

Citizens Advisory Board Committee Minutes



Committee: Strategic Issues

Date: September 12, 2006 – 10:00 a.m. (MT)

Participants

Board Members: John Bolliger, Committee Chair
Seth Beal
Bill Flanery
R.D. Maynard
Fred Sica
Bruce Wendle

DOE-ID: Shannon Brennan
Jim Cooper
Nolan Jensen

Support Staff: Lisa Aldrich
Lori Isenberg

Objective(s) for the Committee Call:

- Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for General Decommissioning Activities under the Idaho Cleanup Project (document has been released and was sent via mail to all CAB members) public comment ends October 9, 2006.

ETR for General Decommissioning Activities

Nolan Jensen gave the committee a brief overview of the document and its purpose. In response to Nick Ceto's concern about continual disposal of low-level waste at the Radioactive Waste Management Complex in the unlined pit, DOE started a dialogue with EPA and the State of Idaho to talk about the options.

The two main advantages for this EE/CA is to get waste out of the unlined pit and more waste into ICDF (only receives CERCLA waste) and establishes a clearer, more consistent regulatory approach. This approach also allows more public involvement.

Flanery was confused by the use of the non-time critical removal action (NTCRA) wording and whether it is a plan or removal action. Jensen said they have been using the words preliminary work. Flanery asked about the difference between the removal action objectives one and two. Jensen said this is the result of the CERCLA risk assessment process. Two perspectives are assessed: carcinogenic risk and toxicity. It acknowledges there are two parts to the risk. Flanery asked if they have considered a phased removal action because of the high number of building that need to be removed. He further asked how they can estimate the cost if they do not yet know the risk. Jensen said when the contract went out for bid there was a list of facilities given to the contractor for D&D. CWI went through and analyzed all these building for risk and cost to submit their bid to DOE. They have a good feel for which facilities are high-risk and which are not. The high-risk facilities will have their own individual EE/CAs.

Wendle commented that Alternative 1 seemed impossible, since you cannot leave a building without some monitoring and then asked where the \$100M came from. Jensen said it is for 100 years of surveillance and monitoring.

Beal asked about the timeline and if it will enable time for individuals interested in preservation and establishing a museum. Cooper said they are very interested in the Community Reuse Organization (CRO) desires and working with the public and the timeline will allow. Jensen commented that he thought none of these facilities are "signature facilities". Cooper further discussed how a determination is made on what is historical and how it is classified as historical.

Actions

- An hour is scheduled on the agenda for the presentation to the full board at the September meeting.