

Citizens Advisory Board Committee Minutes



Committee: End State

Date: December 14, 2005 – 10:00 a.m. (MT)

Participants

Board Members: Annemarie Goldstein, Committee Chair
Bill Flanery
David Kipping
Dick Buxton
Paul Faulkner

DOE-ID: Shannon Brennan
Jim Cooper
Nolan Jensen
Mark Shaw
Bill Leake

Support Staff: Lisa Aldrich
Lori Isenberg

Objective(s) for the Committee Call

- Plan for a presentation addressing groundwater monitoring and Department of Energy's (DOE's) plans for realignment and reduction of monitoring wells (including input from the U.S. Geological Survey)
- Plan to conduct efforts to develop a draft recommendation providing citizen concerns related to the closure of monitoring wells
- Plan for a presentation addressing the draft Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the Loss of Fluid Test Facility (LOFT) (**if the document is available to the public prior to the January meeting**)
- Review and determine whether the CAB should develop a recommendation addressing the draft EE/CA for the LOFT (**if the document is available to the public**)

Groundwater Monitoring/Realignment and Reduction of Monitoring Wells

Kipping noted from a presentation given in the November meeting that the contractor proposes and DOE agrees to realign and reduce monitoring wells by 80%. This was flagged by the CAB as an interest. Would like information for what is planned, why planned, and the rationale is for it? How would this work?

Shaw says that statement is not correct. The wells slated for removal are not monitoring wells.

CAB asked what kind of wells will be removed. Shaw said the well database includes about 1,700 wells, of those 400–500 wells are considered aquifer monitoring wells. A well is defined as any hole deeper than it is wide (i.e., bore holes that are 6 feet deep by 2 inches wide). They have no intention of affecting any monitoring capabilities.

Goldstein clarified that a presentation at the November meeting stated there were 500 plus monitoring wells and 80% were going to be reduced. Shaw says that DOE is not going to reduce their monitoring

capability. Goldstein suggested the CAB receives a presentation that covers these misconceptions and questions that need to be resolved.

Jensen says the incorrect comments came when Scott VanKamp was giving his high level presentation on the life cycle base line and misconceptions came from the lack of people's detailed understanding. So Shaw will give a more detailed presentation. The presentation should go back to square one so that everyone understands the whole thing. Lay it out and define "what is a well" and "what is a bore hole" and explain all the differences between monitoring wells and the wells being monitored. The idea of this is to protect the aquifer.

Plan a 20 minute presentation to bring everyone up to speed with the issue. Include additional time for USGS and Q&A. USGS presentation (by Joe Rousseau) before questions would be helpful. USGS would give us a different perception and more information. Include a facilitated discussion on CAB reaction from these and perhaps a recommendation.

EE/CA for LOFT

Jensen reported that the document was transmitted to EPA and the State of Idaho DEQ last week for the review and comments. It is about 40 pages. They will have it to the CAB in early January. This is the least controversial compared to others. It will be easy to review and will be easy to comment on. A presentation will be good to have. Public comment will be early February.

Kipping asked about the demolition of this facility and what contaminants might be left behind and what DOE plans to do with the left-over contamination. Jensen said very little would be left.

Buxton asked about the historical preservation. Jensen replied it is a signature facility and it is part of the MOU and things will be done to document the building, what it looked like, and some things will be saved like pieces of the building.

Kipping commented that this is important to the CAB because it is the first. Goldstein agreed the process is important not whether it is controversial.

If the document is not received by the January meeting, then the CAB will be asking for an extension of the comment period. Kipping commented having document in hand will save having to do the presentation twice. Agenda should plan for presentation on Wednesday instead of Tuesday for ample time to review the document.

Jensen wanted to update the CAB that there is no reactor vessel in the LOFT. The concern is about contamination and piping and sumps in the basement.

Time for presentation will be 20 minutes and the 10 minutes for Q&A.

Draft Recommendation for Groundwater Monitoring

CAB may submit a recommendation in March.

Draft Recommendation for EE/CA

On hold until the document is received. CAB may decide to make a recommendation in March.

Actions:

- Portage to distribute EE/CA for LOFT to the CAB when received from DOE.
- Portage to develop and distribute minutes for the call.