CWI will also be critical.

Brent Rankin, CWI, Opening Remarks

Rankin introduced himself. He commented that CWI was moving from planning to conducting work. CWI is back to work at the Accelerated Retrieval Project. CWI is washing out a high level waste

tank. CWI is working with the regulators on design of treatment for the sodium bearing waste. Sludge removal at CPP-603 should be started next week.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (EM) PROGRESS STATUS, EMERGING ISSUES

Rick Provencher (DOE-ID) provided a briefing on the progress and status of the EM program at the Idaho National Laboratory Site.

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member commented that part of long term stewardship is to keep the public aware of what has been at the site before. During the tour yesterday, several items were observed that may be of continuing historical interest. Perhaps the Lockheed Martin Advanced Environmental Systems (LMAES) facility should be turned into a museum. Provencher noted that there was a process for studying and preserving the history of these facilities. A CAB member asked whether excavation of the remaining pits would be conducted as a consolidated project and what the public involvement opportunities might be. Provencher replied that the approach for the remaining pits was under discussion with the state and EPA. A CAB member asked about the planned lifetime of the building for storing the excavated buried waste. Provencher replied that this storage facility was temporary. When AMWTF is operating and storage buildings are emptied, the waste can be moved to these existing facilities. A CAB member asked whether plans for the Waste Area Group (WAG) 7 risk assessment would build upon the Constortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) document. Provencher replied there is opportunity to take the information from the CRESP report and implement its recommendations as appropriate.

Public Questions and Answers

A member of the public, John Tanner, Coalition 21, asked what components of the sodium bearing waste will be treated through steam reforming. CWI committed to provide a response. Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, asked what kind of Record of Decision (ROD) was planned for steam reforming. Nolan Jensen, DOE, replied that the ROD is related to the High Level Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Trever commented that there would also be a permitting process for the technology that involves public participation. Brailsford asked what entity was interested in CPP-651. Provencher replied that it was the National Nuclear Security Agency (NNSA). Brailsford asked how retrieved waste and stored waste would be sequenced in terms of shipments. Provencher replied that the current priority was on the stored waste.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) commented that an administrative process that includes public involvement will be followed for the clean up of the remaining pits at the Subsurface Disposal Area (SDA).

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA) noted that there will be a lot of activity over the next six months. EPA will be looking for CAB input on disposition of reactors and treatment of the sodium bearing waste.

DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NUCLEAR REACTORS AND OTHER MAJOR, COMPLEX FACILITIES (PART I)

Joseph A. Legare (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) at the Idaho Cleanup Project.

CAB Questions and Answers

In response to a question from a CAB member, Provencher explained that the contract with CWI allows for changes in the scope of work to be made, including additional work. In response to a question, Legare described the excess property process that makes facilities available to other agencies. However, other federal agencies are generally not interested in facilities at DOE sites due to the history of the facilities and the liabilities. A CAB member asked why the ventilation system had been removed at one of the facilities scheduled to undergo D&D. In reply it was noted that in the case of the Experimental Test Reactor (ETR) stack, the filters were on the outside of the building so it made sense to remove them to reduce risk to workers outside of the facility. However, as ventilation systems are removed,

replacement air movers and filters need to be used. A CAB member commented that the CAB views the concept of end state as the long term condition. A CAB member asked how much of the experience at Rocky Flats can be applied to the Idaho site. Legare replied that the hazards are different but the tools and technologies are there. The innovation from Rocky Flats is the collaboration and coordination between DOE, the regulators and the public, including the CAB, on achievement of a shared mission.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) noted that the citizens of Butte County are interested in historic preservation of the site history. She also commented that it is good to learn from other sites, but there may be unique factors that need to be taken into account for our site. Ultimately, the process comes down to decisions on what material goes somewhere else and what stays behind. The CAB may want to consider to what extent the Idaho National Laboratory Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Disposal Facility (ICDF) should be used, to what extent off site disposal facilities should be used, and what should remain. Decisions on reactor vessels and waste classification will need to be made.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA) commented that EPA has experience on the regulatory process for D&D at Hanford and is interested to hear from the new contractors how D&D was done at Rocky Flats. The high risk facilities are those of most interest to the regulators. The public will be involved in those decisions.

DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NUCLEAR REACTORS AND OTHER MAJOR, COMPLEX FACILITIES (PART II)

Nolan R. Jensen (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on the DOE perspective on D&D.

Public Questions and Answers

Brailsford commented that there are more CERCLA non-time critical removal actions now and asked why clean up plans were no longer used. Jensen replied that most of the decisions on clean up plans have been made. Removal actions are an additional process that is being used for high risk facilities. Trever commented that the clean up agreement has focused on spills, leaks and releases to the environment. It has only been in the last few years that the DOE has had the policy to bring decontamination activities under the CERCLA framework. Trever noted that if there is hazardous waste involved, hazardous waste closure plans are still needed. This process was followed for the New Waste Calcining Facility. Legare clarified that DOE is the decision maker on removal actions but the regulators must be involved because they are involved in final clean up decisions.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) commented that it would be useful in the future to describe the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) standards and whether they may be applied to D&D.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA) commented that use of CERCLA gives EPA a role in D&D of the facilities. D&D must be consistent with the final end state. EPA will also be involved in approving sampling and analysis plans for removal actions.

NAS MEETING

The CAB discussed an upcoming meeting of the NAS regarding tank waste. Kipping will attend as the CAB representative.

THE STATE'S PERSPECTIVE ON LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) identified four issues related to recent legislative developments: special nuclear materials, interim fuel storage, reprocessing and Experimental Breeder Reactor (EBR)-II fuel. The first three issues came up in the House of Representatives and were in the report of the House Appropriations Committee. The report had a proposal to consolidate special nuclear material from other locations to Idaho. This language was not in the Senate's report. This presents an opportunity for Idaho because facilities will be upgraded and research activities will be conducted.

However, the state has concerns that these activities not impact clean up, that there are disposition plans in place, and that there is oversight of DOE's plans for the material.

The issue of interim fuel storage came up in a House bill recommending that DOE should start to identify locations for storing spent fuel from commercial facilities. The Senate does not favor this proposal. The Idaho Congressional delegation has stated it will support the 1995 settlement agreement. The settlement agreement prohibits shipments of commercial fuel to Idaho. There are guidelines for shipment of other types of spent nuclear fuel under the agreement.

An allusion was made in the House legislation to encouraging reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel. There is speculation as to what is meant by reprocessing.

In the Senate version, there is mention of the sodium bonded fuel from EBR-II. The Senate looked at the expenditures for research on this fuel and cut funding for the Advance Fuel Cycle Initiative. The state is interested that funding continue for research on ways to treat the fuel. This language did not appear in the House language. This issue will be resolved in the conference committee convened to work out the differences between the House and Senate versions.

DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NUCLEAR REACTORS AND OTHER MAJOR, COMPLEX FACILITIES (PART III)

Thomas J. Dieter (CWI) provided a presentation on CWI's plans for D&D.

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member asked how 'hot' the reactor vessels were expected to be. Dieter replied that metal shielding would be sufficient to minimize exposure to workers. A CAB member asked if a risk evaluation had been conducted that led to the decision to use disposition instead of entombment. Dieter replied that the goal was to achieve the best end state and that disposition provided this. The CAB member commented that a formal risk assessment along the lines of the CRESP document would take all the risks into account. Rankin commented that a sufficient amount of analysis had been done to support the decision to achieve disposition. The CAB member identified that exposure to radioactive materials on the part of workers could result in latent cancer fatalities and that this should be considered. Rankin believes that radiation exposure to workers will be well within limits. A CAB member asked if the assumptions for clean up costs in earlier estimates were still valid based upon current knowledge. Dieter replied that the information provided by DOE as part of the proposal effort was good although some unexpected conditions may be encountered. Provencher commented that there was still some uncertainty regarding the path forward and end state. In reply to a question, Dieter explained that some of the facilities have deep basements that would remain. Dieter explained that removal to three feet below grade surface is standard in the industry but it does not have a scientific basis. A CAB member asked if Dieter has seen characteristics in Idaho that are different from other projects he has been involved with. Dieter replied that the reactors were not as much of a challenge as the unique facilities such as CPP-601 and CPP-640. A CAB member commented that a lot of coordination and planning would be involved. Radiation control personnel would not allow workers to get in a situation where there would be worker exposure. A CAB member asked if reduction of the building to three feet below ground surface was sufficient if the area is to be released for use. Provencher replied that some type of control into the future would be required as was done at the DOE Mound Site. Faulk commented that EPA's expectation would be that whatever is left would pose a minimal environmental risk. A CAB member observed that there was leakage in the basement of CPP-601, and Dieter replied that CWI would take samples from the basement. Trever noted this was a concern of EPA and the state as well.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) commented that consideration must be given to what should stay in place and what should be sent away. If the CAB has thoughts about these issues before the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analyses (EE/CAs) are developed, this would be useful to guide the regulators as they work on these documents.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA) noted that D&D at Hanford is a bit different. At Hanford, the EE/CA covers the entire facility, not just certain buildings. EPA also commented that it would benefit DOE in the long run to involve the regulators in the characterization work.

PRELIMINARY RISK EVALUATIONS PREPARED BY THE CONSORTIUM FOR RISK EVALUATION WITH STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION (CRESP)

Bill Leake (DOE-ID) introduced the CRESP reports to the CAB. He explained how the reports fit into the process of developing an end states vision for the Idaho site.

PRELIMINARY RISK EVALUATION OF CALCINED HIGH-LEVEL WASTE DISPOSITION PREPARED BY CRESP

Charles W. Powers and David S. Kosson (CRESP) provided an overview of CRESP and of the document prepared by CRESP regarding calcined high-level waste.

CAB Questions and Answers

In reply to a question, Kosson noted that some pieces of the risk equation could be quantified and some could not. For example, there is good information on transportation risk. However, because the design is not known, worker safety is difficult to quantify. A CAB member commented that there could be an equation developed to quantify risk. Kosson noted that trade offs must be made, and that this complicates the equation. Powers noted that the gaps are so significant in the case of the calcine that it is premature to lay out a risk equation analysis. Kosson noted that everyone weights values somewhat differently, and this complicates the situation.

Public Questions and Answers

John Tanner asked if CRESP identified any experiments that needed to be done. Kosson replied that this level of detail could not be developed until the basis of design was under development. Preliminary engineering design studies are recommended to identify additional information needs.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA) commented that the CRESP report identified the basic questions we need to answer. The unfortunate thing is the uncertainty over Yucca Mountain.

Discussion and finalization of the draft recommendation

Goldstein reviewed the draft recommendation. Comments and concerns were noted, and changes were made. The terms 'basis of design' and 'conceptual design' were explained by Kosson. The CAB approved the recommendation by consensus.

PRELIMINARY RISK EVALUATION OF OPTIONS FOR BURIED WASTE DISPOSITION PREPARED BY CRESP

David S. Kosson (CRESP) provided a presentation on the subject document.

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member commented that long term stewardship was an issue of great interest to the CAB. Kosson agreed and noted that there has been no analysis of the costs of an effective long term stewardship program. Powers noted that the lack of public confidence in long term stewardship was in part due to the absence of a sustainable program. EPA is working on this issue.

Public Questions and Answers

Tanner noted that he did not view strontium 90 as a hazard as it has a 30 year half life and does not move through the environment. Clay Nichols commented that he has growing concerns about long term stewardship and the knowledge gaps that we have. The INL has an unusual vadose zone and it is difficult to predict fate and transport of the contaminants.

Discussion and finalization of the draft recommendation

Kipping reviewed the draft recommendation. The CAB discussed comments and concerns. Use of grouting for different purposes and its effectiveness was addressed. Some changes were made. The CAB approved the recommendation by consensus.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD CHAIRS MEETING

Kipping reviewed plans for hosting the EMSSAB chairs meeting in September. A steering committee is developing the agenda. The emphasis will be on waste disposition. The CAB identified the issues it would present at the chairs meeting. Kipping, Bolliger, Preacher and Dixon will attend.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF NUCLEAR OPERATIONS RELATED TO PRODUCTION OF RADIOISOTOPE POWER SYSTEMS

Bill Flanery (Chair, Potential Impacts of Idaho National Laboratory Mission Committee) Review draft letter developed by the Committee

Flanery reviewed the draft letter. The issue whether the project is a defense project was discussed.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)

Trever noted that there is confusion whether the project is a defense project. She also noted some discrepancies between what DOE has stated and what is in the document. She commented that there could have been clearer communications regarding this document. This is an opportunity for the state but needs to be reviewed carefully to assure the project will protect people and that DOE will still meet its commitments to Idaho. She noted that it is not a question whether plutonium 238 production should be resumed, it is a question of where and how. Trever noted that she had identified areas regarding the project that were within the CAB charter.

Discussion and finalization of the CAB's draft letter about the draft EIS

The CAB discussed waste treatment needed for the project and whether vitrification was planned. The CAB discussed the timing for issuing the letter. Some changes were made and it was approved by consensus.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Tanner, Coalition 21, commented that the plutonium consolidation project would be good for the INL. The waste should be manageable. Tanner provided the CAB with information about contamination incidents at Los Alamos related to this project. The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) has given itself credit for improved safety at Los Alamos.

Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, commented that she is confused about the flow between categorical exclusions and EE/CAs. She expressed concern about the three foot limit as excavations have gone to 10 feet in the past. At Rocky Flats, the three foot limit resulted in contaminated transfer lines left in the soil. She was surprised that the reactor vessels could be disposed on site. Regarding the draft EIS, she stated that she believed CAB comments on the project were appropriate. She believes the question of oversight of the radioactive material in the process is very important. She commented that the draft EIS is very general. The environment is described but the impacts are not. The CAB could ask for more information about the project and a better understanding of which steps produce waste. She felt that worker safety should be a concern.

NEW NAME FOR THE INEEL CAB

The CAB discussed and selected the name of the Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board. It will commonly be referred to as the Idaho CAB or CAB.

FISCAL YEAR 2006 ANNUAL WORK PLAN FOR THE CAB

The CAB brainstormed topics that members wish to address in the next annual work plan. The CAB reviewed the topics and organized them into groups. The CAB reviewed the grouping of topics and established names for the issue committees.

DRAFT LETTER TO RICK PROVENCHER REGARDING WHICH CONTRACTORS ARE INVITED TO SIT AT THE TABLE DURING CAB MEETINGS

Kipping reviewed the draft letter regarding which contractors sit at the table during meetings. The CAB discussed the role of the contractor and Provencher provided his view. The CAB determined that a letter on this topic was not needed. The CAB decided that DOE normally may have one person sit at the table to support the DDFO, and may have a second person if approved by the CAB chair.

DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NUCLEAR REACTORS AND OTHER MAJOR, COMPLEX FACILITIES (PART IV)

The CAB brainstormed its reactions on the topic. Rankin noted that safety is a paramount concern. Process knowledge is very important and the points about using the experience of workers were well taken.

LONG-TERM STEWARDSHIP AT THE IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY

Patty Natoni (DOE-ID) provided a presentation on the INL's Long-Term Stewardship program.
CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member asked whether DOE believed there was a commitment on the part of Congress to maintain the program. Natoni replied that the program is required by law, so she assumes that Congress will fund it. Provencher commented that the CAB can watch how the situation results at sites undergoing closure at this time.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) commented that when a decision is made to leave contamination in place, this will not be accepted by the state of Idaho unless there is a definite commitment to long term stewardship. It is important to maintain records.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA) commented that the program has come a long ways in the last few years. The program is in place, and now it should be implemented. The CERCLA five year review process will give the CAB a key element to understand the program. Groundwater monitoring also needs to be integrated.

Facilitated Discussion of What Should be Presented to the Chairs at the Upcoming SSAB Chairs meeting

The CAB discussed the points to be made about Long-Term Stewardship to the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs. The chairs are interested in what is being done at a site with an on-going mission. A CAB member suggested that the presentation could be linked to what the chairs see on the tour. The presentation should include photos.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Kosson commented that the attention to long term stewardship was a good sign. This is important across the complex. Tanner commented that studies should be done on the calcine to eliminate the uncertainties.

PROPOSAL TO HOST EVENING SESSIONS FOR THE PUBLIC

Corrigan reported that the committee had not obtained any specific indications that the public would come to an evening meeting. Faulk commented that the most successful meetings are those conducted in

conjunction with a university. Corrigan commented that the committee has no proposal for an evening meeting at this time. However, if through direct contacts, it appears people will come to an evening meeting, this could be reconsidered.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

John Tanner commented that when the United States Geological Service (USGS) or State of Idaho is taking samples from a well, they are measuring total concentration regardless of the physical form of the radionuclides.

PROPOSAL REGARDING USE OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS DEVELOPED BY THE OAK RIDGE SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Corrigan reported on the review of the materials developed by Oak Ridge. Steps will be taken to gather information on how to conduct outreach through education. Steps include asking for review of the materials and investigating whether a student would be interested in a project to modify the Oak Ridge materials. This topic will be assigned to the NE/EM Interface Committee.

CAB PROCEDURES

Georgia Dixon (Administrative Decision Making Ad Hoc Committee)

The CAB reviewed proposed changes to the CAB procedures to address decision-making. The proposed changes will be considered at the September meeting.

BOARD WORK

Topics for discussion at the September 2005 meeting

A list of topics identified by the ex officios and the CAB for the September meeting was reviewed and discussed. The CAB identified a theme for the meeting of wrapping up the projects and work done by the former contractor, Bechtel Babcock Wilcox Idaho.

Committee schedule

A committee call schedule was handed out.

Unanswered questions

The CAB remains interested in the Foster-Wheeler project. There is a question about steam reforming. Is it the only technology being provided for sodium bearing waste? The CAB member also expressed an interest in facilities disposition and historical preservation. A question was raised about what happens to cultural sites when facilities are dispositioned.

Next steps and action items

Thank you letters will be sent to those who put the tour together, including the bus driver. The letters will mention the thoroughness of the tours. A separate thank you will be sent to Bob Waters who volunteered his time during the tour of CPP-601.

The CAB will transmit to DOE the success stories on CRESO and utilization of independent sources.

Success stories

The CAB accomplished a great deal of work for this meeting. Three major documents were reviewed and input was provided on each one. The CRESO documents and the technical support provided by CRESO were very valuable. The CAB successfully sought out information sources from other groups or agencies beyond DOE.

Meeting Evaluation for the July 2005 Meeting

+	Δ
Tour stayed on time	The tour was too long
Presentations, particularly Tom Dieter's	Inadequate answer from CWI on disposition of CPP-641
Aerial photographs	CRESP report was not easy to follow
Facilities for meeting are good	
Presentation by Kathleen Trever was useful. Input was helpful.	
CRESP attendance and input	
Annual Work Plan exercise	
Staff Support – smooth meeting	
Inclusion of information from non-DOE sources as a supplement.	
Assistance from Dennis Faulk was appreciated	
Lively and well planned meeting	
The new footer on the recommendations is good.	
Brent Rankin's participation was appreciated.	
Good minutes from the last meeting	
Hand delivery of documents was helpful.	
The CRESP documents were difficult to get through but were very informative.	

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL) Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) will be September 19-20, 2005, at the Ameritel Inn in Idaho Falls, Idaho. The meeting will be from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday, September 19, 2005 and from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Tuesday, September 20, 2005. The CAB will receive comments from the public at various times throughout the meeting as indicated on the final meeting agenda.



LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachments are included at the end of the minutes

- Attachment A July 2005 Final INEEL CAB Meeting Agenda
- Attachment B INEEL CAB Meeting Attendance
- Attachment C Public Attendance

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibits and handouts are not included in the minutes, but are available upon request by calling the INEEL CAB Support Staff at (208) 557-7886.

- Exhibit 1 Idaho Cleanup Project
- Exhibit 2 Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D at the Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP)
- Exhibit 3 DOE’s Perspective on Decontamination and Decommissioning
- Exhibit 4 TAN, RTC, PBF, and INTEC D&D
- Exhibit 5 Preliminary Risk Evaluations at the Idaho Site
- Exhibit 6 Preliminary Risk Evaluation of Calcined High-Level Waste Disposition at the Idaho Site
- Exhibit 7 Preliminary Risk Evaluation of Options for Buried Waste Disposition at the Idaho Site
- Exhibit 8 The INL Site’s Long-Term Stewardship Program

LIST OF HANDOUTS

- Handout 1 The National Academies Committee on Management of Certain Radioactive Waste Streams Stored in Tanks at Three DOE Sites, Meeting Agenda
- Handout 2 Letter to Mr. Goldsmith from Rick Provencher, Page 2 only (handed out by Bill Leake, DOE-ID prior to the CRESP Presentations)

ATTACHMENT A
July 2005 Final Agenda

**Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory
Citizens Advisory Board
FINAL AGENDA FOR THE JULY 2005 MEETING**

Note: The name of the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory was changed to the Idaho National Laboratory on January 31, 2005. The Citizens Advisory Board has not yet determined how it will change its name.

Meeting Location

Ameritel Inn
645 Lindsay Boulevard
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Meeting Dates and Times (times approximate)

Tuesday, July 19, 2005 from 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. with a lunch break from 12:00 P.M. to 1:00 P.M.
Wednesday, July 20, 2005 from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. with a lunch break from 12:00 P.M. to 1:00 P.M.

Opportunities for Public Participation (times approximate)

Tuesday, July 19, 2005 from 11:45 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. and 5:25 P.M. to 5:40 P.M.
Wednesday, July 20, 2005 from 10:20 A.M. to 10:35 A.M. and 2:20 P.M. to 2:35 P.M.

Meeting Objectives

The July 2005 meeting of the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory Citizens Advisory Board will be designed to achieve the following objectives:

- > Receive a presentation addressing the accomplishments in the last two months for the Idaho Cleanup Project (ICP), new Idaho Operations Office Strategic Plan (with emphasis on cleanup prior to 2012 and cleanup between 2012 and 2035), status of the transition for the new ICP contractor and the coordination between CH2M-WG Idaho (CWI) and Bechtel B&W Idaho (BBWI), the status of shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant from the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project, production improvements in the cleanup of the dry storage at CPP-603, and the selection of steam reforming to treat sodium bearing waste and transuranic waste;
- > Receive presentations relevant to the theme of the meeting which is focused on CAB's desire to develop a better understanding of how DOE makes decisions related to decontamination and decommissioning for nuclear reactors and other major complex facilities. Specific information needs identified by the CAB include:
 - DOE's decision making process for D&D of major complex facilities,
 - Basic options that are available and the end states associated with each option,
 - The current status of all non-active reactors and other facilities,
 - The current schedule for D&D of all major facilities, and
 - The roles and responsibilities of the regulators and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;
- > Discuss information presented within the theme of the meeting and develop ideas for possible future recommendations (if desired);
- > Receive presentations and develop consensus recommendation(s) addressing the two Independent Risk Assessment(s) developed by the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation;
- > Develop consensus on a letter addressing the CAB's reactions to and concerns about potential impacts of Idaho National Laboratory missions on the environment and the cleanup program;
- > Develop consensus on a letter addressing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Consolidation of Nuclear Operations Related to Production of Radioisotope Power Systems;
- > Receive a presentation addressing DOE's approach to long-term stewardship;

- > Continue efforts to plan for the upcoming Site Specific Advisory Board chairs meeting;
- > Discuss the possibility of hosting evening sessions for the public in the future;
- > Discuss the possible use of educational materials developed by the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board in Idaho;
- > Develop consensus on a letter regarding which contractors sit at the table during CAB meetings;
- > Begin processes to develop an Annual Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2006; and
- > Discuss proposed changes to the INEEL CAB's Procedures to address administrative decision making.

**Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory
Citizens Advisory Board
Final Agenda for Tuesday, July 19, 2005**

Welcome and Introductions	8:00 AM - 8:30 AM
David Kipping (INEEL CAB Chair) Opening remarks	8:00 AM - 8:05 AM
Rick Provencher (Deputy Designated Federal Official) Opening remarks	8:05 AM - 8:10 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) Opening remarks	8:10 AM - 8:15 AM
Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Opening remarks	8:15 AM - 8:20 AM
Bill Johnson (CWI Liaison) Opening remarks	8:20 AM - 8:25 AM
Wendy Green Lowe (Facilitator) Meeting orientation	8:25 AM - 8:30 AM
Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting	8:30 AM - 8:40 AM
David Kipping (Chair) Report on status of preparations	8:30 AM - 8:35 AM
Nominations of CAB members to attend the meeting on behalf of the CAB	8:35 AM - 8:40 AM
Environmental Management Program Status and Items of Potential Interest to the INEEL CAB	8:40 AM - 9:25 AM
Rick Provencher (DOE-ID) Presentation	8:40 AM - 9:10 AM
CAB questions and answers	9:10 AM - 9:15 AM
Public questions and answers	9:15 AM - 9:20 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	9:20 AM - 9:25 AM
Break	9:25 AM - 9:40 AM
Decontamination and Decommissioning of Nuclear Reactors and Other Major, Complex Facilities (Part I)	9:40 AM - 10:35 AM
Joseph A. Legare (DOE-ID) Presentation addressing decontamination and decommissioning at the Idaho Cleanup Project	9:40 AM - 10:15 AM
CAB questions and answers	10:15 AM - 10:25 AM
Public questions and answers	10:25 AM - 10:30 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	10:30 AM - 10:35 AM
Break	10:35 AM - 10:50 AM
Decontamination and Decommissioning of Nuclear Reactors and Other Major, Complex Facilities (Part II)	10:50 AM - 11:45 AM
Nolan R. Jensen (DOE-ID) Presentation addressing DOE's perspectives on decontamination and decommissioning	10:50 AM - 11:25 AM
CAB questions and answers	11:25 AM - 11:35 AM
Public questions and answers	11:35 AM - 11:40 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	11:40 AM - 11:45 AM

Public Participation	11:45 AM - 12:00 PM
David Kipping (INEEL CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
Lunch	12:00 PM - 1:00 PM
The State's Perspective on Legislative Developments	1:00 PM - 1:15 PM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) Status report	
Letter Addressing CAB's Reactions to and Concerns About the Potential Impacts of Idaho National Laboratory Mission on the Environment and the Idaho Cleanup Project	1:15 PM - 1:20 PM
Bill Flanery (Potential Impacts of Idaho National Laboratory Mission Committee) Review draft letter	
Decontamination and Decommissioning of Nuclear Reactors and Other Major, Complex Facilities (Part III)	1:20 PM - 2:15 PM
Thomas J. Dieter (CWI) Presentation addressing decontamination and decommissioning at Test Area North, Reactors Technology Complex, the Power Burst Facility, and the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center	1:20 PM - 1:55 PM
CAB questions and answers	1:55 PM - 2:05 PM
Public questions and answers	2:05 PM - 2:10 PM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	2:10 PM - 2:15 PM
Break	2:15 PM - 2:25 PM
Preliminary Risk Evaluations Prepared by the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP)	2:25 PM - 2:30 PM
Bill Leake (DOE-ID) Introduction	
Preliminary Risk Evaluation of Calcined High-Level Waste Disposition Prepared by CRESP	2:30 PM - 3:25 PM
Charles W. Powers and David S. Kosson (CRESP) Presentation	2:30 PM - 2:50 PM
CAB questions and answers	2:50 PM - 2:55 PM
Public questions and answers	2:55 PM - 3:00 PM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	3:00 PM - 3:05 PM
Annemarie Goldstein (End State Committee Chair) Review draft recommendation developed by the Committee	3:05 PM - 3:15 PM
Facilitated discussion of CAB reactions to and concerns about the document and/or the draft recommendation	3:15 PM - 3:25 PM
Break	3:25 PM - 3:35 PM

Preliminary Risk Evaluation of Options for Buried Waste Disposition Prepared by CRESP **3:35 PM - 4:30 PM**

- Charles W. Powers and David S. Kosson (CRESP) Presentation 3:35 PM - 3:55 PM
- CAB questions and answers 3:55 PM - 4:00 PM
- Public questions and answers 4:00 PM - 4:05 PM
- Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives 4:05 PM - 4:10 PM
- David Kipping (End State Committee member) Review draft recommendation developed by the Committee 4:10 PM - 4:20 PM
- Facilitated discussion of CAB reactions to and concerns about the document and/or the draft recommendation 4:20 PM - 4:30 PM

Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting (continued) **4:30 PM - 4:40 PM**

- Facilitated brainstorm of topics for possible reporting as the INEEL CAB's "Top Three Issues" 4:30 PM - 4:35 PM
- Facilitated brainstorm of issues for possible reporting as "Top Waste Disposition Issues" 4:35 PM - 4:40 PM

Break **4:40 PM - 4:50 PM**

Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Consolidation of Nuclear Operations Related to Production of Radioisotope Power Systems **4:50 PM - 5:25 PM**

- Bill Flanery (Potential Impacts of Idaho National Laboratory Mission Committee) Review draft letter developed by the Committee 4:50 PM - 5:00 PM
- Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives 5:00 PM - 5:05 PM
- Facilitated discussion of CAB reactions to and concerns about the draft Environmental Impact Statement and/or the CAB's draft letter 5:05 PM - 5:25 PM

Public Participation **5:25 PM - 5:40 PM**

- David Kipping (INEEL CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration

New Name for the INEEL CAB **5:40 PM - 5:50 PM**

- Facilitated discussion

Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Work Plan for the CAB **5:50 PM - 6:00 PM**

- Facilitated brainstorm of topics of interest to the CAB members

**Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory
Citizens Advisory Board
Final Agenda for Wednesday, July 20, 2005**

Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Work Plan for the CAB (continued)	8:00 AM - 8:30 AM
Facilitated organization of proposed topics into themes	
Draft Letter to Rick Provencher Regarding Which Contractors Are Invited to Sit at the Table during CAB Meetings	8:30 AM - 8:40 AM
David Kipping (Chair) Review draft letter	
Decontamination and Decommissioning of Nuclear Reactors and Other Major, Complex Facilities (Part IV)	8:40 AM - 9:10 AM
Facilitated sounding board of reactions to and concerns about information presented	
Break	9:10 AM - 9:25 AM
Long-Term Stewardship at the Idaho National Laboratory	9:25 AM - 10:20 AM
Patty Natoni (DOE-ID) Presentation	9:25 AM - 9:55 AM
CAB questions and answers	9:55 AM - 10:00 AM
Public questions and answers	10:00 AM - 10:05 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	10:05 AM - 10:10 AM
Facilitated discussion of what should be presented to the Chairs at the upcoming Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting	10:10 AM - 10:20 AM
Public Participation	10:20 AM - 10:35 AM
David Kipping (INEEL CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
Break	10:35 AM - 10:50 AM
Preliminary Risk Evaluation of Calcined High-Level Waste Disposition Prepared by CRESP (continued)	10:50 AM - 11:30 AM
Annemarie Goldstein (End State Committee Chair) Review draft recommendation	10:50 AM - 11:00 AM
Facilitated discussion and finalization of CAB recommendation	11:00 AM - 11:30 AM
Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Work Plan for the CAB (continued)	11:30 AM - 11:50 AM
Facilitated discussion of committee structure and assignment of themes to committees	
Proposal to Host Evening Sessions for the Public	11:50 AM - 12:00 PM
Karen Corrigan (Administrative Committee) Present proposal	11:50 AM - 11:55 AM
Facilitated discussion	11:55 AM - 12:00 PM
Lunch	12:00 PM - 1:00 PM

Letter Addressing CAB's Reactions to and Concerns About the Potential Impacts of Idaho National Laboratory Mission on the Environment and the Idaho Cleanup Project (continued)	1:00 PM - 1:25 PM
Facilitated discussion and finalization of CAB letter	
Preliminary Risk Evaluation of Options for Buried Waste Disposition Prepared by CRESP (continued)	1:25 PM - 2:05 PM
David Kipping (End State Committee member) Review draft recommendation	1:25 PM - 1:35 PM
Facilitated discussion and finalization of CAB recommendation	1:35 PM - 2:05 PM
Break	2:05 PM - 2:20 PM
Public Participation	2:20 PM - 2:35 PM
David Kipping (INEEL CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
Draft Letter Addressing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Consolidation of Nuclear Operations Related to Production of Radioisotope Power Systems	2:35 PM - 3:05 PM
Bill Flanery (Potential Impacts of Idaho National Laboratory Mission Committee) Review draft letter	2:35 PM - 2:40 PM
Facilitated discussion and finalization of draft letter	2:40 PM - 3:05 PM
Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting (continued)	3:05 PM - 3:15 PM
Decision regarding which CAB members will attend the meeting on behalf of the CAB	
Draft Letter to Rick Provencher Regarding Which Contractors Are Invited to Sit at the Table during CAB Meetings (continued)	3:15 PM - 3:35 PM
Facilitated discussion and finalization of CAB letter	
Break	3:35 PM - 3:50 PM
Proposal Regarding Use of Educational Materials Developed by the Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board	3:50 PM - 4:00 PM
Karen Corrigan (Administrative Committee Chair) Present proposal	3:50 PM - 3:55 PM
Facilitated discussion of proposal	3:55 PM - 4:00 PM
CAB Procedures	4:00 PM - 4:15 PM
Georgia Dixon (Administrative Decision Making Ad Hoc Committee) Review Committee's recommendation	4:00 PM - 4:05 PM
Facilitated discussion regarding Administrative Decision Making Committee's proposal	4:05 PM - 4:15 PM

Board Work

4:15 PM - 5:00 PM

Status of efforts under the INEEL CAB's Annual Work Plan

4:15 PM - 4:20 PM

Topics for discussion at the September 2005 meeting

4:20 PM - 4:30 PM

Committee schedule

4:30 PM - 4:35 PM

Unanswered questions

4:35 PM - 4:40 PM

Next steps and action items

4:40 PM - 4:45 PM

Meeting evaluation for the July 2005 meeting

4:45 PM - 4:55 PM

Success stories

4:55 PM - 5:00 PM



ATTACHMENT B

INEEL CAB Meeting Attendance

	Tuesday July 19, 2005				Wednesday July 20, 2005			
	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out
INEEL CAB Members								
David Kipping (Chair)	7:50	12:00	1:00	6:00	7:50	11:45	1:00	5:30
Larry Knight (Vice Chair)	8:00	Working Lunch		6:00	7:45	11:45	1:00	5:30
Seth Beal	ABSENT				8:00	11:45	1:00	5:30
John Bolliger	7:30	12:00	1:00	6:00	7:45	11:45	1:00	5:30
Richard Buxton	7:45	Working Lunch		6:00	7:45	11:45	1:00	5:30
Karen Corrigan	7:30	Working Lunch		6:00	7:40	11:45	1:00	5:30
D.H. DeTonancour	7:55	12:00	1:00	6:00	7:55	11:45	1:00	5:30
Georgia Dixon	7:50	Working Lunch		6:00	7:55	11:45	1:00	5:30
Paul Faulkner	7:54	11:54	12:55	6:00	7:59	11:45	1:00	5:32
William Flanery	7:50	12:00	1:00	6:00	7:55	11:45	1:00	5:27
Lila Gold	ABSENT							
Annemarie Goldstein	7:45	Working Lunch		6:00	7:40	11:45	1:00	5:30
Ann Nichols	ABSENT							
Willie Preacher	7:55	12:00	1:00	6:08	8:00	11:45	1:00	5:40
State of Idaho/EPA								
Kathleen Trever, State	7:55	12:00	1:05	6:00	8:10	11:45	1:00	
Dennis Faulk, U.S. EPA	7:50	12:00	1:00	6:00	7:52	11:45	1:00	
DOE-ID Representatives								
Rick Provencher, DOE-ID	7:50	12:00	1:00	6:00	7:50	11:45	1:00	5:30
Shannon Brennan, DOE-ID	7:55	12:00	1:00	6:00	7:55	12:00	12:30	5:00
INEEL Liaison								
Brent Rankin								

ATTACHMENT C

Members of the Public in Attendance July 19-20, 2005

July 19, 2005

Greg Duggan, DOE-ID
Kevin O'Neill, DOE-ID
Pete Dirkmatt, CWI
Kevin Kostelnik, BEA
George Freund, Coalition 21
Mike Heiser, CWI
Kathleen Hain, DOE-ID
Stacey Francis, CWI
Bill Leake, DOE-ID
Erik Simpson, CWI
Steve Allred, CWI
Kevin G. Brown, CRESP
Joe LeGare, DOE-ID
Rick Denning, INL Oversight
Wendy Dixon, NR/IBO
John Tanner, Coalition 21
David Kosson, CRESP
Christine Switzer, CRESP
Nolan Jensen, DOE-ID
Tom Dieter, CWI
Jim Floerke, CWI
Beatrice Brailsford
Bob Holmes
Frank Webber, CWI
Lisa Green, DOE-ID
Mike Hart, ComDesign

July 20, 2005

Clay Nichols
Erik Simpson
Wendy Dixon, NR/IBO
Jim Floerke, CWI
Tom Dieter, CWI
Joe Campbell, CWI
Mike Hodel, CWI
Patty Natoni, DOE-ID
Syl Losinski, CWI
Stacey Francis, CWI
Alan Jines, DOE-ID
Christine Switzer, CRESP
Kevin G. Brown, CRESP
David Kosson, CRESP
Lisa Green, DOE-ID
Frank Webber, CWI