



## **SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES**

**November 15-16, 2005**

**Held at:  
Eagle Rock Art Museum  
300 South Capital  
Idaho Falls, ID**

These minutes were approved and certified by:

*David Kipping*

---

David Kipping, Chair, Idaho CAB

December 14, 2005

Date



---

## TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2005

### MEETING PARTICIPANTS

**Members:** David Kipping (Chair), Larry Knight (Vice Chair), Seth Beal, John Bolliger, D.H. "Doc" DeTonancour, Georgia Dixon, Paul Faulkner, Lila Gold, Annemarie Goldstein, and Arthur Randall.

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

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

#### David Kipping, CAB Chair, Opening Remarks

Kipping commented that Chuck Geska, a former Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) member, had died of a stroke recently, and he wanted to make sure the CAB was aware of this. Kipping provided an update on Yucca Mountain and the recent announcement that no packaging of spent fuel would take place there. There will be an ongoing issue regarding whether packaging facilities are needed and where they will be located, particularly for commercial fuel. Funding for Yucca Mountain has been cut by 30%. This may be because the project is no longer slated to open in 2010, so less money is needed. Kipping reviewed the issue of exposure guidelines for Yucca Mountain. Under the current proposal, EPA would set the exposure limit at 350 millirem per year after 10,000 years. This is more than 20 times the amount of the allowable exposure up until then. At Hanford, in early October, DOE notified the state of Washington that it was not on schedule or budget for the vitrification plant. In June 2006, DOE will announce the new schedule and budget. The Congressional Budget Office has said the project could be delayed 5 years and that the cost will be up to \$10 billion instead of \$5.8 billion. Another problem at Hanford is there is no plan for storage of the vitrified high level waste if Yucca Mountain does not open in a timely fashion.

The support contract for the CAB has been awarded to Portage Environmental. Kipping introduced Lisa Aldrich, project manager. She introduced the Idaho Operations Office manager, Kerry Martin, and the technical lead, John Beller.

Kipping commented that the focus of the meeting was the lifecycle baseline. The entire cleanup program will be reviewed at this meeting. As the CAB hears the overview, Kipping requests the members to think about the topics for which they would like to have additional information and review.

#### Rick Provencher, DOE-ID, Opening Remarks

Provencher welcomed the CAB. He noted that CH2M Washington Idaho (CWI) is focused on a lifecycle baseline for the term of its contract. However, the government is working on a lifecycle baseline that will cover the period 2012 to 2035. There will be uncertainties that need to be resolved for accomplishing the plans for now through 2012, and DOE will be looking for CAB input.

Work at the site is picking up in pace, and is happening in a safe manner. This is also true of the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP). Productivity improvements have increased at the facility. There was a propane leak at the facility last week. No injuries occurred and the problem was fixed within a couple of days. About 3,400 cubic meters have been shipped to date. There is a real possibility that DOE will not meet the milestone of December 2005 for shipment of 6,000 cubic meters of waste. However, the milestone should be met in March 2006. Provencher commended Bechtel for its efforts. DOE has decided to discontinue receipt of spent fuel into the state at the end of the calendar year until the 6,000 cubic meter milestone is met.

#### Kathleen Trever, State of Idaho, Opening Remarks

Trever commented on the upcoming 6,000 cubic meter deadline for shipment of transuranic (TRU) waste out of Idaho. This is a disappointment, but the state appreciates the efforts to meet safety standards while working to minimize delays. The state also appreciates DOE's decision not to ship spent fuel until the milestone is met. Other areas of progress include TRU waste retrieval work with DOE on the decision regarding treatment for sodium bearing waste, and work with Nuclear Regulatory Commission on its review of the 3116 waste determination.

### **Nick Ceto, EPA, Opening Remarks**

Ceto reported that EPA has recently granted approval to Idaho to make waste shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Ceto believes that budget issues will be more significant in coming years for DOE. Ceto commented on the 350 millirem standard for Yucca Mountain. EPA has been very clear that the standard does not apply to current cleanup programs in terms of the risk range that EPA is seeking to achieve. Ceto commented that he had been in New Orleans working on response to Hurricane Katrina. Ceto introduced Diane Thangamani, who will be working for EPA on Idaho cleanup issues.

### **Bill Johnson, CWI, Opening Remarks**

Johnson commented that submittal of the lifecycle baseline was a significant effort for CWI. Since the submittal, CWI has engaged in discussions with DOE and the regulators. During this time, the focus has been continued safe performance of the work at the site. Of note is the collaboration of CWI, Battelle Energy Alliance (BEA), and AMWTP on the electrical safety plan for the site. There are many ongoing activities focused on safety including revalidation efforts taking place for systems that fall under Integrated Safety Management System.

## **RECENT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES**

### **Rick Provencher (DOE-ID)**

Provencher reviewed a handout summarizing recent public involvement activities. He noted that the cleanup program teams up with BEA as it goes about the state to talk about the Idaho National Laboratory. The two major areas of public involvement recently have included sodium bearing waste (SBW) treatment. DOE is evaluating comments received and will communicate on how it has resolved comments when the Record of Decision (ROD) is finalized. The second activity is the 3316 tank waste process. There have been no comments to date, and the comment period has closed. Provencher understands that the CAB may have some comments, and he related that the NRC would be open to comments.

### **Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)**

Trever commented that in mid-October, the State Oversight Program participated in the Twin Falls science exhibition. There was interest from students and teachers in the state's information, particularly in the map of the aquifer. The DEQ permit for the high level waste evaporator is out for public comment. A hearing is set for November 29, and the comment period closes on December 5.

### **Nick Ceto (U.S. EPA)**

Ceto commented that EPA has been involved in the public comment on the Federal Register notice of approvals of the WIPP shipments. He is not aware any comments were received.

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

A CAB member noted a lack of public comment on documents and asked if DOE was letting the public know about the documents and was seeking comment. Ceto commented that when things are going well at the site, and there is less interest in that situation. Trever observed that National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents are not useful tools to communicate with the public on issues. NEPA documents provide a communication safety net, but they do not assist in resolving issues.

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

### **Rick Provencher (DOE-ID)**

Provencher provided a briefing on the status of the Environmental Management (EM) program. A CAB member asked why work on the reactors at Reactor Technology Complex (RTC) was underway when the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the facilities had not been completed. Provencher replied that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) process would define the end state plan. DOE was taking action to get the facilities ready for

the final steps of decommissioning. In reply to a question about sludge removal from CPP-603 Basins, Johnson explained that the sludge will be grouted and disposed at RWMC. Trever commented that air and hazardous waste permits will be required for the sodium bearing waste (SBW) treatment facility. The permit process could take up to 18 months. A CAB member asked if a new storage facility would have to be built to accommodate the treated SBW if were to be placed into canisters. Johnson replied that the proposed treatment facility would include space for modular storage of canisters. Johnson noted that the bin sets could be an alternative for storage of the treated SBW. A CAB member commented that he just returned from a meeting of the State and Tribal Government Working Group (STGWG). At the meeting, attendees had asked about the impacts of the cleanup being conducted. There is concern that these actions have determined the end state and that clean up will be completed without an end state or long term stewardship plan. Provencher replied that several RODs were in place. DOE did not want to do anything that was not in line with these RODs. DOE was also careful not to impact the final end state decision when cleanup actions are taken. The CAB member noted that the idea of end states and long term stewardship seem to be on hold. Provencher replied that DOE has realized that the CERCLA process may be the best process to follow in order to determine final end states. Ceto mentioned that EPA had held a similar concern about end states, but as far as incrementally moving towards closure, EPA believes that DOE is willing to take steps to decommission while realizing that the final end state will have to be a public decision. The PBF reactor is a good example.

### **CAB Questions and Answers**

A CAB member asked why the spent fuel from the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) would be put into wet storage. Johnson explained that the fuel is first placed in wet storage until it has aged enough that it can go into dry storage. Kipping noted that CPP-666 is scheduled to be emptied and asked what would happen when this is completed. Provencher replied that there is no current commitment to close the facility. EM is the landlord and wishes to get out of the facility by removing all the EM owned spent fuel, but at that point there may be other programs interested in taking over the facility.

### **Public Questions and Answers**

In reply to a question from Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, Johnson explained that evaluation reports are prepared after each evaluation activity to show what was removed and what remains at an area. The reports are not decision documents. Trever explained that these documents are needed for characterization activities under the Voluntary Consent Order (VCO). In reply to a question, Johnson explained the process for disposing of the sludge from CPP-603 basins at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC).

John Tanner, Coalition 21, asked whether CPP-601 had been reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Officer and whether demolition of this facility had been approved. Shannon Brennan provided the CAB with information that in 1998, a final determination had been made for CPP-601. It is a signature facility but can be demolished. Jim Cooper handed out a list of the signature facilities.

### **Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)**

Trever commented that progress is being made on cleanup. The key challenges over the next year will be the subsurface disposal area, the tank farm and decommissioning of facilities. Trever clarified that the legislation on classification of tank residuals took Idaho and South Carolina out of the issues surrounding waste classification. As she understands it, the parties have provided the judge with their thoughts on the status of the litigation and how it applies to Hanford. The judge has not yet decided if the case will be kept active.

### **Nick Ceto (U.S. EPA)**

Ceto congratulated Provencher for progress on cleanup. There are some concerns about a proposal that may delay removal of the water from the 603 Basins. There are concerns about continuing use of the unlined burial grounds at RWMC for waste disposal. EPA would prefer the CPP 603 treated sludge go to the Idaho CERCLA Disposal Facility (ICDF) instead of RWMC. EPA continues to urge DOE to review its plans to use RWMC for low-level radioactive waste disposal. There is interest in follow up

information on the results of the beryllium block grouting. Jeff Perry, DOE-ID, provided information on the results. Over the last year, tritium levels have decreased. Carbon-14 levels have not changed.

## **COMPREHENSIVE FIVE YEAR REVIEW FOR ALL IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY RECORDS OF DECISION TO DATE, IN COMPLIANCE WITH CERCLA**

### **Mark Shaw (DOE-ID)**

Shaw provided a presentation on the CERCLA Five Year review.

### **CAB Questions and Answers**

A CAB member asked what time period should elapse before DOE would recommend that monitoring could be discontinued. Shaw replied that no time frame is specified, but that the decision is up to the regulators. Shaw explained that the purpose of the 5 year review is to determine whether the controls put in place are functioning as intended and is remaining protective. The CAB member suggested that DOE may need to revisit these remedies and determine if the remedy of institutional controls is still reasonable. A CAB member noted that approximately 10% of the volatile organics have been removed from RWMC and asked how long operations would have to continue. Shaw explained that the objective of the remedial action is to prevent further migration of contamination to the aquifer. The remedy is achieving this objective. Trever commented that there are proposals aimed at going after the source of contamination to reduce the volume. This would improve the efficiency of the vapor extraction system. Trever noted that the five year review document needs to be considered along with changes in remedies being considered by the agencies. A CAB member asked if there was a mechanism for reviewing decisions that had been made to see if there could be improvements. Ceto commented that part of the purpose of a five year review is to look at the remedies and determine effectiveness. This does not mean that each time a new technology comes out, that it will be reviewed to see if it is more effective. So long as the remedy is effective, it will not change.

### **Public Questions and Answers**

Brailsford asked about cesium and what the cleanup standard would be for cesium in the future. Shaw replied that the Appendix A of the five year review provided detailed information on cesium. Shaw indicated that the soil standard for cesium would be negotiated under each clean up decision.

Tanner asked if the cesium contamination was buried or surface. Shaw replied that the cesium contaminated soil was at the surface. Tanner asked about impacts on drinking water from iodine 129 at WAG 4. Shaw replied that he was not aware that iodine 129 continued to be an issue.

### **Facilitated Discussion of CAB Reactions**

A CAB member noted that it may be desirable to revisit cleanup decisions, particularly for areas where contamination will remain beyond the planned institutional controls. A CAB member is less concerned about the result than the use of the review as a tool to assess effectiveness of cleanup decisions. Ceto commented that it may be valuable for the CABs to work collectively to provide advice to DOE about how to design institutional control systems that will last for hundreds of years. While these controls are not well understood, remedies are being fashioned that will rely on long term controls.

## **IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT PROPOSED LIFECYCLE BASELINE**

### **Bill Leake (DOE-ID)**

Leake provided an introductory presentation on the lifecycle baseline.

### **CAB Questions and Answers**

A CAB member asked how payments to the contractor would be affected by the baseline. Leake explained that award fee will be based upon successful completion of the baseline.

### **Nick Ceto (U.S. EPA)**

Ceto commented that EPA is reviewing the baseline and will have comments in a few weeks.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, commented that a source of concern for the Alliance is that the CAB was provided a document that it was asked to keep close and not share with the public. She cautioned the CAB that this could compromise its mission. The CAB should not be in the position of standing in place of the citizens of the state of Idaho. The CAB chair responded that he had never been informed the documents were confidential or should not be shared. The CAB is a public body. The meetings and conference calls are public. The chair is not aware of any prohibition on sharing information. A CAB member noted that it would not accept a document under circumstances where it must be kept from the public.

## **IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT PROPOSED LIFECYCLE BASELINE FOR THE IDAHO NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY AND ENGINEERING CENTER (INTEC)**

### **Scott Van Camp (DOE-ID)**

Van Camp provided a presentation on the lifecycle baseline for INTEC. Ceto asked about the need for EE/CAs to be prepared and approved prior to demolition. Van Camp agreed that EE/CAs would be needed. A CAB member asked why certain facilities would not be completed by 2012. Provencher replied that the main driver is the complexity of the facilities. There are many unknowns related to contamination that may remain. It will take quite a bit of effort to go in and characterize material so that removal can proceed safely. The contract recognizes that high risk facilities will take longer to get cleaned up safely. Funding is also an issue. Ceto asked about the dates for CPP-603 as they did not match with the schedule in the EE/CA. This is the schedule that the DOE hopes to meet. Wendy Dixon, Naval Reactors Facility (NRF) explained that spent nuclear fuel continues to be received at NRF. No more fuel is being sent to INTEC. NRF is preparing a packaging and storage facility that will be used for the naval fuel at INTEC. NRF is receiving spent nuclear fuel at this time instead of having it go to INTEC.

### **CAB Questions and Answers**

A CAB member asked how material with enriched uranium would be disposed at RWMC. Katie Hain (DOE-ID) replied that some of the special nuclear materials (SNM) can be stabilized and accepted at RWMC. Other items must be recycled or disposed elsewhere. One issue is whether the items can be transported commercially. Wendy Dixon clarified that Naval Reactors (NR) is a party to the settlement agreement. There is a provision regarding spent fuel shipments that is tied to shipments of waste out of the state. This provision applies only to DOE fuel and not to NR fuel. A CAB member asked why there was a task to prepare a Long Term Stewardship Plan as this has already been done. Johnson reported that the task involved preparation of an annual update to the Long Term Stewardship Implementation Plan.

### **Public Questions and Answers**

Brailsford asked for explanation of the terms used in the briefing. She also asked about the sodium bearing waste. Van Camp explained that the carbonate waste form is eligible for WIPP. The mineralized waste form would be eligible for Yucca Mountain. The question whether the bin set could be used instead of storage vaults is a separate question. Brailsford asked when the decision would be made between carbonate and mineralized. Van Camp estimated this would be in a couple of years. There may be design changes needed if there is a change from the carbonate form. Joel Case, DOE-ID, explained that there were efforts underway to resolve this issue. Brailsford observed that there are decision points that should be interwoven with the milestones for SBW treatment.

Tanner asked if DOE was pursuing acceptance of waste forms other than borosilicate glass at Yucca Mountain. Van Camp replied that there are high level wastes that do not meet the current waste acceptance criteria. The DOE is looking at ways that the waste can be accepted without conversion to the glass form. In the short term, Yucca Mountain is focused on its license application and will likely not seek to make changes until the license is issued. Tanner asked about risks that the system will plug when SBW is treated to the mineralized waste form. Case replied that issues with build up were identified during testing on the mineralized waste form. This is more problematic than with the carbonate form.

Provencher commented that this is a good discussion. It focuses on the uncertainties involved. The one thing that is certain is DOE's plans to get the waste out of the tanks and put it into a form that is relatively neutral with respect to ultimate disposition.

## **IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT PROPOSED LIFECYCLE BASELINE FOR THE RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPLEX**

### **Ed Ziemianski (DOE-ID) Presentation**

Ziemianski provided a presentation on the baseline for RWMC. A CAB member asked if the RWMC would reach the stage where he could walk his dog. Ziemianski replied that this was probably not the case. A CAB member asked if DOE was considering closing the current low level waste disposal area sooner than planned. Ziemianski replied that Idaho was a certified shipper to the Nevada Test Site and could send the waste there. The impact would be cost. Ceto pointed out that there were project risks related to cleanup of RWMC. An alternative strategy is being considered that would be an interim ROD or partial ROD for RWMC.

### **CAB Questions and Answers**

A CAB member asked whether the upgrades at AMWTF were conducted in a manner that would avoid future problems. Ziemianski replied that the new contractor took a systematic approach to upgrades and worked hard to make effective upgrades. A CAB member asked if there were plans to expand ICDF beyond the second cell. Nolan Jensen, DOE-ID, replied that ICDF was authorized for two cells in the ROD for Operable Unit 3-13. Therefore, further review would be needed before ICDF could be expanded. A CAB member noted that the baseline document addressed packaging of waste into plastic bags. Ziemianski explained that the waste is inside plastic bags, but is further packaged into drums. Ziemianski explained the reference to use of heat sealed bags for remote handled waste.

### **Nick Ceto (U.S. EPA)**

Ceto commented that for RWMC, several assumptions had to be made to prepare the baseline document. Many of the assumptions have not been agreed upon by the regulators.

## **SELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

The CAB conducted a discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the chair and the vice-chair. The current chair related that he is quite involved in the agenda for the meetings. The chair and vice-chair try to cover the conference calls, which can be time consuming. The chair and vice-chair are also involved with the other CAB chairs. There is a conference call about once a month with all the chairs, and they meet twice a year.

The CAB elected co-chairs, Bill Flanery and Dick Buxton. John Bolliger was elected vice-chair.

## **MEMBER AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Willie Preacher (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes)**

Preacher reported on a recent Western Governors Association meeting he attended regarding waste transportation. Shortly after the meeting, Wendy Dixon from Naval Reactors came to talk to the Tribes about transportation of naval fuel. A lot of states, communities and Tribes are concerned about transporting nuclear waste across their areas. Railroad transport is a particular concern. Preacher also attended a meeting of the STGWG, and a mayor from California commented that cleanup involves moving waste from one place to another. There is a concern that if transportation is taking place, communication and training are very important.

### **Bill Flanery (Nuclear Energy and Environmental Management Interface Committee Chair)**

Doc DeTonancour reported that the CAB had received a response to its request for a presentation on the plutonium consolidation Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The letter indicated that the

document was not complete, but that DOE would reconsider this request at a later date when the document is available.

## **LETTER REGARDING THE DRAFT SECTION 3116 DETERMINATION FOR THE IDAHO NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY AND ENGINEERING CENTER TANK FARM FACILITY** **Larry Knight (Cleanup and Closure of the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee Chair)**

Knight explained the letter regarding Doe's draft determination for liquid waste to be removed from the tanks at INTEC. He provided background on the issue and the process that DOE was following to obtain a waste determination. Although the stated comment period has ended, DOE has indicated an interest in receiving the CAB's input. The committee prepared a draft letter based upon the document as it exists now.

### **Facilitated discussion of questions about and reactions to the draft letter**

A CAB member commented that the real interest is the radioactivity left behind after the grout fails and the tanks corrode. A CAB member asked if the radiation could lessen the integrity of the grout. Provencher replied that DOE expected the radiation levels to be low enough that it would not affect the grout or the metal of the tank. A CAB member asked what was planned for the sand pads. A CAB member replied that the grout would surround the sand pads although the grout is not expected to infiltrate the sand. Trever noted there is an area of confusion over what sand pads are suspected to be contaminated. The state has asked about this. Further information on this may be helpful to everyone. In reply to a question about the state's oversight of the tank issues, Trever replied that the state could support this approach so long as it is done in compliance and that there is independent review of the project. The low level waste standards should also be met. Trever commented that the issues identified in the draft letter are similar to some of the issues upon which the state has been commenting.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

John Tanner, Coalition 21, commented on the history of the issue regarding waste determinations for the tank waste. He explained the type of waste in the tanks and the methods used to pump the tanks. He commented that he had been unaware that the sand pads underneath the tanks might be contaminated.

## **MEMBER AND COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **David Kipping, John Bolliger, and Georgia Dixon, Report on Recent Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting**

Kipping provided a report on the recent chairs meeting. The first day included a tour. The chairs met on the second and third day. The tour was well attended and received. The theme of the meeting was waste disposition. Headquarters personnel provided briefings on waste disposition strategies. The chairs worked on a letter to send to DOE Headquarters. Bolliger commented that it was a great opportunity to listen to the different views of the sites. There are many similarities as well as differences. Dixon commented that she was impressed with the lively discussions at the meeting.

## **LETTER DEVELOPED AT THE SITE SPECIFIC ADVISORY BOARD CHAIRS MEETING** **David Kipping (CAB Chair)**

Kipping went through the letter in detail and explained the background for the language. The letter is the product of 17 people representing all the CABs. Kipping reported that all sites but Fernald have acted on the letter. All approved the letter except the Hanford Advisory Board. The CAB determined that it would not agree to sign the letter.

## **IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT PROPOSED LIFECYCLE BASELINE FOR THE POWER BURST FACILITY, TEST AREA NORTH, AND REACTOR TECHNOLOGY CENTER**

**Nolan Jensen (DOE-ID)**

Jensen provided a presentation on the lifecycle baseline for the Power Burst Facility (PBF), Test Area North (TAN), and Reactor Technology Center (RTC).

### **CAB Questions and Answers**

A CAB member asked for the definition of a high risk facility. Jensen explained that DOE identified facilities that it expected to pose significant challenges for cleanup in the RFP. Jensen explained that the V tanks would be sent to ICDF when the contents have been treated. A CAB member commented that DOE kept identifying that there was no risk to disposition of facilities when none of these activities seem as though they will be easy. Van Camp explained that risk was viewed by DOE as programmatic risk in terms of CWI being able to accomplish this work within the contract period. A CAB member asked whether the information provided about the baseline would be updated. Provencher replied that the periodic status provided on the cleanup program would include an update on the baseline. Provencher noted that the contractor has prepared its risk evaluation for getting all the work accomplished by 2012. The analysis indicates that there is a 50% probability of success of getting the work done by 2012. The challenge is to recognize this and manage the uncertainties to get the work done by 2012. A CAB member asked about the basis for the change in the decision regarding disposition of the PBF reactor so that cleanup would be completed by 2012. Provencher explained that CWI's proposal is to remove the contents of the reactor, but this has not yet been approved by the regulators. A CAB member asked about the treatment of the waste from the V tanks. Jensen replied that the treatment was aimed at the organics in the waste. After treatment, the residue is placed in the tanks. The tanks are grouted and will be disposed at ICDF. A CAB member asked whether the plans for TAN-607 were final. Provencher replied that the DOE was investigating whether there was a viable customer for the facility. A CAB member asked for an explanation of DOE's plans to apply a categorical exclusion under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for cleanup actions. Jensen replied that work was done in preparation for cleanup and determination of an end state under the provisions of NEPA that exclude such actions from further NEPA review. A CAB member commented that the focus should be on cleanup of those facilities that are definitely slated for cleanup. Provencher agreed and replied that DOE is trying to proceed in a manner that could accommodate a future customer for certain facilities.

## **IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT PROPOSED LIFECYCLE BASELINE FOR THE OTHER, MISCELLANEOUS SITES**

### **Scott Van Camp (DOE-ID)**

Van Camp provided a presentation on the lifecycle baseline for the other, miscellaneous sites.

### **CAB Questions and Answers**

A CAB member asked how many wells would remain on site after 2012. Van Camp replied that the needs for monitoring wells were being studied. The overall number of wells will decrease, but new wells will be installed where required and to conduct studies. A CAB member asked if there was a danger of polluting the Lost River that runs to the Snake. Van Camp replied that the danger would be minimal. A CAB member asked if bioremediation was being conducted on the unexploded ordnance at the site, and Johnson replied that it was not. A CAB member asked if there were plans to research the need for wells to support the model. Van Camp replied that a lot of data exists to assist with the model; however, there may be gaps where additional wells are needed. Provencher noted that the United States Geological Survey (USGS) provides expert assistance in evaluation of the INL site and the Snake River Aquifer. The CAB may want to consider asking the USGS back to talk to the CAB about the ground water model and any data gaps. A CAB member asked how much of the area where unexploded ordnance is located will be subject to institutional controls. Van Camp replied that the goal is to minimize the area that will be subject to institutional controls, but it is not yet known what the extent of that area is.

## **Public Questions and Answers**

Brailsford asked what percentage of the wells to be closed extended to the aquifer, and how the wells would be closed. Van Camp replied that it was not known which wells would be abandoned that would reach the aquifer. With regard to closure, Van Camp replied that the well would be capped and reported to the state as abandoned.

### **Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)**

Trever commented that the issue of groundwater monitoring is of key interest to people in the state of Idaho. It would be useful to get the CAB's input on a way to approach the topic. The CAB could assist with understanding the wells and the plans.

### **Nick Ceto (U.S. EPA)**

Ceto noted that the plans to reduce the number of wells were a plan of the contractor but it is subject to regulatory review and oversight. The EPA will be involved in evaluating any plans to change groundwater monitoring.

## **IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT PROPOSED LIFECYCLE BASELINE FOR 2012 AND BEYOND**

### **Bill Leake (DOE-ID)**

Bill Leake provided a presentation on the baseline for 2012 and beyond. He explained that there would be some D&D of facilities after 2012, including the facilities for sodium bearing waste treatment and calcine storage at INTEC, and waste disposition at RWMC. Spent Nuclear Fuel management will continue as well. Leake explained that the former Performance Management Plan (PMP) would be phased out and the focus would be on the baseline. Trever commented that the state and other states had been asked to spend a lot of time on development of the PMP. A CAB member commented that it was useful to have a document like the PMP to track progress of cleanup. Leake agreed that it would be useful to put together all the information into a manageable format similar to the old PMP and indicated that DOE would agree to do so. It could be a summary level document that would include scope, schedule and cost as well as major milestones. A CAB member asked at what point would the site start looking at existing facilities as part of plans for new generation reactors. Leake replied that except for TAN 607, there has been no interest from other DOE offices in the facilities. Provencher noted that DOE does have a 10 year plan that looks at the future for the laboratory side as well as the clean up side of the site. As the new mission becomes clearer, existing facilities may be more attractive to new missions. He feels confident that the facilities planned for demolition in the near future are not those facilities that would have a use. Trever asked about long term stewardship and how facilities subject to long term stewardship would be transferred. Leake replied that the site landlord would become responsible for long term stewardship after 2035. In reply to a question, Provencher explained that CWI is charged with providing a design for retrieval of calcine by the end of the contract. A ROD will be put in place by 2009 to address the decision for calcine disposition. By 2012 the plan is to submit a permit application under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) for the calcine. A CAB member asked about the spent fuel storage facilities at the site and how this activity fit into long term plans. Provencher replied that CWI is responsible for operating the spent fuel storage at INTEC. The remainder of the EM owned spent fuel in CPP-666 will be moved into dry storage by 2009. The CWI contract assumes that the Foster-Wheeler facility will be built. CWI would be responsible for delivering the spent fuel to that facility. Beyond 2012, the plan is to put the spent fuel into canisters and ship it off-site by 2035. A CAB member commented that the plans that involve Foster-Wheeler and Yucca Mountain are uncertain and that there should be a national strategy to review options for spent nuclear fuel. Provencher noted that there are discussions at the national level regarding spent fuel. Regarding Foster-Wheeler, options for storage of spent fuel are also being investigated.

**Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho)**

Trever commented that it is in the DOE's interest to have a simple tool that can be used to track cleanup progress. It has been helpful to have a project broken out so that the start, progress and end can be tracked.

**LETTER REGARDING THE DRAFT SECTION 3116 DETERMINATION FOR THE IDAHO NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY AND ENGINEERING CENTER TANK FARM FACILITY (CONTINUED)**

**Facilitated Finalization of letter drafted by the Cleanup and Closure of the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee**

The CAB reviewed the letter and made some changes. The CAB approved the letter by consensus. A courtesy copy will be sent to the Anna Bradford, NRC.

**IDAHO CLEANUP PROJECT PROPOSED LIFECYCLE BASELINE (CONTINUED)**

**Facilitated sounding board and discussion of reactions to and concerns about CWI's Proposed Lifecycle Baseline**

The CAB discussed whether it is useful to receive copies of the presentations or whether a summary would suffice. A CAB member suggested it would be useful to have an outline of a presentation. The CAB decided that there could be a format for presentations that would allow for three slides per page with room to take notes. The handouts could be double-sided. The photographs should be large enough they can be viewed. However, the photographs could be handled by handing around the large scale photos.

The CAB conducted a sounding board of reactions to the presentations. Johnson commented that many of the activities in the baseline are required by the contract. The decisions about timing of activities are in large part based upon setting an end date and planning backwards to determine when work needs to start. This exercise then identifies when funding is required for the activities. This will involve an iterative process to determine what can be done under the funding profile that is expected. For this baseline, work on high risk facilities is moved up to increase the likelihood the projects can be completed within the contract term. The CAB discussed what it should do with the sounding board. The sounding board will be reviewed by the CAB members to see that comments are captured and then referred to the Strategic Issues Committee.

**Facilitated discussion of the potential need to change the Annual Work Plan and how those changes will be accomplished**

The CAB reviewed the work plan and discussed whether changes were needed. A member commented that few new topics could be identified. A member commented that it would be helpful to cross walk the PMP and the lifecycle baseline and to have a way to provide updates. A presentation on the Snake River Plain aquifer, including the vadose zone, was identified as a topic that should be covered after new members come on board in May, 2006. A CAB member expressed a wish to have more committee work done during the meetings. A CAB member asked if the work plan fit with DOE's plans. Provencher replied that the work plan was satisfactory to DOE.

**TRIBAL CONCERNS ALONG TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS**

**Willie Preacher (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes)**

Preacher provided a presentation describing Tribal concerns along transportation corridors.

**CAB Questions and Answers**

A CAB member asked whether the tribes were involved when the site was first established. Preacher replied that the tribes were not involved. A CAB member asked if the tribes conducted annual inspections of sites of interest. Preacher replied that the tribes have been involved since they stopped the shipments.

DOE has been making an effort to communicate with the tribes. The tribes also make yearly visits to sites that have historical or archaeological interest. The tribes also participate in cultural resource surveys with INL personnel. A CAB member asked what was done to disposition artifacts. Preacher replied that some artifacts were kept by Idaho State University, but were finally returned. DOE is aware that artifacts should not be disturbed, but it is hard to know if items are being removed.

### **Public Questions and Answers**

Brailsford asked if the 39 tribes affected by shipments to Yucca Mountain were federally recognized and had reservation borders. Preacher replied that some of the tribes are recognized as a tribe even though they do not have a reservation. Tribal members may live in several villages or area. Other tribes may have land but have been removed from the land. However, they retain an interest in the trust land. The Tribes' view is that actions affecting tribal members can affect the tribe as a whole.

Tanner commented that Yucca Mountain communicates with the public through documents and asked if this was an accepted form of communication. Preacher replied that this was accepted, but that further work was needed to make sure the communications were understandable and translated into the tribes' languages.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Steve Allred commented that he is a member of the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB), which deals with national cleanup issues. He offered to work with the Idaho CAB to take any issues of national concern to the EMAB for consideration.

John Tanner, Coalition 21, commented that his group is satisfied with what DOE has done with regard to the high level waste tanks and with DOE's plans for tank closure. The tanks have been pumped and cleaned. The sand has been flushed. What is left is a small amount of contamination. What remains is further sampling and the grouting. The plans for grouting are designed to remove as much of the remaining waste as possible. Once this is done, any leakage due to corrosion would be extremely slow. It does not seem necessary for DOE to do any more than they are planning to do.

Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance, commented that she would like to see a slide show of Ceto's work in New Orleans. She commented on the CPP sludge going to unlined pits above an aquifer. DOE is disposing of waste exactly as it did a half century ago. The lifecycle baseline is derived from the Request for Proposals for the cleanup contract. However, now DOE states that the baseline is the product of the contractor. The commenter does not understand how a contract has come to substitute for public discussion of what is to be done. She is concerned about how to move forward when documents are not available to the public. She is concerned the baseline is a completed document and she is concerned about how the process will move forward. Ceto commented that there is a public process for the decisions to be made, and that process has not been followed yet. EPA and the state will still follow their regulatory process and be vigilant to see that the right cleanup is conducted. The baseline is a mechanism for DOE to try to get its work done, but there may be points when the approach is not accepted.

### **NEW MEMBER CANDIDATE SELECTION**

#### **Facilitated discussion of results and next steps**

The five new members are Heather Westenzweig, Fred Sica, R.D. Maynard, Bruce Wendle, and Damond Watkins. The top two vote receivers will be contacted to determine if they are available for the January meeting after the information has been submitted to DOE for review.

### **LETTER REGARDING DOCUMENTS RECEIVED BY CAB**

Goldstein introduced and explained the letter drafted to clarify the CAB's policy on accepting documents for review. The CAB discussed the letter and made some changes. The CAB discussed whether the letter might result in the CAB receiving fewer draft documents. A CAB member commented



that the CAB's involvement is most significant when it is reviewing pre-decisional documents. A CAB member expressed a concern that the CAB not be viewed as a tool of DOE. Provencher commented that many pre-decisional documents undergo review, and that the best input from the CAB is received at the front end of a decision. The gray zone is the type of document such as a baseline that technically need not be provided to the CAB, but that DOE believes would be useful to have the CAB review. In the future, Provencher commented that it would be made clear whether a document is planned to be shared with the public or not so that the CAB can decide whether it wants to review it. The letter will be sent to Provencher.

## BOARD WORK

### Topics for Discussion at the January 2006 Meeting

The CAB reviewed a list of topics for the January meeting that had been prepared by the chair. The CAB agreed that it was still interested in the topics related to the theme and the topics that are also appropriate for consideration in January. The budget topic is schedule driven and should be covered in January. Information on the status of cleanup is less of a priority as many matters were covered at the November meeting. There is interest in groundwater monitoring. A CAB member commented that the ROD for SBW treatment technology is of interest as well. A CAB member suggested that Ceto's presentation on his hurricane relief work in New Orleans would be of interest, and perhaps it could be scheduled during the noon hour one day of the meeting.

### Unanswered Questions

One unanswered question was identified: information on dose to workers.

### Next Steps and Action Items

Thank you to art museum staff for hosting meeting.

- Thank you to Lori for setting up the lunch.
- Thank you to Tim for cinnamon rolls.
- Agenda items are increasing again and they need to be narrowed down for January through committee work.
- Support staff to prepare preliminary agenda and preliminary committee objectives.
- Portage Environmental to prepare conference call schedule.
- Have an introduction to Portage before the meeting.

### Meeting Evaluation for the November 2005 Meeting

+	Δ
Preacher's presentation was effective.	DOE presentations did not respond to CAB's requests for information.
DOE's presentations did exhibit that the new contractor understands what needs to be done.	DOE uncertainty over disposition of treated SBW and questions on use of Bin Set 7.
Steve Allred's offer to coordinate with the EMAB was appreciated.	CAB should focus on topics on upcoming activities instead of things that are five years away.
The status report on public involvement activities was useful.	
The large pictures of the before and after conditions of facilities are good.	



**Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Idaho CAB will be January 17 and 18, 2006. 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 ..... November 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 INL EM CAB Support Staff at 208-227-1361.*

- Exhibit 1 ..... Public Outreach Summary (September through October 2005)
- Exhibit 2 ..... Status of Idaho Cleanup Project
- Exhibit 3 ..... CERCLA Five-Year Review
- Exhibit 4 ..... Idaho Cleanup Project Lifecycle Baseline Introduction
- Exhibit 5 ..... Idaho Cleanup Project Lifecycle Baseline,  
Idaho Nuclear Technology & Engineering Center
- Exhibit 6 ..... Idaho Cleanup Project Lifecycle Baseline, Test Area North,  
Reactor Technology Center, Power Burst Facility,
- Exhibit 7 ..... Idaho Cleanup Project Lifecycle Baseline,  
Miscellaneous Sites
- Exhibit 8 ..... Idaho Cleanup Project Lifecycle Baseline, Radioactive Waste Management Complex
- Exhibit 9 ..... Tribes Concerns Along Transportation Corridors

**LIST OF HANDOUTS**

- Handout 1 ..... Remaining Historical Buildings to be Demolished or Dispositioned  
Under new ICP RFP





**ATTACHMENT A**  
**November 2005 Final Agenda**

**Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management  
Citizen Advisory Board (CAB)**

**FINAL AGENDA FOR THE November 2005 MEETING**

**The following signatures indicate final approval for the agenda for the November 2005 meeting of the Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board.**

**All requests for changes after the final agenda has been signed must be approved by both the CAB Chair and the Deputy Designated Federal Official.**



**David Kipping  
CAB Chair**



**Rick Provencher  
Deputy Designated Federal Official**

**Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management  
Citizens Advisory Board  
FINAL AGENDA FOR THE NOVEMBER 2005 MEETING**

**Meeting Location**

Eagle Rock Art Museum  
300 South Capital Avenue  
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

**Meeting Dates and Times (times approximate)**

Tuesday, November 15, 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.

Wednesday, November 16, 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, November 15, 2005 from 12:15 P.M. to 12:30 P.M. and 5:05 P.M. to 5:20 P.M.

Wednesday, November 16, 2005 from 11:45 A.M. to 12:00 noon and 3:20 P.M. to 3:35 P.M.

**Meeting Objectives**

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

- > Receive a presentation addressing the status of the Environmental Management Program and items of potential interest to the CAB (including the Pit 4 and Pit 6 excavations, the 6000 cubic meter project, and the status of the Foster-Wheeler Project);
- > Receive presentations and participate in facilitated discussions focused on the theme of the meeting "Idaho Cleanup Project Proposed Lifecycle Baseline" composed of topics including:
  - Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Cleanup,
  - Radioactive Waste Management Complex,
  - The Power Burst Facility, Reactor Testing Complex, and Test Area North,
  - Other miscellaneous sites, and
  - 2012 and beyond;
- > Develop a letter to DOE transmitting questions about the Draft Section 3116 Determination for the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Tank Farm Facility (which addresses waste determination of the cleaned tank residuals);
- > Receive a presentation on the Comprehensive Five Year Review for all Idaho National Laboratory Records of Decision To Date, in Compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act;
- > Receive a presentation addressing Tribal concerns along transportation corridors as identified by the Transportation External Coordination Working Group (complex-wide);
- > Discuss recent public involvement activities;
- > Consider the letter drafted by the Chairs at the recent Department of Energy Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting
- > Conduct elections for CAB Chair and Vice Chair (who will take office in May 2006);

- > Conduct processes to select new members to fill current vacancies (who will be seated on the Board in January 2006);
- > Conduct processes to select new members to fill vacancies created when current members retire (who will be seated on the Board in May 2006); and
- > Conduct processes to evaluate the Annual Work Plan and the potential need for changes based on the Lifecycle Baseline.

**Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management  
Citizens Advisory Board  
Final Agenda for November 15, 2005**

<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	<b>8:00 AM - 8:45 AM</b>
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 (CWI Liaison) Opening remarks	8:35 AM - 8:40 AM
Wendy Green Lowe (Facilitator) Meeting orientation	8:40 AM - 8:45 AM
<b>Recent Public Involvement Activities</b>	<b>8:45 AM - 9:00 AM</b>
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	8:45 AM - 8:55 AM
Facilitated discussion of concerns raised by the public during those public involvement opportunities	8:55 AM - 9:00 AM
<b>Break</b>	<b>9:00 AM - 9:15 AM</b>
<b>Environmental Management Program Status and Items of Potential Interest to the CAB</b>	<b>9:15 AM - 10:35 AM</b>
Rick Provencher (DOE-ID) Presentation	9:15 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
<b>Break</b>	<b>10:35 AM - 10:50 AM</b>
<b>Comprehensive Five Year Review for all Idaho National Laboratory Records of Decision To Date, in Compliance with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act</b>	<b>10:50 AM - 11:40 AM</b>
Mark Shaw (DOE-ID) Presentation	10:50 AM - 11:10 AM
CAB questions and answers	11:10 AM - 11:15 AM
Public questions and answers	11:15 AM - 11:20 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	11:20 AM - 11:30 AM
Facilitated discussion of reactions and concerns related to the Comprehensive Five Year Review	11:30 AM - 11:40 AM

<b>Idaho Cleanup Project Proposed Lifecycle Baseline</b>	<b>11:40 AM - 12:15 PM</b>
Bill Leake (DOE-ID) Presentation	11:40 AM - 11:55 AM
CAB questions and answers	11:55 AM - 12:05 PM
Public questions and answers	12:05 PM - 12:10 PM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	12:10 PM - 12:15 PM
<b>Public Participation</b>	<b>12:15 PM - 12:30 PM</b>
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
<b>Lunch</b>	<b>12:30 PM - 1:30 PM</b>
<b>Idaho Cleanup Project Proposed Lifecycle Baseline for the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center</b>	<b>1:30 PM - 2:40 PM</b>
Scott Van Camp (DOE-ID) Presentation	1:30 PM - 2:15 PM
CAB questions and answers	2:15 PM - 2:25 PM
Public questions and answers	2:25 PM - 2:30 PM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	2:30 PM - 2:40 PM
<b>Election of Chair and Vice Chair</b>	<b>2:40 PM - 2:50 PM</b>
Facilitated discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the chair and vice chair	
<b>Break</b>	<b>2:50 PM - 3:05 PM</b>
<b>Idaho Cleanup Project Proposed Lifecycle Baseline for the Radioactive Waste Management Complex</b>	<b>3:05 PM - 4:15 PM</b>
Ed Ziemianski (DOE-ID) Presentation	3:05 PM - 3:50 PM
CAB questions and answers	3:50 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 - 4:15 PM
<b>New Member Selection</b>	<b>4:15 PM - 4:25 PM</b>
John Bolliger (Administrative Committee Chair) Review processes and provide instructions to the Board for Ballot #1	
<b>New Member Candidate Selection (continued)</b>	<b>4:25 PM - 4:30 PM</b>
First round of balloting	
<b>Break</b>	<b>4:30 PM - 4:45 PM</b>

**Member and Committee Reports**

**4:45 PM - 4:55 PM**

Willie Preacher (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) Report on the Recent Western Governors Association Meeting

4:45 PM - 4:50 PM

Bill Flanery (Nuclear Energy and Environmental Management Interface Committee Chair) Report on request for presentation on the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Consolidation of Nuclear Operations Related to Production of Radioisotope Power Systems

4:50 PM - 4:55 PM

**Letter Regarding the Draft Section 3116 Determination for the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Tank Farm Facility**

**4:55 PM - 5:10 PM**

Larry Knight (Cleanup and Closure of the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee Chair) Review draft letter

4:55 PM - 5:00 PM

Facilitated discussion of questions about and reactions to the draft letter

5:00 PM - 5:10 PM

**Public Participation**

**5:10 PM - 5:25 PM**

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

**Member and Committee Reports**

**5:25 PM - 5:35 PM**

David Kipping and John Bolliger, Report on Recent Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting

**Letter Developed at the Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting**

**5:35 PM - 5:50 PM**

David Kipping (CAB Chair) Present letter drafted by the Chairs at the Recent Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting

5:35 PM - 5:40 PM

Facilitated discussion of questions about and reactions to the draft letter

5:40 PM - 5:50 PM

**Election of Chair and Vice Chair (continued)**

**5:50 PM - 6:00 PM**

Nominations for Chair

**Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management  
Citizens Advisory Board  
Final Agenda for Wednesday, November 16, 2005**

	<b>8:00 AM - 8:45 AM</b>
<b>Idaho Cleanup Project Proposed Lifecycle Baseline for the Power Burst Facility, Test Area North, and Reactor Testing Complex</b>	
Scott Van Camp (DOE-ID) Presentation	8:00 AM - 8:30 AM
CAB questions and answers	8:30 AM - 8:35 AM
Public questions and answers	8:35 AM - 8:40 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	8:40 AM - 8:45 AM
<b>Election of Chair and Vice Chair (continued)</b>	<b>8:45 AM - 8:50 AM</b>
Ballot for Chair	
<b>New Member Candidate Selection (continued)</b>	<b>8:50 AM - 9:00 AM</b>
Second round of balloting (if needed)	
<b>Break</b>	<b>9:00 AM - 9:15 AM</b>
<b>Idaho Cleanup Project Proposed Lifecycle Baseline for the Other, Miscellaneous Sites</b>	<b>9:15 AM - 9:55 AM</b>
Scott Van Camp (DOE-ID) Presentation	9:15 AM - 9:35 AM
CAB questions and answers	9:35 AM - 9:40 AM
Public questions and answers	9:40 AM - 9:45 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	9:45 AM - 9:55 AM
<b>New Member Candidate Selection (continued)</b>	<b>9:55 AM - 10:05 AM</b>
Third round of balloting (if needed)	
<b>Break</b>	<b>10:05 AM - 10:20 AM</b>
<b>Idaho Cleanup Project Proposed Lifecycle Baseline for 2012 and Beyond</b>	<b>10:20 AM - 11:15 AM</b>
Rick Provencher (DOE-ID) Presentation	10:20 AM - 10:50 AM
CAB questions and answers	10:50 AM - 11:00 AM
Public questions and answers	11:00 AM - 11:05 AM
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) and Nick Ceto (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency) Agency perspectives	11:05 AM - 11:15 AM
<b>Election of Chair and Vice Chair (continued)</b>	<b>11:15 AM - 11:20 AM</b>
Nominations for Vice Chair	

<b>Letter Regarding the Draft Section 3116 Determination for the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Tank Farm Facility (continued)</b>	<b>11:20 AM - 11:45 AM</b>
Facilitated finalization of letter drafted by the Cleanup and Closure of the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center Committee	
<b>Public Participation</b>	<b>11:45 AM - 12:00 PM</b>
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
<b>Lunch</b>	<b>12:00 PM - 1:00 PM</b>
<b>Idaho Cleanup Project Proposed Lifecycle Baseline (continued)</b>	<b>1:00 PM - 1:40 PM</b>
Facilitated sounding board and discussion of reactions to and concerns about CWI's Proposed Lifecycle Baseline	1:00 PM - 1:25 PM
Facilitated listing of topics that CAB members would like more information about	1:25 PM - 1:40 PM
<b>CAB's Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Work Plan Revisited</b>	<b>1:40 PM - 2:10 PM</b>
Facilitated discussion of topics, priorities, and scheduled outlined in the Annual Work Plan	1:40 PM - 1:55 PM
Facilitated discussion of the potential need to change the Annual Work Plan and how those changes will be accomplished	1:55 PM - 2:10 PM
<b>Break</b>	<b>2:10 PM - 2:25 PM</b>
<b>Tribal Concerns along Transportation Corridors</b>	<b>2:25 PM - 3:10 PM</b>
Willie Preacher (Shoshone-Bannock Tribes) Presentation	2:25 PM - 2:55 PM
CAB questions and answers	2:55 PM - 3:05 PM
Public questions and answers	3:05 PM - 3:10 PM
<b>Letter Developed at the Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting (continued)</b>	<b>3:10 PM - 3:20 PM</b>
Facilitated decision regarding granting permission to David Kipping to sign the letter drafted by the Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs	
<b>Public Participation</b>	<b>3:20 PM - 3:35 PM</b>
David Kipping (CAB Chair) Invite public comment on issues under consideration	
<b>Election of Chair and Vice Chair (continued)</b>	<b>3:35 PM - 3:40 PM</b>
Ballot for Vice Chair	
<b>Break</b>	<b>3:40 PM - 3:55 PM</b>
<b>New Member Candidate Selection (continued)</b>	<b>3:55 PM - 4:15 PM</b>
Facilitated discussion of results and next steps	

**Board Work**

**4:15 PM - 5:00 PM**

Status of efforts under the CAB's Annual Work Plan  
Topics for discussion at the January 2006 meeting  
Committee schedule  
Unanswered questions  
Next steps and action items  
Meeting evaluation for the November 2005 meeting  
Success stories

4:15 PM - 4:20 PM  
4:20 PM - 4:30 PM  
4:30 PM - 4:35 PM  
4:35 PM - 4:40 PM  
4:40 PM - 4:45 PM  
4:45 PM - 4:55 PM  
4:55 PM - 5:00 PM



**ATTACHMENT B**

**CAB Meeting Attendance**

	Monday November 15, 2005				Tuesday November 16, 2005			
	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out
<b>INEEL CAB Members</b>								
David Kipping (Chair)	7:40	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
Lawrence Knight (Vice Chair)	8:00	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
Seth Beal	ABSENT		2:00	5:35	9:15	12:00	1:30	5:00
John Bolliger	7:50	12:15	1:30	5:37	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
Richard Buxton	7:50	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
D.H. DeTonancour	8:00	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
Georgia Dixon	8:00	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
Paul Faulkner	8:10	12:15	1:25	5:35	7:55	12:00	1:30	5:00
William Flanery	ABSENT							
Lila Gold	8:00	12:15	1:30	5:35	7:59	12:00	2:00	5:00
Annemarie Goldstein	7:45	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
Willie Preacher	8:00	12:15	1:30	5:35	7:55	12:00	1:45	5:00
Arthur Randall	8:00	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
<b>State of Idaho/EPA</b>								
Kathleen Trever, State	8:00	11:45	3:00	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:55	3:10
Nick Ceto, U.S. EPA	8:00	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
<b>DOE-ID Representatives</b>								
Rick Provencher, DOE-ID	8:00	12:15	1:30	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00
Shannon Brennan, DOE-ID	7:30	12:15	1:20	5:35	7:30	12:00	1:30	5:00
<b>Idaho Site Liaison</b>								
William J. Johnson	8:00	12:15	1:20	5:35	8:00	12:00	1:30	5:00





---

## ATTACHMENT C

### Members of the Public in Attendance November 15-16, 2005

---

#### November 15, 2005

John Beller, Portage  
Lisa Aldrich, Portage  
Kerri Martin, Portage  
Mary Willcox, DOE-ID  
Bill Leake, DOE-ID  
Frank Webber, CWI  
Dave Collett, CWI  
Diane Thangamani, EPA  
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance  
Wendy Bauer, DOE-ID  
Ann Tyson, CWI  
Nicole Stricker, Post Register  
John Tanner, Coalition 21  
Stacey Francis, CWI  
Wendy Dixon, NR/IBO  
Rick Denning, State of Idaho  
Alan Jines, DOE-ID  
Pete Dirkmaat, CWI  
Jeff Perry, DOE-ID  
Steve Allred, DOE EMAB  
Garth Hassel, Safety & Ecology Corp.  
Kathleen Hain, DOE-ID  
Lori Isenberg, Northwest Dynamics  
Jim Cooper, DOE-ID  
Edward Ziemianski, DOE-ID  
Erik Simpson, CWI  
Carol Cole, North Wind

---

#### November 16, 2005

John Beller, Portage  
Lisa Aldrich, Portage  
Kerri Martin, Portage  
Bill Harker, DOE-ID  
Bill Leake, DOE-ID  
Diane Thangamani, EPA  
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance  
Wendy Bauer, DOE-ID  
Jim French, CWI  
Bob Holmes, BNE America  
John Tanner, Coalition 21  
Ralph Reeves  
Wendy Dixon, NR/IBO  
Rick Denning, State of Idaho  
Alan Jines, DOE-ID  
Garth Hassel, Safety & Ecology Corp.  
Lori Isenberg, Northwest Dynamics  
Carol Cole, North Wind  
Erik Simpson, CWI  
Amy Lientz, CWI