



SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

May 16–17, 2006

Held at the
AmeriTel Inn
645 Lindsay Blvd.
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

These minutes were approved and certified by:



Bill (William) Flanery, Chair
Idaho National Laboratory Site
Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board

August 1, 2006
Date

The information presented within this meeting record document is for information purposes only. Every effort has been made to capture and record, with accuracy, the intent of the presentations and dialogue that occurred at this meeting; however, this document is not a verbatim transcript, and should not be treated as such.



TUESDAY, MAY 16, 2006

CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD (CAB) MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Members: John Bolliger (Vice Chair), Seth Beal, Paul Faulkner, William Flanery, Lila Gold, R.D. Maynard, Willie Preacher, Robert Rodriguez, Fred Sica, Damond Watkins, Douglas Weir, and Bruce Wendle.

Ex-Officio Members: Rick Provencher (Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office [DOE-ID]), Bruce Olenick (State of Idaho), Dennis Faulk (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]), and William Johnson (Idaho Cleanup Project Liaison).

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Robert Rodriguez from Burley, Idaho; Damond Watkins from Idaho Falls, Idaho; and Douglas Weir from Hayden Lake, Idaho were introduced as the newest members of the CAB.

Beth Sellers, Manager, DOE-ID

Ms. Sellars said it is important that new members as well as old members understand how valuable this Citizens Advisory Board is to DOE-ID and to the Department of Energy around the complex. Ms. Sellars appreciates personally the efforts and desire of the Board to learn more and help the Department of Energy.

Bill Flanery, CAB Chair, Opening Remarks

Mr. Flanery commented that the Board will alternate chairmanship from meeting to meeting to see what will work most efficiently for the Board. He further commented that protection to the workers at the Site while in the cleanup progress is the most important factor. Mr. Flanery says the Board needs to continue to do work effectively and continue with giving recommendations that are helpful to DOE. He added that the CAB is a very diverse group, which is great and beneficial for DOE.

Rick Provencher, DDFO, Opening Remarks

Mr. Provencher said there has been a lot of cleanup progress. He added that DOE-ID extended Bechtel contract for two years. Mr. Provencher also commented that funding for Fiscal Year 2007 is currently being deliberated by Congress. He added that DOE-ID has put in for an additional 32 million for Integrated Waste Treatment Facility design work to be able to continue to use the building.

Bruce Olenick, State of Idaho, Opening Remarks

Mr. Olenick said the current court case involving DOE and the State of Idaho is still awaiting decision. He added that the State expects the Bush Administrations Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) initiative to evaluate Idaho National Laboratory (INL) sites, including some that are currently slated for cleanup. Mr. Olenick said the current GNEP proposal includes three major types of facilities. (1) Develop a fast reactor to destroy plutonium. (2) Advanced fuel facility to improve fuel types and come up with better waste forms (3) Develop an engineering scale reprocessing facility. Mr. Olenick commented that Building 651 and 691 may receive some special funding to help with adding more security at these buildings. He added a major concern for Idaho is not to have waste or materials come to Idaho without a clear, workable plan for their disposition. Mr. Olenick said the State is keenly interested in the Tank Farm and the subsurface disposal activities. He added that these are the ones that have a lot of technical issues to go through.

Dennis Faulk, U.S. EPA, Opening Remarks

Mr. Faulk said the INL is on the superfund list. He added that EPA is dealing with the Tank Farms and the Subsurface Disposal activities. Mr. Faulk commented that when push comes to shove on the superfund issues EPA gets to make the final decisions. He added that EPA will remain involved with the cleanup at the INL and is excited for cleanup completion.

William Johnson, Idaho Cleanup Project Liaison, Opening Remarks

Mr. Johnson commented on the significant risks being eliminated from the project. He added that these risks are in the cleanup areas with the aquifer, workers, public, etc. Mr. Johnson said CWI is on schedule with

current contract. He added that they have completed sludge material cleanup. Mr. Johnson said all of the regulatory milestones have been met. He added that in June, CWI will recertify for overall safety programs.

RECENT PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Mr. Provencher said the March 2nd, 14th, 21st open houses that the Idaho Cleanup Project conducted are summarized. The comments included good visual displays, the kinds of media used, two way communications was very helpful, fact sheets were helpful and it was nice to be able to walk away with them. The buried waste and steam reforming area received most of the attention. There were conflicting comments that the State participation was a good thing, but then also had comments that DOE and the State should not have participated. Mr. Provencher commented that DOE appreciated the State's presence. He added that the open house format should not be in lieu of public meetings. Mr. Provencher said Earth Day was a success and DOE had a high volume turnout.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM STATUS AND ITEMS OF POTENTIAL INTEREST PRESENTATION—RICK PROVENCHER

A CAB member asked what constitutes a safety injury. Mr. Provencher answered something that requires treatment or is OSHA recordable. A CAB member asked who issues the permits in Nevada for accepting waste. Mr. Provencher said it is believed it will be the state of Nevada. A CAB member said Mr. Provencher stated that DOE is looking at a grout station closer and asked why. Mr. Provencher said DOE is looking at doing this to keep all the trucks from going back and forth on the highways. A CAB member said there is a lot of reference to sodium bearing waste and asked why it is singled out. Mr. Provencher said it is a byproduct of the reprocessing plant. Mr. Provencher added that it differed from the other high level waste in chemistry. There were two calciner plants at INTEC which generated calcine and that came to the sodium bearing waste and ended up making a different recipe than was originally segregated for. Sludge term means a result of the fact that the facility had no ventilation so a lot of dust and dirt entered the facility and settled in the bottom of the pools. DOE categorizes sludge as material is heavier than water. A CAB member asked if the material from Japan is research material. Mr. Provencher answered yes it is. A CAB member asked if baseline takes the place of End State. Mr. Provencher answered that it does not and added that this is the work DOE-ID wants the contractor to do between now and 2012.

Agency Perspectives

EPA said the ICDF was designed for CERCLA "soils and debris," which does not equal reactor vessels. Engineering Evaluations/Cost Analysis (EE/CAs) are a simplified process for addressing human health and the environment under CERCLA. They are being used for the demolition of buildings at the site; however, Idaho has some reservations about what activities they should cover. EPA believes.

EPA likes the EE/CA process because it gives a role for EPA in the decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) of the buildings. EPA gets the final role in the end state. ICDF is a very unutilized facility. At some point the liners need to be decontaminated. Right now they are being kept wet but when the 603 dries the liners need to be taken care of.

The State also supports steam reforming but DOE needs to continue to work out the disposal pathways for the treated waste. The State also has concerns related to water infiltration at the LLW disposal facility at RWMC and the potential need for operational controls through closure at the facility to mitigate any current impacts to the aquifer and the WAG 7 risk assessment.

The State summarized that the major issues surrounding the Tank Farm 3116 Waste Determination process are the need for DOE to characterize the waste according to NRC regulations and the need for a DOE communications and strategy plan for conducting 3116 waste determinations in the future.

Public Questions and Answers

No questions.

ORIENTATION 1—FEDERAL ADVISORY BOARDS PRESENTATION—SHANNON BRENNAN

Ms. Brennan provided an overview of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and the boards constituted by it. A CAB member commented that DOE needs to define “who is the stakeholders.” A CAB member asked if there any information from the board that is not available to the public, like in a newspaper interview. Ms. Brennan answered that there is not, all information is available. She added that DOE will notify the Board if there are certain restrictions on any information/documents that are not to be made public information.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No one signed up for public participation.

INTRODUCTION TO AND INITIAL DISCUSSION ON RECOMMENDATION #126—CLEAN/CLOSE RWMC COMMITTEE

Recommendation was introduced for the full board’s consideration.

ORIENTATION 2—CAB PROCESSES AND PRODUCTS PRESENTATION—SHANNON BRENNAN

Ms. Brennan provided an overview to orientate the new members. A CAB member commented that the Board needs a heads up on when things are going on at the site that is confidential. A CAB member commented that the Board needs to make a decision to accept confidential information or not. The Board questions if information isn’t available to the public, should the Board accept it. Ms. Brennan said there might be room for conscientious ruling. She added that each Board member has the right to opt out on receiving confidential information or not to accept it. A CAB member asked if the Board type up something on this and vote on it as a CAB. A CAB member commented that the strategic committee should get together and come up with a solution for this. Seth Beal asked how he as a Commissioner could stay out of conflict with the CAB. Ms. Brennan answered that you yourself will know when you are uncomfortable with a topic. She added that a CAB member can choose to not participate in the discussion if they feel it is inappropriate. Ms. Brennan said a distinction needs to be made between conflict and conversion. She added that when there is a real or potential gain on your part then maybe you would want to rethink participating. Ms. Brennan said when you are an elective official you want to think about if you are going to be any part of a contract being awarded and are you directly responsible for this. Ms. Brennan added that if a CAB member thinks that someone is stepping out of line on any issues then maybe you will want to take that person aside and express your concerns.

3116 DETERMINATION RESPONSES TO NRC PRESENTATION—KEITH LOCKIE

A CAB member asked if anyone attempted the alternative cost of this project. Mr. Lockie answered there was an alternative cost estimate done and that included digging all the tanks up and the disposal of it (not a very accurate number but get a ball park figure). A CAB member asked what the decay time is of the stainless steel tank. Mr. Lockie answered an analysis done that predicts the tank time is tens of thousands of years, a very long period of time. A CAB member asked if the waste is radioactive. Mr. Lockie said it is at low levels; there is enough dose that a person wouldn’t want to be contaminated by it. A CAB member asked if Idaho federal representatives on board with this. Mr. Lockie answered they have been a part of the environmental impact statement and DOE has talked with their staff a few years ago but recently have not been in contact. He added that communication is a strategy that needs to be looked at. The department needs to be closely integrated with this.

Agency Perspective

The whole perspective of the EPA is getting the perched water dried up. EPA thinks the tanks are looking really good. (NOTE: This presentation was rescheduled to a time when the State representative could not attend; Idaho’s perspective on the §3116 determination was provided earlier in the day.)Public Questions and Answers



REPORT ON CHAIR'S MEETING AT OAKRIDGE—BILL FLANERY

The two letters composed at the chair's meeting were approved for signature by the Board.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN BRIEFING—SETH BEAL

Information presented can be obtained from <http://www.ocrwm.doe.gov>.



WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 2006

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Members: John Bolliger (Vice Chair), Seth Beal, Paul Faulkner, William Flanery, Lila Gold, R.D. Maynard, Willie Preacher, Robert Rodriguez, Fred Sica, Damond Watkins, Douglas Weir, and Bruce Wendle.

Ex-Officio Members: Rick Provencher (Department of Energy, Idaho Operations Office [DOE-ID]), Bruce Olenick (State of Idaho), Dennis Faulk (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA]), and William Johnson (Idaho Cleanup Project Liaison).

WASTE AREA GROUP (WAG)—7 INCLUDING LYSIMETER UPDATE (WELL) PRESENTATION—MARK ARENAZ

A CAB member asked for a definition of remediation. Mr. Arenaz answered remediation is subcomponents that range from no action to some that pertain to monitor the site for some and includes in-situ grouting and removal of some focused areas. He added that six or seven are combined with a reasonable alternative. A CAB member asked what the health effects are of someone breathing this contamination. Mr. Arenaz said as these assessments are made, it is assumed that although the waste is buried that the waste is being dug up by accident and brings up some of the waste by accident and that is how the scenario is done just for the purposes of the analysis. Mr. Arenaz said there could also be rodents that bring the waste to the subsurface as well, but there is a large barrier to prevent the animals from burrowing. He added that there is a combination of the waste, dust, liquid, etc. Mr. Arenaz said the lysimeter is used to collect the moisture sample from the ground in selected regions to measure the moisture in the vadose zone and the level is above what is considered normal. Mr. Arenaz said this bore hole has the open construction methodology on this well allowing us to see this. He added that when we calculate the risks we calculate it for the entire Subsurface Disposal Area. A CAB member asked if the risks are due to open borehole construction is causing the contamination, and if this is from seepage. Mr. Arenaz answered yes, but added that it hasn't been pin-pointed yet where it is coming from. Mr. Arenaz also added that the construction needs to be corrected on this well before going any further with it. He added that there are ways to back fill with grout and seal up the bottom portion of the well but will still keep the upper part of the well and use that. DOE is still looking in to as why we are getting this contamination. CAB would like more information on the progress of this project.

Agency Perspectives

Although DOE did comment that no more Pu detections have occurred and that they determined that Pu is not an aquifer risk, the State elaborated by stating that the potential for downward migration exists, as evidenced by this ongoing (while not wide-spread) transport of uranium from buried wastes.

Public Questions and Answers

None.

RECOMMENDATION #126 DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL

Recommendation was approved by consensus.

ORIENTATION 3—INL SITE CLEANUP PRESENTATION—SHANNON BRENNAN

Ms. Brennan provided an overview of the Idaho National Laboratory facilities and the cleanup associated with each. Action item for Mr. Provencher to look into why DOE-ID accepted waste from Rocky Flats.

ORIENTATION 4—TRIBAL OVERVIEW PRESENTATION—WILLIE PREACHER

Mr. Preacher provided an overview of the tribal lands and concerns including the DOE oversight.

ORIENTATION 5—CAB PRODUCTS PRESENTATION—SHANNON BRENNAN

Ms. Brennan provided an overview of CAB recommendations and the deliberation process.

LOW-LEVEL WASTE DISPOSITION PLAN PRESENTATION—BRIAN EDGERTON

A CAB member asked what is dangerous to man in a day. Mr. Edgerton said acute is like x-ray and that has a different impact on the body. A CAB member asked how the 200 radon is this calculated. Mr. Edgerton said this is an average amount. The CAB asked how long soft-sided containers (SSCs) last in the ground. DOE stated that SSCs last for 18 months in direct sunlight but can last indefinitely. The State added that the risk scenarios do not account for any added containment protection provided by SSCs. The only purpose of SSCs is to reduce the amount of subsidence occurring in the landfill (as opposed to that occurring using wooden boxes). SSCs are not considered waste containment devices. A CAB member asked how much material is put over the top of the containers and if water allowed through. Mr. Edgerton said there is no control of precipitation to the pit and the cover is about 8 feet. Moisture is allowed on the containers but the pit is surveyed which has not indicated any leakage of any material into that pit. A CAB member asked if when the modeling is done is the stuff just dumped on the ground and is there more concern with people getting in at the top. Mr. Edgerton said the exposure path ways are the air and the water. The modeling is done as if you were living at this facility. The organics have been found in the aquifer. Predictions are for the mobile nuclides. The CAB concluded that they need to refer this to the RWMC subcommittee and see what they want to do with moving forward with this issue.

Agency Perspectives

What will you do after 2008? EPA would like to see the SDA closed as soon as possible; DOE should use 21st century disposal methods including liners and better monitoring.

The State reiterated that while on-site disposal of INL LLW may be a viable option, it does not support LLW from other DOE sites coming to INL for disposal. To address a CAB comment which concerned waste that is treated or repackaged at the INL and returned to the originator, the State said that MFC currently performs this type of activity and as long as all of the waste is returned to the originator, it is not a State concern, however, individual cases still must be reviewed.

(This soil cap comment was a CAB comment)The State reiterated the potential need for operational controls at the disposal area to avoid any additional groundwater impacts at WAG 7. The State also emphasized that additional surface water pathways introduced at WAG 7 due to LLW operations at the SDA is not good. The additional water could aid in contaminate transport from other portions of the SDA if it were to travel laterally. The State also was interested in the reasons why DOE has shown an apparent increase of projected waste to be disposed of at the SDA in the years 2006, 2007, and 2008.

Public Questions and Answers

A member of the public asked if the Nevada Test Site is a RCRA test site. Mr. Edgerton said it is. A member of the public said on the bar chart is a closure date of 2008, but what was said is a different date, what is the correct date? Mr. Edgerton confirmed that it is September 30, 2008. A member of the public asked if the CCP-603 sludge is going to be put in this pit. Mr. Edgerton said after it is dried and so forth the material will be put in there. A member of the public asked if they are both neither RCRA nor CERCLA? Mr. Edgerton said correct, this is nonhazardous waste and NTS does have an interim permit.

STEAM REFORMING TECHNOLOGY PRESENTATION—JOEL CASE

A CAB member asked if an emergency flare etc. is needed in the tank. Mr. Case said the tank does have a rapid shut down system and that all has been evaluated and the system is a self shut down in case of some emergency. He added that there are monitor systems that will shut the system down. A CAB member asked how tight the timelines are. Mr. Case said they are really tight and the timeline includes the shipment to destination. A CAB member asked why install the facility in Pocatello and then tear it down and move to the site? Mr. Case answered this is to have residency in Pocatello and make sure that the facility will work and how it will work before it is set up at the site. Mr. Case said it gives opportunity to have oversight management there continuously to oversee everything that is going on.

Agency Perspectives

The State supports the steam reforming process but many of the disposal options for this waste need to be resolved by DOE.

Public Questions and Answers

A member of the public commented that cost is an issue and DOE could have made a glass facility for a lesser cost, then asked if the size was changed for robust. Mr. Case said it was for the robust of it and the permit modification says if DOE wants to send tank waste to DOE then you have to send another Class 3 Permit. A member of the public asked of there is a date to decide on how the waste will be treated and what form is used. Mr. Case said yes, when construction is started which is estimated in May of 2009.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No one signed up to participate at this session.

FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR OPERABLE UNIT 3-14 (TANK FARM SOILS) PRESENTATION— NICOLE HERNANDEZ

A CAB member asked if things are purposely injected into the well. Ms. Hernandez said back then it was allowed, this well was drilled in the early 1950s and then it was legal to only drill the injection well as deep as you needed to go to get rid of the waste. A CAB member asked if the perched water is absorbed. Ms. Hernandez said it recharges itself at a high rate and then percolates down. Lori Cahn (ICP) added that there will be asphalt by 2012 that will prevent this from happening. She also added that it is preventing the migration from perched water from moving into aquifer. There are insignificant results to the aquifer from digging up or grouting the soils. 18,000 gallons of sodium bearing waste was released to the tank farm soils from CPP-31.

Agency Perspectives

No comments.

Public Questions and Answers

A member of the public asked if it is going down 4 feet. Ms. Hernandez said no, we are going down to the basalt about 40 feet. Twenty feet of basalt was removed so it will actually be going down 60 feet. A member of the public asked if that much disturbance would have an affect on recharged water. Ms. Hernandez said it would be done in an enclosure. A member of the public asked if excavation that deep would have an effect on re-charge of the perched water. Ms. Hernandez answered it would have to be done in an enclosure to protect workers. She added that the strontium 90 that remains in the in the soil was from about 30 years ago isn't going anywhere; it is essentially decaying in place. A member of the public asked what the treatment is for strontium in water. Ms. Cahn said it is to absorb it onto to a medium.

SOUNDING BOARD

Bill: I think the discussion on the RWMC indicates that there are some unresolved issues regarding what is the best way to proceed with the disposal of LLW at the RWMC, or should it be somewhere else? Should it be at the ICDF? If we could have some more discussion on this and some more technical information it would help us weigh in on this and I think we would have something to say about it. I think that the issues are not well enough resolved.

Bruce: After two meetings we seem to be approaching these major problems at a much later date than I would think would be necessary to do anything about it them. It seems that like once the, for instance the Sodium Process, there really doesn't seem anything that the CAB can do to influence that at all. It seems to be pretty well water under the bridge. It struck me that I wonder why we are so late in exposing ourselves to these projects to do anything of value. That is just my thoughts on it.

Seth: My comments really go to the LLW question. I guess the thing that caught my attention was in the previous discussion in reference to perched water in injection wells. In the 1950s the injection wells were a practice and were acceptable and now are no longer acceptable. I still have some feelings that maybe we are sitting in that same particular situation with LLW being placed in unlined pits. I would anticipate that maybe there should be some consideration of dedicating a clean site, preparing it with liner, and before the LLW is covered and making it that much more costly to move, and if that is the right thing to do then it is the right thing to do now. If the science and if all those question that are being raised can be answered then maybe the end place is the right place but if not the most cost effective thing you can do is to do it now and do it right.

Robert: My question is, this is for DOE, how do we know if we are really getting the full information from DOE and do they really acknowledge our decisions? For example, I hear an opinion from DOE on a project but they don't present that there may be a problem. We hear it from the State of Idaho and EPA. So maybe they should commit and say we may have a problem or this is the problem that we may encounter now. I still keep hearing stakeholder, stakeholder, stakeholder. Who is it, what is it. At the beginning when I read some of these articles, I assumed that stakeholder meant people that live in Idaho and anything to do with the site means stakeholders. Also vaults, linings, from what I get at these discussions, a vault to me is concrete, a lining is some kind of protective liner to protect the environment. This maybe can be discussed so that I can understand it better. And this is about it, thank you.

Willie: I still have the idea that DOE needs to be consistent from TAN to RWMC with their determination and their version of cleanup. Like I mentioned before the tank farms can clean up pretty good. Pit 4 you are only picking up certain things and leaving some things in place. Now we find out we have LLW is put inside the SDA which develops another pathway. The main issue of cleanup was to protect the aquifer is what we were told down at the reservation when they came. And I think a lot of things need to be really looked at as to why. It seems like everybody is vying to do the best job of cleanup. We have heard from various areas, various WAGs and whatever and they have their own version of their cleanup and they are doing the best they can. But I think everything needs to be looked at as to how they can effectively cleanup, not stabilize, but cleanup because at some point you may have to dig up the LLW and you might have to deal with those issues. And I really think there needs to be a path forward for a lot of these programs that you have got because you don't know for sure if the Sodium Bearing Waste is going to go to WIPP or where it is going to go. Calcine was determined at one point to be a safe suitable form of storage, now it may not be. But it looks like steam reforming is doing the same thing. You are putting in the calcine again. The shipping of this across the states to wherever it is going to go, I know the tribes are going to be a little concerned with shipping soluble waste. Everything else has been pretty much solid and this is going to be granules. We look at not just the land that it is going to go over but you are looking at the Snake River, if that is to fall in something is to happen and you may contaminate the water ways. I really watch a lot of these cleanups and I see it at other sites and it is pretty much the same. I don't know how cleanup is going; it is based pretty much on funding. The Sodium Bearing Waste, I know it goes on a timeline but what happens if funding is cut, where do you go from there? We have seen some funding cuts this year with some of the cleanup parts. I would like to see probably more cleanup and I know the tribe would. Because if you were going to come and give a presentation right now they would remember that first meeting that DOE came to them and said we are going to do this cleanup. Accelerated cleanup is going to force us to do cleanup and then with the money that is left over we will do additional cleanup to a better standard.

Lila: I would like to see Shannon review what our policies and our procedures are and what do we really want to do? We need to change our policy or our procedure and we need to follow them.

John: LLW I thought we were floundering on that a little. I think this does need a recommendation from the board. The steam reforming subject; I don't understand why we need to build the site twice. I think it is a waste of money and it leads to mistakes. Is that what we really want to do?

RD: When building ICDF, who came up with the criteria that does not allow that waste stream in that facility? Did the facilitator have all the criteria? How do we address it? Do we need to write a new criteria for the ICDF?

Doug: How does the site prioritize the money that they get?

CAB WORK

Follow-up discussion from Orientation

Turn in the forms and they will be compiled and emailed out.

Development of INL Site EM CAB's Annual Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2007

Information from the two regulators and DOE will be compiled and the CAB will review it and then adds any additional information. Then it will be prioritized from most important to least. Maybe DOE could provide a graph as to what and where the money is going to be spent.

Topics for discussion and details of tour for the July 2006 meeting

Follow up on next steps from orientation

Final work plan discussion

Willie will give an update if anything from his meeting with Savannah River

Shannon will check into retreats/tours and what are the limits and rules of having a retreat out of state

Maybe have a tour at Middle Butte

Committee schedule

TAN 607 EE/CA

LLW Pit updates

Mid-year Life-cycle Baseline

Update on GNEP

Update on 3116

Groundwater update or theme

Action Items

- A copy of Seth's presentation to Lila
- A copy of the Annual Work Plan to the board for review before next meeting
- Send out to staff to make plans for the upcoming tours.

Evaluation of the May 2006 meeting including success stories

What went well?

- Quality of presentations went well
- Orientations went well
- Seth's presentation was very informative
- Thank you for the 3-hole punched material
- Lunch with each other one day sure works well and saves time.

What did not go well or could be improved?

- Public questions and answers (need to say can ask clarifying questions only, not comments)
- I would like to see all the experts up to the front of the room and not called on at the back of the room

- I wish we had more of dissenting opinions
- I didn't like that the agenda was changed after the agenda was already distributed
- Loss of Heather Westenzweig
- We need to do something different with the audio visual capabilities that we have.



LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachments are included at the end of the minutes

- Attachment A.....March 2006 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 (March through May 2006)
- Exhibit 2 Environmental Management Program Status and Items of Potential Interest
- Exhibit 3Orientation 1-Federal Advisory Board Presentation
- Exhibit 4 Introduction to and Initial Discussion of Recommendation #126
- Exhibit 5Orientation 2-CAB Processes and Products Presentation
- Exhibit 63116 Determination Responses to NRC Presentation
- Exhibit 7 Waste Area Group (WAG)-7 Including Lysimeter Update (well) Presentation
- Exhibit 8 Orientation 3-INL Site Cleanup Presentation
- Exhibit 9 Orientation 4-Tribal Overview Presentation
- Exhibit 10 Orientation 5-CAB Products Presentation
- Exhibit 11Low-Level Waste Disposition Plan Presentation
- Exhibit 12 Steam Reforming Technology Presentation

LIST OF HANDOUTS

- Handout 1 EE/CA Schedule



ATTACHMENT A

Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board (CAB)

Final Agenda for the Revision 1 May 2006 Meeting

The following signatures indicate final approval for the agenda for the May 2006 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.

William (Bill) S. Flanery
CAB Chair

Richard B. Provencher
Deputy Designated Federal Official



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

**Final Agenda
Revision 1
May 2006**

Meeting Location

AmeriTel Inn
645 Lindsay Blvd.
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Meeting Dates and Times (Times are approximate)

Tuesday, May 16, 2006 from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. with a lunch break from 12:00 to 1:00.

Wednesday, May 17, 2006 from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. with a lunch break from 12:00 to 1:00.

Opportunities for Public Participation

Tuesday, May 16, 2006 from 1:00 to 1:15 p.m. and from 3:30 to 3:45.

Wednesday, May 17, 2006 from 1:00 to 1:15 p.m. and from 3:15 to 3:30.

Objectives

- Environmental Management Program Status Report (including the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project (AMWTP) contract and shipment goals, the Accelerated Retrieval Project (ARP) drum fire update, and other topics)
- Low-level waste (LLW) disposition plan
- Feasibility study for Operable Unit (OU) 3-14 (tank farm soils)
- Steam reforming technology
- Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center (INTEC) Tank Farm Facility (TFF) 3116 determination responses to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
- Waste Area Group (WAG) – 7 including lysimeter update (Radioactive Waste Management Complex [RWMC])
- New member orientation and board refresher training.

Recommendations and Letters

- Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) Stakeholder Involvement (Recommendation #126).



Schedule for Tuesday, May 16, 2006

Welcome and Introductions	8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.
Introduction of new members	
Bill Flanery (CAB Chair) opening remarks and orientation of agenda	
Rick Provencher (DOE-ID DDFO) opening remarks	
Kathleen Trever (State of Idaho) opening remarks	
Dennis Faulk (USEPA) opening remarks	
Bill Johnson (CWI Liaison) opening remarks	
Recent Public Involvement Activities	9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m.
Rick Provencher	
Kathleen Trever	
Dennis Faulk	
Facilitated discussion of public involvement opportunities.	
BREAK	9:15 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.
Environmental Management Program Status and Items of Potential Interest	9:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.
Rick Provencher (DOE-ID) Presentation	
Agency Perspectives	
CAB Questions and Answers	
Public Questions and Answers	
BREAK	10:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Orientation 1—Federal Advisory Boards	11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Shannon Brennan Presentation	
LUNCH (get to know each other luncheon)	12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Public Participation	1:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.
Bill Flanery (CAB Chair) will invite public to comment. (Sign in at back table.)	
Introduction to and Initial Discussion on Recommendation #126 (Clean/Close RWMC Committee, Doc DeTonancour and RD Maynard)	1:15 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Radioactive Waste Management Complex Stakeholder Involvement	(Pre-meeting Assignment #1)
BREAK	1:30 p.m. – 1:45 p.m.
Orientation 2—CAB Processes	1:45 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Shannon Brennan Presentation	
BREAK	3:15 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Public Participation	3:30 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.
Bill Flanery (CAB Chair) will invite public to comment. (Sign in at back table.)	
3116 Determination Responses to NRC	3:45 a.m. – 4:45 p.m.
Keith Lockie Presentation	45
Agency Perspectives	5
CAB Questions and Answers	5
Public Questions and Answers	5
Report on Chair’s Meeting at Oakridge	4:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Bill Flanery will give an overview of the chair’s meeting.	
Yucca Mountain Briefing (Seth Beal)	5:00 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

Schedule for Wednesday, May 17, 2006

Waste Area Group (WAG) – 7 Including Lysimeter Update (well)	8:00 a.m. – 8:35 a.m.
Mark Arenaz Presentation	20
Agency Perspectives	5
CAB Questions and Answers	5
Public Questions and Answers	5
Recommendation #126 Discussion and Approval	8:35 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.
Radioactive Waste Management Complex Stakeholder Involvement	
BREAK	9:00 a.m. – 9:10 a.m.
Orientation 3—INL Site Cleanup	9:10 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Shannon Brennan Presentation	
Orientation 4—Tribal Overview	10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Willie Preacher Presentation	
BREAK	11:00 a.m. – 11:10 a.m.
Orientation 5—CAB Products	11:10 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Shannon Brennan Presentation	
LUNCH	12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Public Participation	1:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.
Bill Flanery (CAB Chair) will invite public to comment. (Sign in at back table.)	
Low-Level Waste Disposition Plan	1:15 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.
Brian Edgerton Presentation	45
Agency Perspectives	5
CAB Questions and Answers	5
Public Questions and Answers	5
BREAK	2:15 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Steam Reforming Technology	2:30 p.m. – 3:05 p.m.
Joel Case Presentation	20
Agency Perspectives	5
CAB Questions and Answers	5
Public Questions and Answers	5
BREAK	3:05 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.
Public Participation	3:15 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Bill Flanery (CAB Chair) will invite public to comment. (Sign in at back table.)	
Feasibility Study for Operable Unit 3-14 (Tank Farm Soils)	3:30 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.
Nicole Hernandez Presentation	30
Agency Perspectives	5
CAB Questions and Answers	5
Public Questions and Answers	5
Sounding Board	4:15 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.
Q&A, facilitated discussion, and sounding board on orientation.	
CAB Wrap-Up Work	4:45 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.
Follow-up discussion from orientation	
Development of INL Site EM CAB’s Annual Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2007	
Integrated D&D EE/CA Schedule (Jim Cooper)	
Topics for discussion at and details of tour for the July 2006 meeting	
Unanswered questions, next steps and action items, committee schedule	
Evaluation of the May 2006 meeting including success stories	



ATTACHMENT B

CAB Meeting Attendance

	Tuesday May 16, 2006				Wednesday May 17, 2006			
	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out	Time In	Time Out
INL CAB Members								
John Bolliger (Vice Chair)	7:45	Lunch presentation		5:00	7:40	12:00	1:00	5:50
Seth Beal	8:00			5:00	8:05	12:00	1:00	5:50
Richard Buxton	Absent							
Doc DeTonancour	Absent							
Paul Faulkner	7:58	Lunch presentation		5:00	7:50	12:00	1:00	5:50
William Flanery	7:40			5:00	7:45	12:00	1:00	5:50
Lila Gold	3:50			5:00	7:50	12:00	1:00	5:50
R.D. Maynard	7:41			5:00	7:50	12:00	1:00	5:50
Willie Preacher	7:40			5:00	7:59	12:00	1:00	5:50
Robert Rodriguez	7:40			5:00	7:40	12:00	1:00	5:50
Fred Sica	7:45			5:00	7:45	12:00	1:00	5:50
Damond Watkins	7:55			5:00	7:55	12:00	1:00	5:50
Douglas Weir	7:45			5:00	7:40	12:00	1:00	5:50
Bruce Wendle	11:30			5:00	8:00	12:00	1:00	5:50
State of Idaho/EPA								
Bruce Olenick, State	7:45	Lunch presentation		5:00	8:30	12:00	1:00	5:50
Dennis Faulk, U.S. EPA	7:55			5:00	8:00	12:00	1:00	5:50
DOE-ID Representatives								
Rick Provencher, DOE-ID	7:30	Lunch presentation		5:00	8:00	12:00	1:00	5:50
Shannon Brennan, DOE-ID	7:30			5:00	8:00	12:00	1:00	5:50
Idaho Cleanup Project Liaison								
William Johnson	7:51	12:00	1:00	5:00	8:00	12:00	1:00	5:50

ATTACHMENT C

Members of the Public in Attendance May 16-17, 2006

May 16, 2006

Beth Sellars, DOE-ID
Wendy Dixon, DOE-ID
Ed Ziemianski, DOE-ID
Erik Simpson, CWI
Tim Carlson, BEA
Rick Dale, AMWTP
Carol Cole, Public
Rebecca Robbins, Energy Solutions
Alan Parker, ICP
Nicole Stricker, Post Register
Mike Hart, Communication Designs
Daryl Semir, Public
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
B. Bowhan, DOE-ID
Keith Lockie, DOE-ID
Scott Van Camp, DOE-ID
Brandt Meagher, ICP

May 17, 2006

Dave Collett, CWI
Frank Webber, ICP
Steve Lopez, ICP
Brandt Meagher, ICP
Mark Arenaz, DOE-ID
Ed Ziemianski, DOE-ID
Amy Lientz, CWI
Erik Simpson, CWI
Nicole Hernandez, DOE-ID
Beatrice Brailsford, Snake River Alliance
Karen Bass, Public
Wendy Bauer, DOE-ID
Nolan Jensen, DOE
Mark Hutchison, NRF
Flint Hall, DEQ, IWL
Reggie Thorpe, SHO-BAN Tribes
Mary Willcox, DOE-ID
Daryl Semir, Public
R. Seitz, ICP
M. Waters, ICP
B. Bowhan, DOE-ID
Brian Edgerton, DOE-ID
G. Harrop, Energy Solutions
Julie Swenson, DOE-ID
Deb Edgerton, Public
R. Robbins, Energy Solutions
Joel Case, DOE-ID
Scott Van Camp, DOE-ID
Lorie Cahn, ICP
Bill Owen, DOE-ID
Garth Hassel, Public
W. Scott Roesener, ICP
Jim Cooper, DOE-ID