



SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

September 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, Idaho CAB

January 9, 2006

Date



MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2005

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Members: David Kipping (Chair), Larry Knight (Vice Chair), Seth Beal, John Bolliger, D.H. “Doc” DeTonancour, Georgia Dixon, Paul Faulkner, William Flanery, Annemarie Goldstein, and Arthur Randall.

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 CAB. He expressed the loss that the CAB had suffered with the death of member Karen Corrigan. Current and former CAB members provided their memories of Karen and her contribution to the Board.

Kipping reviewed the theme of the meeting as one of ‘lessons learned’ from the cleanup work that has been taking place at the site. He covered recent developments across the DOE complex. NRC is expecting to receive a license application for Yucca Mountain in the spring of 2006. NRC then has three years to make a decision. NRC is also involved in reviewing applications from DOE for waste determinations. Savannah River Site currently has top priority due to tank capacity issues. The support service contract for the CAB has not yet been awarded. The current contract will be extended through December 1, 2005.

Rick Provencher, DOE-ID, Opening Remarks

Provencher reported that the transition has been completed on the cleanup contract and on the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP). DOE is awaiting delivery of the CH2M Washington Idaho (CWI) baseline next week. The new Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM), Jim Rispoli, has a strong construction background and will be focused on project management, which will be a benefit to Idaho and the EM complex. On the issue of the waste determination, Provencher related that Idaho has prepared a quality document that should help with the review cycle. There is an upcoming record of decision on the sodium bearing waste treatment, and DOE will be interested in the CAB’s thoughts.

Kathleen Trever, State of Idaho, Opening Remarks

Trever commented that she has met Jim Rispoli, EM-1, and she is optimistic that things will continue to progress under his tenure. She expects that the NRC review of the Idaho waste determination will take 6 to 8 months. The document is a good quality product that will provide a basis for making sound policy. Trever introduced Nicole Stricker, reporter for the Post Register.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, Opening Remarks

Faulk commented that Nick Ceto has gone to New Orleans for three weeks to work on response to Hurricane Katrina. He mentioned that Michael Bogert, from Idaho, has been appointed EPA Regional Administrator. He commented that the end state for cleanup is now in sight at both Idaho and Washington, with much of the cleanup to be completed in 7 years.

Bill Johnson, CWI, Opening Remarks

Johnson remarked about the steps taken to assure safety for workers and the environment at the ICP. The ICP has surpassed 1.5 million hours without an injury or illness resulting in a lost-work day. CWI is very active in engaging the work force to focus on safety in the future. CWI has submitted an electrical safety improvement plan to DOE and has put a hoisting and rigging program in place. CWI is seeking to maintain site’s successful involvement in the Voluntary Protection Program. A new program is being implemented to encourage workers to look out for one another on safe work performance.

WELCOME TO NEW MEMBER ARTHUR RANDALL

The CAB welcomed Arthur Randall and shared their favorite acronyms with him.

RECENT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Rick Provencher (DOE-ID)

Provencher provided an overview of public outreach activities. He noted that recent workshops on sodium bearing waste had been conducted to target discussions with particular groups. The public has expressed interest in continuing to be involved as plans are being developed. DOE is seeking to be responsive to feedback to demonstrate that the public concerns are being considered. Flanery asked how public concerns about space batteries were being considered. Provencher recognized that the laboratory side of the INL needs to take a similar approach. Knight commented that he observed a contrast between the public involvement activities related to cleanup and those related to plutonium 238 consolidation. Knight stated that Provencher's group is taking the right approach.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)

Trever commented that she attended the five meetings in Idaho on plutonium 238 consolidation. She viewed the meetings as poorly run. She is not convinced that the comments provided at the meetings are representative of the citizens of Idaho. It was unfortunate that there were no opportunities to receive and respond to comments and discuss issues. She commented that time for the CAB to respond to the notice regarding sodium bearing waste should have been factored into the public comment period. She reviewed other activities related to sodium bearing waste and on upcoming public outreach events and meetings.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA)

Faulk commented that EPA approaches public involvement by making this the responsibility of the project managers. He provided the example of buried waste retrieval as one where public involvement altered the strategy for characterization of the waste. He noted the public's interest in Idaho in removing waste from Idaho instead of disposing of it. He also commented that the Hanford advisory board focuses on commenting to the agencies about their public involvement activities, where at Idaho the CAB has a more technical approach. He expressed a need to have a communications strategy that encompassed both the cleanup side and the future mission of the site.

Facilitated discussion of concerns raised by the public during those public involvement opportunities

Knight noted that the CAB goes through a periodic examination of who it represents, and that our CAB includes many of the same interests identified in other public forums. Goldstein commented that confusion of the public over the split between the lab side and the clean up side needed to be addressed. The public views it as one entity. Flanery commented that EM outreach ought to take over the Nuclear Energy (NE) outreach. Kipping commented that there is something going on in public outreach nearly every day for the NE side. Most of this is explaining the mission. There is a difference between selling a large project and dealing with the specifics of a plan such as plutonium 238 consolidation. He felt the plutonium 238 effort was really a sales pitch and not an effort to understand the public's concerns. EM does a pretty good job of getting the facts out and informing the public. Dixon noted that informal processes need to be used, as this is where there are the real opportunities to have dialogue with the public. Public involvement needs to be an everyday, ongoing effort. Trever commented that many of her frustrations with the plutonium 238 consolidation activities stem from DOE Headquarters.

The CAB reviewed whether this topic should be continued with a 15 minute goal. Goldstein asked for more specific numbers and facts about public outreach. Trever commented that it would be useful to have something provided to the CAB ahead of time. In response to a question from Faulk, Flanery explained why the CAB was interested in the subject. Flanery noted that the CAB was concerned that public involvement activities are just designed to meet legal requirements. The CAB is interested in what the impact of public involvement is on the DOE's planning. Brennan asked for clarification of the information the CAB would like to receive on public involvement. Flanery replied that DOE should be

looking for ways to make meetings more productive and to improve the process. The CAB may be of help in that regard. He would like to hear the DOE's thoughts on this. The committee will work on providing further clarification of its interests in this area.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM STATUS AND ITEMS OF POTENTIAL INTEREST OF THE CAB

Rick Provencher (DOE-ID)

Provencher provided a presentation on the status of the EM Program.

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member asked why DOE was taking responsibility to disposition the former Lockheed facilities. Provencher replied that DOE had received funding to do this as part of a settlement with Lockheed. In reply to a question, Provencher related the circumstances involving a fire in the charcoal filter at the V tank treatment unit. Johnson clarified that the concentration of volatile organics was higher than the level for which the system had been designed, resulting in a stronger exothermic reaction. The charcoal was downstream of high efficiency particulate air filtration. Trever clarified that the slide showing tank farm volumes showed higher volumes than are expected to remain in the tanks. Trever commented that two separate regulatory requirements applied to the treatment technology for sodium bearing waste – hazardous chemicals and air contaminants. In response to a question, the practices for subsurface waste disposal were explained. In response to a question, Johnson described what had been done and what was planned to characterize the underground lines from the V Tank system. All lines will be sampled and analyzed before closure activities take place.

Public Questions and Answers

A member of the public asked if the process of developing a lifecycle baseline would be iterative. Provencher replied that the baseline will recognize that there is a process for achieving regulatory acceptance of the plans. The baseline will identify the activities needed to establish approved plans. .

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)

Trever commented that the laboratory and the cleanup program need to work closely on a strategy for continued waste disposal at the site. One area of interest to the state regarding the life cycle baseline will be the plans for waste retrieval.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA)

Faulk commented that the regulatory agencies make the final decision on cleanup. The five year review recently submitted to EPA will lay the foundation for long term stewardship and institutional controls that will be needed. The issue of materials disposition is key for EPA. EPA will be encouraging DOE to cease disposal in unlined trenches.

SODIUM BEARING WASTE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY - THE PATH FORWARD

Joel Case (DOE-ID)

Case provided a presentation on the sodium bearing waste and treatment technology selection.

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member asked why the treatment of direct evaporation was not pursued. Case replied that the treatment technology resulted in a hydrated waste form. Long term performance and acceptance at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) are issues. The bidders on the site cleanup contract were responsible for proposing a treatment technology. A CAB member asked why carbonate was not selected for the final waste form for steam reforming. Case replied that this doubles the waste volume and does not support vitrification down the line. A CAB member asked if there were any problems from a contract standpoint if vitrification was selected. Case replied that if DOE selected a different technology it would be an issue to address under the contract. A CAB member asked what percentage of the calcine was similar in make up to sodium bearing waste. It is about six percent (6%).

Public Questions and Answers

A member of the public, Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, asked if the steam reforming facility could be used for calcine, and Case replied it could be used for packaging of calcine for direct shipment to Yucca Mountain. She expressed skepticism that calcine could be shipped to Yucca Mountain. Case replied that the waste form meets the performance objectives for Yucca Mountain, but there are other issues that may impact ability to ship. Case noted that calcine and steam reforming have advantages for disposal at WIPP. WIPP had more concerns about the evaporation product form. She asked if the regulators in New Mexico would accept this waste form at WIPP. Case explained the acceptance process, which would involve modification to the WIPP permit.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)

Trever commented that there is a similar waste form at Oak Ridge that has been approved for shipment to WIPP. Case replied that DOE will be working with the Oak Ridge people to understand their shared issues.

DOE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE ON SODIUM BEARING WASTE TECHNOLOGY SELECTION

Jack Depperschmidt (DOE-ID)

Depperschmidt attended the meeting to provide further information about the federal register notice. He described the reasons why DOE conducted a supplement analysis of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for High Level Waste and Facilities Disposition. The supplement analysis considered the technology proposed by the contractor as well as updated characterization data on the sodium bearing waste. Another issue was new data regarding latent cancer evaluations. The DOE also reviewed whether consolidation of waste from 5 tanks into 3 tanks would have an impact on groundwater. The federal register notice was to make the public aware of the way DOE was leaning on technology for the waste.

Currently, DOE is planning to include facilities disposition as part of the record of decision. The majority of facilities disposition issues will be addressed in the record of decision. Depperschmidt clarified that existing facilities and new facilities built to manage high level waste would be part of the decision. The question is what will be included in facilities disposition if the waste is determined to be other than high level waste. A CAB member asked if decontamination of the bin sets would be part of the record of decision. This was raised as an example of the issues that the CAB has in mind regarding the scope of the record of decision. The CAB expressed concern that a record of decision could be reached without additional information and public comment. There does not appear to be detail about facilities disposition in the supplement analysis or federal register notice. Depperschmidt explained that the 2002 EIS explained the impacts on facilities disposition. There were no changes in this area that caused DOE to inform the public that impacts were different. The 2002 EIS is still valid for facilities disposition, and should be referred to in order to understand what is planned. A CAB member commented that the CAB does not know what facilities are involved in facility disposition, particularly if the waste is reclassified. Trever commented that there was an administrative document issued as a result of the EIS that identified that DOE would be issuing records of decision in phases.

STATUS OF THE CLOSURE OF THE TANK FARM

Keith Lockie (DOE-ID)

Lockie provided a presentation on closure of the tank farm.

CAB Questions and Answers

In reply to a question about the grouting process for the tanks, Lockie described the baseline strategy to use the engineered pour to provide an opportunity for additional waste removal, but that complete mixing of grout and residuals would not occur. Some mixing will occur, but there will be pockets and layers of waste. Most mixing systems involve pulling the waste up to mix it with the grout. DOE's philosophy is that if the waste can be pulled up it should be removed. The key question is if concentrations of radionuclides can be averaged when the material is not well mixed. Lockie described

how the grout would be poured, and explained that the sand pads will be surrounded by grout but not mixed into the grout. the sand is not accessible for sampling. To determine the sand's radionuclide content, DOE estimated the amount of liquid that infiltrated into the vault. The vault floors have shown no cracks or leaks that would have caused the liquid to be released. CAB member asked if the weight of the grout could affect the vault floors. Lockie replied that weight should not be an issue. Grouting will be conducted to keep more concrete in the tank than in the vault as grouting takes place to reduce the potential to "float" the tank. A CAB member asked about the above-ground facilities associated with the tanks. The shield blocks over the tank risers and valve blocks have been removed. The piping and cooling coils will be flushed. Events will need to be sequenced due to continuing use of some tanks. CERCLA decisions will be made in the future to lay out a final end state, but one option being considered is a cap that is several feet above ground level.

Public Questions and Answers

Brailsford asked if the comments DOE receives on the plan will be forwarded on to NRC. Lockie replied that DOE would be using a system to capture the comments. Trever noted that the state would be sharing its comments with the NRC and DOE. Brailsford asked if another submittal to NRC would be needed for the three tanks that are yet to be cleaned. Lockie explained that the current plan includes an estimate of what is involved with all the tanks and makes predictions about how the three tanks would be cleaned. Lockie commented that field sites are approaching the question of waste determination for tanks differently. Idaho is seeking one determination for the entire tank farm, while some sites are going on a tank by tank basis. Brailsford asked if the project would have to go back to NRC if the actual work shows a difference from the assumptions. Lockie replied that DOE and NRC would be looking at this. If the assumptions proved not to be valid, they would be revisited. NRC will be involved in reviewing DOE's execution of the plan.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)

Trever noted that the state will be looking for two things in review of the document. The first is a sound technical approach. The second is a transparent process so that the public can be involved. The state is planning a technical review with NRC and DOE, and this may be an iterative process. The state will be looking at how concentrations are calculated, at the involvement of a heterogeneous waste form, and at how this process gets factored into the CERCLA process to look at risk at the tank farm as a whole. The issue of the sand pads may need more review and analysis. The state will be viewing the tanks that have been cleaned differently from the tanks that contain liquid waste. These tanks may present unique challenges for cleaning as they contain a variety of wastes.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA)

Faulk noted that the process for evaluating the tanks is similar to CERCLA and seems adequate.

DOE'S APPROACH TO DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NUCLEAR REACTORS AND OTHER MAJOR, COMPLEX FACILITIES

Annemarie Goldstein (Chair, End State Committee)

Goldstein reviewed the draft letter on decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) and explained the way it was developed.

STATUS OF OPERATIONS AT THE IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE, COMPENSATION, AND LIABILITY ACT (CERCLA) DISPOSAL FACILITY (ICDF)

Nolan Jensen (DOE-ID)

Jensen provided a presentation of the status of the ICDF operations.

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member asked what was added to the mercury contaminated soil to prevent it from leaching. Jensen replied that the specific material is proprietary. After treatment, the material is tested to make sure

it will not leach. A CAB member asked when cell 2 would be filled. Jensen estimated it would be 7 to 10 years. Jensen noted that only wastes that are CERCLA wastes can go to ICDF. Johnson noted that the remaining cell is an asset for the site and waste will be minimized so that D&D and cleanup activities can be completed without filling the second cell. There will be an engineered cap once the cell is full. A CAB member asked for a rough idea of what percentage of the material in the first cell is contaminated soil and how much is debris. Jensen estimated that at least 80% is soil¹. Trever commented that there is a maximum ratio of soil to debris that is 6 or 7 parts soil to one part debris. Jensen further explained that the basis for the cell was the record of decision for INTEC, and the landfill will be at the proposed limit once the second cell is completed. The landfill is designed to meet hazardous waste landfill cell criteria. It is a state of the art landfill in terms of technical design. Faulk noted that the only difference is that no permit was needed as it was constructed under CERCLA. The record of decision includes criteria for design in compliance with the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA).

Public Questions and Answers

In reply to a question from Brailsford about the physical form of the treated mercury soil, Jensen explained that it is still in a gravel/soil form. The reagents tie up the mercury.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA)

A CAB member asked if waste that is currently going to the subsurface disposal area could go to ICDF. Faulk replied that if there is an ongoing mission, disposal capacity is needed. If it is to be on site, EPA believes a state of the art facility would be required. Trever clarified that there is no permitted disposal at INL for mixed low level waste. The issue is low level waste generated from ongoing activities.

CAB'S FISCAL YEAR 2006 ANNUAL WORK PLAN

David Kipping (CAB Chair) Review Draft Plan

Kipping described the approach to development of the annual work plan. He noted that the plan was developed in a time when there was a lot of uncertainty over CWI's baseline and plan, so there are still some unresolved questions.

Facilitated Discussion

The CAB discussed the need to prioritize the issues. The suggestion was made for the Board as a whole to conduct the prioritization. A CAB member commented that the starting point should be the contractor's proposals and plans. The CAB decided to conduct a prioritization exercise after the contractor baseline has been presented.

LESSONS LEARNED TO DATE FROM THE POWER BURST FACILITY (PBF)

Bill Harker (DOE-ID)

Harker provided a presentation on accomplishments and lessons learned from D&D of the PBF.

CAB Questions and Answers

In reply to a question Harker explained the excess process used for equipment from PBF. Provencher noted that the money generated from sales of this type of equipment is generally not enough to support the cost of the excess program. In response to a question, Harker clarified that the water from PBF went to an evaporation pond adjacent to the PBF that holds about 125,000 gallons. When the pond dries, the liner would be disposed in ICDF. The ring around the liner will go to excess if it is not contaminated. A CAB member asked if there were similarities or differences between PBF and the Experimental Test Reactor (ETR). Harker noted that the issue of lead is similar and the lessons learned about lead removal are being applied. The workers come up with good ideas to maintain exposures as

¹ On Tuesday, September 20, DOE provided the CAB with a more accurate figure – approximately 99% of the current contents by weight are contaminated soil.

low as reasonably achievable. Work is all well below allowable exposures. Provencher commented that the small remote operated vehicle was developed for ETR due to concerns identified during PBF work about entry into some of the more contaminated areas. A CAB member commented on plans for CPP-601 to take care of issues such as deep basement rooms and that the situation was similar. Harker agreed and noted that use of fixatives was a good approach to minimize the spread of contamination. A CAB member noted that there will be issues to sort through about how to proceed with the contaminated facilities. Harker noted that he is examining successful approaches used at INL and other facilities.

Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)

Trever asked what would be done differently after PBF. Harker replied that any lines would be carefully checked out and that workers would be prepared for worst case conditions. Ways to avoid skin contamination were also identified. DOE will be smarter about working in cubicles that have a lot of equipment in them.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA)

Faulk commented that the initial end state proposed for PBF was not one that the agencies could support. This is what led to the approach of two phases for decommissioning. This illustrates how the regulators can work with DOE to come up with solutions.

STEAM REFORMING TREATMENT FOR THE SODIUM BEARING WASTE

Larry Knight (Chair, Cleanup and Closure of Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee) Review Recommendation Drafted by the Committee

Knight introduced the draft recommendation.

Facilitated discussion of CAB questions about and reactions to the draft recommendation

The CAB discussed the draft recommendation. Information received at the meeting was discussed, and the ex officios provided information. The committee agreed to meet and make changes to the draft.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Brailsford commented that there are stumbling blocks to steam reforming. DOE has not defined the goals enough or has set up goals that do not work together. We are all desirous of digging up waste. We are not desirous of characterizing waste over and over again due to uncertainties over waste acceptance criteria. What we are looking at are these goals: safe storage of waste; this may be a waste stream that will need to be treated twice. Someone needs to really press DOE on the process that will be used to relabel the waste for the final disposition step. Is the goal safe storage or certain disposition? After the tour, it is extraordinary to see the piles of waste that DOE says are not acceptable at WIPP yet but will be going to WIPP. There is a growing effort to get as much to WIPP as possible by changing the rules. We may reach a point where New Mexico will start to push back. The vitrification story at Hanford is a long and expensive story, but much of the problems have been due to DOE. DOE's goals are ill defined and possibly contradictory.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2005

STATUS OF CLEANUP ACTIVITIES AT THE RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPLEX

Jeff Perry (DOE-ID)

Perry provided a presentation on the WAG

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member asked if any waste that is retrieved will be replaced in the ground. Perry clarified that if it goes in a drum, it doesn't go back; if it doesn't go in a drum, it goes back to the pit. In reply to a question whether VOCs migrated through or to the aquifer, Perry noted there had been detection in the aquifer at the level of 500 parts per billion (ppb). A CAB member commented that it is most useful to have the public comment period on documents span a CAB meeting. In reply to a question about accuracy of waste location information, Perry replied that inventory records have been verified to be accurate. Provencher commented that just 2 of the 123 targeted drums have been shown to be other than targeted waste. Perry noted that the Feasibility Study should be available in fourth quarter 2006.

PATH FORWARD FOR RETRIEVAL, TREATMENT, AND DISPOSITION OF REMOTE-HANDLED TRANSURANIC WASTE

Bill Lattin (DOE-ID)

Lattin provided a presentation on management of remote handled (RH) transuranic (TRU) waste.

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member asked how the definition of RH TRU relates to TRU waste. Lattin explained that certain nuclides in the RH TRU contribute to a dose outside the container. A CAB member asked if the drums would be filtered when they are vented. Lattin replied that the filter will allow gases but no particles to pass through. All drums now need to be vented. A CAB member asked about the reduction in headspace gas sampling being sought under the WIPP permit modification. Lattin replied that the request applies to all waste targeted for WIPP. Lattin provided further explanation of the drum configurations and sampling issues. A CAB member asked if some of the waste from the Dry Rod Consolidation Test (contained in 6 vaults) was considered an 'orphan waste'. DOE has disposal options but no option is yet certain. The Dry Rod Consolidation Test core components are planned to be shipped to the Nevada Test Site in 2007.

Public Questions and Answers

In response to a question from Brailsford, Lattin replied that the inserts from the Hot Fuel Examination Facility are considered low level radioactive waste based on the radionuclides involved, although the waste is radioactive.

UPCOMING ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD CHAIRS MEETING

David Kipping (CAB Chair) Report on Plans for Upcoming Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting

At the meeting, each SSAB will provide a report on their top waste disposition issues. Kipping reviewed the issues for Idaho. He noted the concerns of the other Boards, particularly the concerns about wastes coming into the other DOE sites. The sites will also address their site specific issues and share those with the other CABs. Idaho will also address long term stewardship at the meeting. Kipping will provide a brief overview of long term stewardship and the CAB's involvement in the subject.

Facilitated Discussion Regarding CAB Participation

A CAB member commented that if DOE is planning to leave waste where it is, instead of shipping it to WIPP or Yucca Mountain, there could be a strong reaction against this. Kipping noted that there are other solutions such as the proposal by the Goshute Tribe in Utah to take spent nuclear fuel. A CAB member asked if any other sites were interested in taking this waste. A CAB member commented that the meeting looks like it is coming together well and that Idaho has been a leader in long term stewardship.

DOE'S APPROACH TO DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING OF NUCLEAR REACTORS AND OTHER MAJOR, COMPLEX FACILITIES (CONTINUED)

Facilitated Discussion and Finalization of Letter Drafted by the End State Committee

The CAB approved the letter by consensus.

NEW MEMBER RECRUITMENT

Facilitated Discussion Regarding the Ongoing Composition of the CAB and Recruitment Goals for Upcoming Rotation of Members

The CAB reviewed information on how CAB members were viewed as representing various perspectives and information about the 'ideal' composition of CAB members to assist in evaluating what perspectives the new members should represent. The CAB discussed whether additional criteria beyond what is listed in the Board's procedures should be considered. Geographic areas and other considerations were identified for recruitment.

CAB PROCEDURES

Facilitated Discussion and Decision Related to Proposed Amendments to the CAB Procedures

The CAB discussed the proposed amendments and voted to approve the changes.

EVALUATIONS OF SURPLUS FACILITIES TO SUPPORT DISPOSITION DECISION-MAKING

Bob Starck (DOE-ID)

Starck provided a presentation on disposition of surplus facilities that are owned by DOE-ID.

CAB Questions and Answers

A CAB member asked about prehistoric sites at the INL. Starck replied that about 8% of the sites had been surveyed and there are around 2,000 such sites at this time. In reply to a question, it was identified that just one building had been disqualified from consideration as a historic property due to modifications in the 1980s. This was the medical and dispensary building. In reply to a question about how artifacts are managed, Starck identified that a warehouse has been established for interim storage of the artifacts. The difference between artifacts and items of historical interest was explained. A CAB member asked if there could be a long term facility at the INL for storage. Starck replied that there would be issues involved such as climate temperature and control that would have to be resolved. Julie Braun, INL, commented that there are plans to change some of the exhibits at Experimental Breeder Reactor I and to use them as traveling exhibits. The CAB asked whether items had been removed from buildings that were ready for D&D. Starck replied that DOE is following a process for evaluating how to preserve signature properties that are being demolished at the site. DOE is negotiating mitigation measures via a Memorandum of Agreement with the State Historic Preservation Office. In reply to a question, Julie Braun explained the extent of historic significance needed to establish a property as a signature property. The CAB discussed how tradeoffs are made between the needs for cleanup and historic preservation. The CAB expressed interest in having a tour that focuses on cultural and historic resources at the INL.

Dennis Faulk (U.S. EPA)

Faulk commented that the presentation was timely in that the agencies are currently having discussions on reactors.

STEAM REFORMING TREATMENT FOR THE SODIUM BEARING WASTE

Larry Knight (Chair, Cleanup and Closure of Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee) Review Recommendation Drafted by the Committee

Knight reviewed the changes made to the draft recommendation based upon the CAB's review. Some additional changes were made, and the CAB adopted the recommendation by consensus.

MEMBER AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

David Kipping, Report on attendance at recent National Academy of Sciences Meeting in Idaho Falls

Kipping reported the meeting focused on tank waste at Savannah River, Hanford and Idaho. The Academies' report should be available by the January 2006 meeting and may be of interest to the CAB.

Bill Flanery (Nuclear Energy and Environmental Management Interface Committee Chair) Report on Committee's review of DOE's response to CAB letter 05-CAB-123

Flanery reported that DOE has thanked the CAB for the letter, and that this is sufficient for now.

Bill Flanery (Nuclear Energy and Environmental Management Interface Committee Chair) Report on Committee's review of DOE's response to CAB letter 05-CAB-125

Flanery reported that DOE confirmed that the NEPA document manager for the project, Tim Frazier, had received the letter including comments on the EIS.

David Kipping (Cleanup and Closure of the Radioactive Waste Management Complex Committee Chair) Report on Committee's review of DOE's response to CAB Recommendation #121

Kipping reported that the response to the recommendation was timely and complete. He noted that the response was thorough. The answer to the part of the recommendation regarding whether waste should go into the pit was not clear. It was clarified on a committee call that if the waste is packaged into a drum, it will not return to the pit. If it is not packaged it will go back to the pit.

Larry Knight (Cleanup and Closure of the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee Chair) Report on Committee's review of DOE's response to CAB Recommendation #122

Knight reported that the recommendation had included a number of different issues related to cleanup and closure of INTEC. He reviewed the response from DOE. The committee did not have a problem with the response as presented. Flanery noted a concern about the issue of availability of Yucca Mountain and plans for a second repository. He hopes DOE will be preparing for this. A member of the public asked if Congress is required to act upon a decision for a second repository in the next few years.

Annemarie Goldstein (End State Committee Chair) Report on Committee's consideration of the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Two Dynamic Tests for Protective Elements and Vehicles Project

Goldstein reported that this project involved testing of DOE securing barriers and vehicles to withstand large explosives. The committee reviewed the document and believed it was complete. There is no expected long term impact on the environment. The committee had no comments.

Public Comment

George Freund, Coalition 21, commented that SBW should go to WIPP. It makes more sense to classify by content than source. He commented on articles on cancer deaths due to Chernobyl.



Conservative estimates are no more than 4,000, which is less than what was claimed before. His group will be trying to publicize this.

BOARD WORK

Set Calendar (date and locations) for 2006 CAB Meetings

The CAB set its meetings for 2006 as follows: January 17 and 18 in Idaho Falls; March 20 (afternoon self-evaluation retreat), 21 and 22 in Coeur d’Alene; May 16 and 17 in Idaho Falls; July 18 and 19 in Idaho Falls; September 18 (tour), 19 and 20 in Idaho Falls; and November 14 and 15 in Twin Falls.

Status of Efforts Under the CAB’s Annual Work Plan

The annual work plan has been completed.

Topics for Discussion at the November 2005 Meeting

The CAB reviewed a list of topics for discussion in November

Committee Schedule

The CAB reviewed and made changes to the schedule.

Unanswered Questions

Unanswered questions will be followed up by DOE. Questions are: the role of Congress in deciding on a second repository; and how comments from the public will be responded to on the 3116 evaluation and whether they will be passed along to NRC

Next Steps and Action Items

Thank you’s will be sent to participants on the INTEC conference call.

All CAB members will assist in recruiting new members.

Meeting Evaluation for the September 2005 Meeting

+	Δ
The presentation on the tank farm was useful and a good update. The presentation on remote handled transuranic waste was timely. The presentation on PBF lessons learned was better in terms of identifying problems solved.	Presentation on historic resources was not tied to issue of decision making on D&D
The handouts were appreciated.	More emphasis on problems solved and lessons learned is needed.
We had time to cover subjects at the meeting	Joel Case’s presentation was difficult to follow and confusing.
The number of topics was good – not too much	
Memorial for Karen was handled well, including the time spent to remember her.	
Unanswered questions went well.	
Good support from Bill Johnson. We need to reach out to him and to Jim French for conference calls.	

Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Idaho CAB’s next meeting will be November 15-16, at the Ameritel Inn, 645 Lindsay Blvd., Idaho Falls. The meeting will be from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Tuesday, November 15, 2005 and from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Wednesday, November 16, 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 September 2005 Final CAB Meeting Agenda
- Attachment B 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 CAB Support Staff at (208) 557-7886.

- Exhibit 1 Status of Idaho Cleanup Project
- Exhibit 2 Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Sodium Bearing Waste Path Forward
- Exhibit 3 Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Tank Farm Closure
- Exhibit 4 Update on the INL CERCLA Disposal Facility
- Exhibit 5 Lessons Learned from Phase I Decommissioning of the PBF-620 Reactor Building
- Exhibit 6 Waste Area Group 7 (Radioactive Waste Management Complex) Cleanup Activities
- Exhibit 7 Remote-Handled Transuranic Waste Disposition
- Exhibit 8 Evaluations of Surplus Facilities to Support Disposition Decision-Making

LIST OF HANDOUTS

- Handout 1 Progress to Cleanup – Performance Management Plan (PMP) Status for Activities
Planned through FY 2005
- Handout 2 Federal Register Notice of Availability of Draft Section 3116 Determination
Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Tank Farm Facility



ATTACHMENT A
September 2005 Final Agenda
Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management
Citizens Advisory Board
FINAL AGENDA FOR THE SEPTEMBER 2005 MEETING

Meeting Location

Ameritel Inn
645 Lindsay Boulevard
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Meeting Dates and Times (times approximate)

Monday, September 19, 2005 from 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. with a lunch break from 12:30 P.M. to 1:30 P.M.
Tuesday, September 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)

Monday, September 19, 2005 from 12:15 P.M. to 12:30 P.M. and 5:45 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.
Tuesday, September 20, 2005 from 11:45 A.M. to 12:00 noon and 3:10 P.M. to 3:25 P.M.

Meeting Objectives

The September 2005 meeting of the Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board will be designed to achieve the following objectives:

- > Welcome new member Arthur Randall;
- > Discuss recent public involvement activities and how the agencies are responding to issues raised at those activities;
- > Receive a presentation addressing the status of the Environmental Management Program, with a special emphasis on the close-out of the old cleanup contract, what was accomplished, and lessons that were learned and addressing the current status of specific projects including the Test Area North Rebound Study; the status of Waste Area Groups 1, 2, 4, 5, and 10; the 6000 cubic meter project; and cleanup of the CPP-603 Basin. (Cleanup and closure of the Tank Farm, Radioactive Waste Management Complex, and the Power Burst Facility and the overall approach to the remote-handled transuranic waste will be addressed in stand-alone presentations.)
- > Receive presentations on the status of the closure of the Tank Farm – including characteristics of the Idaho tank waste, plans for cleaning and closure of the tanks, the performance assessment, the sodium bearing waste treatment plan, and plans for disposition of the sodium bearing waste;
- > Develop consensus on a letter as follow-up to the July meeting discussion related to DOE's approach to decontamination and decommissioning of nuclear reactors and other major, complex facilities;
- > Receive a presentation on the status of operations at Idaho National Laboratory Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Disposal Facility, addressing the new Sizing, Staging, Storage and Treatment Facility and the current waste acceptance criteria;
- > Receive a presentation on the lessons learned to date from the Power Burst Facility;
- > Complete processes to complete an Annual Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2006;
- > Develop consensus on a recommendation addressing the selection of steam reforming treatment for the sodium bearing waste;
- > Receive a presentation on the status of cleanup activities at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) - including the status of the excavations of Pit 4 and Pit 4/6, plans for future excavations in the Subsurface Disposal Area (pits 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10), schedule for upcoming Engineering Evaluations and Cost Analyses, the risk assessment for buried waste, and plans for determination of the overall remedy and end state for the RWMC;
- > Receive a presentation addressing the path forward for retrieval, treatment, and disposal of remote-handled transuranic waste, including and explanation of what it is, where it came from, and related issues;
- > Discuss the ongoing composition of the CAB and recruitment goals for the upcoming rotation of members;
- > Determine whether to adopt proposed changes to the CAB's Procedures to address administrative decision making; and
- > Receive a presentation addressing how DOE property is evaluated for historical significance prior to final disposition.



**Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management
Citizens Advisory Board
Final Agenda for Monday, September 19, 2005**

Welcome and Introductions	8:00 AM - 8:45 AM
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Opening remarks	8:00 AM - 8:15 AM
Rick Provencher (Deputy Designated Federal Official) Opening remarks	8:15 AM - 8:25 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) Opening remarks	8:25 AM - 8:30 AM
Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Opening remarks	8:30 AM - 8:35 AM
Bill Johnson (Idaho Site Liaison) Opening remarks	8:35 AM - 8:40 AM
Wendy Green Lowe (Facilitator) Meeting orientation	8:40 AM - 8:45 AM
Welcome to New Member Arthur Randall	8:45 AM - 9:00 AM
Facilitated discussion	
Recent Public Involvement Activities	9:00 AM - 9:15 AM
Rick Provencher (DOE-ID), Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho), and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Quick summary reports on recent public involvement opportunities (subject matter, how many people attended, and the range of issues raised by the public) and how their respective agencies are responding to the public input received	9:00 AM - 9:10 AM
Facilitated discussion of concerns raised by the public during those public involvement opportunities	9:10 AM - 9:15 AM
Break	9:15 AM - 9:30 AM
Environmental Management Program Status and Items of Potential Interest to the CAB	9:30 AM - 10:35 AM
Rick Provencher (DOE-ID) Presentation	9:30 AM - 10:15 AM
CAB questions and answers	10:15 AM - 10:20 AM
Public questions and answers	10:20 AM - 10:25 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	10:25 AM - 10:35 AM
Break	10:35 AM - 10:50 AM
Sodium Bearing Waste Treatment Technology - The Path Forward	10:50 AM - 11:40 AM
Joel Case (DOE-ID) Presentation	10:50 AM - 11:20 AM
CAB questions and answers	11:20 AM - 11:30 AM
Public questions and answers	11:30 AM - 11:35 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	11:35 AM - 11:40 AM
Status of the Closure of the Tank Farm	11:40 AM - 12:15 PM
Keith Lockie (DOE-ID) Presentation	11:40 AM - 12:10 PM
CAB questions and answers	12:10 PM - 12:15 PM
Public Participation	12:15 PM - 12:30 PM
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
Lunch	12:30 PM - 1:30 PM
Status of the Closure of the Tank Farm (continued)	1:30 PM - 2:55 PM
Keith Lockie (DOE-ID) Presentation	1:30 PM - 2:30 PM
CAB questions and answers	2:30 PM - 2:40 PM
Public questions and answers	2:40 PM - 2:45 PM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	2:45 PM - 2:55 PM
DOE's Approach to Decontamination and Decommissioning of Nuclear Reactors and Other Major, Complex Facilities	2:55 PM - 3:10 PM
Annemarie Goldstein (End State Committee) Review of the letter as drafted by the Committee	2:55 PM - 3:00 PM
Facilitated discussions of questions and/or concerns related to the draft letter	3:00 PM - 3:10 PM
Break	3:10 PM - 3:25 PM



September 2005 Summary Meeting Minutes

Status of Operations at the Idaho National Laboratory Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act Disposal Facility	3:25 PM - 4:10 PM
Nolan Jensen (DOE-ID) Presentation	3:25 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
CAB's Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Work Plan	4:10 PM - 4:35 PM
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Review draft plan	4:10 PM - 4:20 PM
Facilitated discussion	4:20 PM - 4:35 PM
Break	4:35 PM - 4:50 PM
Lessons Learned to Date from the Power Burst Facility	4:50 PM - 5:25 PM
Bill Harker (DOE-ID) Presentation	4:50 PM - 5:10 PM
CAB questions and answers	5:10 PM - 5:15 PM
Public questions and answers	5:15 PM - 5:20 PM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	5:20 PM - 5:25 PM
Steam Reforming Treatment for the Sodium Bearing Waste	5:25 PM - 5:45 PM
Larry Knight (Cleanup and Closure of Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee Chair) Review recommendation drafted by the Committee	5:25 PM - 5:35 PM
Facilitated discussion of CAB questions about and reactions to the draft recommendation	5:35 PM - 5:45 PM
Public Participation	5:45 PM - 6:00 PM
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board Final Agenda for Tuesday, September 20, 2005	
Status of Cleanup Activities at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex	8:00 AM - 9:00 AM
Jeff Perry (DOE-ID) Presentation	8:00 AM - 8:45 AM
CAB questions and answers	8:45 AM - 8:50 AM
Public questions and answers	8:50 AM - 8:55 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	8:55 AM - 9:00 AM
Break	9:00 AM - 9:15 AM
Path Forward for Retrieval, Treatment, and Disposition of Remote-Handled Transuranic Waste	9:15 AM - 10:00 AM
Bill Lattin (DOE-ID) Presentation	9:15 AM - 9:45 AM
CAB questions and answers	9:45 AM - 9:50 AM
Public questions and answers	9:50 AM - 9:55 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	9:55 AM - 10:00 AM
Upcoming Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs meeting	10:00 AM - 10:15 AM
David Kipping, Report on plans for upcoming Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs meeting	10:00 AM - 10:10 AM
Facilitated discussion regarding CAB participation	10:10 AM - 10:15 AM
Break	10:15 AM - 10:30 AM
DOE's Approach to Decontamination and Decommissioning of Nuclear Reactors and Other Major, Complex Facilities (continued)	10:30 AM - 11:00 AM
Facilitated discussion and finalization of recommendation drafted by the End State Committee	
New Member Recruitment	11:00 AM - 11:30 AM
Facilitated discussion regarding the ongoing composition of the CAB and recruitment goals for upcoming rotation of members	



September 2005 Summary Meeting Minutes

CAB Procedures	11:30 AM - 11:45 AM
Facilitated discussion and decision related to proposed amendments to the CAB Procedures	
Public Participation	11:45 AM - 12:00 PM
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
Lunch	12:00 PM - 1:00 PM
Evaluations of Surplus Facilities to Support Disposition Decision-Making	1:00 PM - 1:55 PM
Bob Starck (DOE-ID) Presentation	1:00 PM - 1:40 PM
CAB questions and answers	1:40 PM - 1:45 PM
Public questions and answers	1:45 PM - 1:50 PM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	1:50 PM - 1:55 PM
CAB's Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Work Plan (continued)	1:55 PM - 2:10 PM
Facilitated discussion and finalization of Draft Annual Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2006	
Break	2:10 PM - 2:25 PM
Steam Reforming Treatment for the Sodium Bearing Waste (continued)	2:25 PM - 3:10 PM
Facilitated discussion and finalization of recommendation drafted by the Cleanup and Closure of the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee	
Public Participation	3:10 PM - 3:25 PM
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
Break	3:25 PM - 3:40 PM
Member and Committee Reports	3:40 PM - 4:10 PM
David Kipping, Report on attendance at recent National Academy of Sciences Meeting in Idaho Falls	3:40 PM - 3:45 PM
Bill Flanery (Nuclear Energy and Environmental Management Interface Committee Chair) Report on Committee's review of DOE's response to CAB letter 05-CAB-123	3:45 PM - 3:50 PM
Bill Flanery (Nuclear Energy and Environmental Management Interface Committee Chair) Report on Committee's review of DOE's response to CAB letter 05-CAB-125	3:50 PM - 3:55 PM
David Kipping (Cleanup and Closure of the Radioactive Waste Management Complex Committee Chair) Report on Committee's review of DOE's response to CAB recommendation #121	3:55 PM - 4:00 PM
Larry Knight (Cleanup and Closure of the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee Chair) Report on Committee's review of DOE's response to CAB recommendation #122	4:00 PM - 4:05 PM
Annemarie Goldstein (End State Committee Chair) Report on Committee's consideration of the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Two Dynamic Tests for Protective Elements and Vehicles Project	4:05 PM - 4:10 PM
Board Work	4:10 PM - 5:00 PM
Set calendar (date and locations) for 2006 CAB meetings	4:10 PM - 4:15 PM
Status of efforts under the CAB's Annual Work Plan	4:15 PM - 4:20 PM
Topics for discussion at the November 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 September 2005 meeting	4:45 PM - 4:55 PM
Success stories	4:55 PM - 5:00 PM



ATTACHMENT B

CAB Meeting Attendance

	Monday September 19, 2005				Tuesday September 20, 2005			
	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out
Idaho CAB Members								
David Kipping (Chair)	7:35	12:45	1:45	6:00	7:45	11:30	1:00	5:30
Lawrence Knight (Vice Chair)	7:55	12:45	1:45	6:00	8:00	11:30	1:00	5:00
Seth Beal	8:15	12:45	1:45	6:00	ABSENT			
John Bolliger	7:50	12:45	1:45	6:04	8:00	11:30	1:00	5:11
Richard Buxton	ABSENT							
D.H. DeTonancour	7:55	12:45	1:45	6:00	8:00	11:30	1:00	
Georgia Dixon	7:57	12:45	1:45	6:00	8:00	11:30	1:00	5:00
Paul Faulkner	7:50	12:45	1:45	6:00	7:57	11:30	1:00	5:00
William Flanery	7:45	12:45	1:45	6:00	7:50	11:25	1:00	5:11
Lila Gold	ABSENT							
Annemarie Goldstein	7:50	12:45	1:45	6:00	7:45	11:30	1:00	5:00
Willie Preacher	ABSENT							
Arthur Randall	7:55	12:45	1:45	6:00	8:00	11:30	1:00	5:00
State of Idaho/EPA								
Kathleen Trever, State	8:00	12:45	1:45		8:45	11:30	1:10	3:40
Dennis Faulk, U.S. EPA	7:52				7:55			
DOE-ID Representatives								
Rick Provencher, DOE-ID	7:50	12:45	1:45	6:00	7:50	11:30	1:00	5:00
Shannon Brennan, DOE-ID	7:45	12:45	1:45	6:00	8:00	11:30	1:00	5:00
Idaho Site Liaison								
William J. Johnson	7:45				7:50			



ATTACHMENT C

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

September 19, 2005

Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Bill Leake, DOE-ID
Marilyn Paarmann, CH2M Hill
Stacey Francis, CWI
Erik Simpson, CWI
Rick Denning, State of Idaho
Rebecca Robbins, BNG
Bill Harroon, CWI
Jim French, CWI
Bill Harker, DOE-ID
Nicole Hernandez, DOE-ID
Nolan Jensen, DOE-ID

September 20, 2005

Rick Denning, State of Idaho
Erik Simpson, CWI
Rebecca Robbins, BNG
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Gerri Flemming, DOE SRS
Julie Braun, BEA
Robert Starck, DOE-ID
Anne Halpenny
George Freund, Coalition 21