	Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board Meeting July 30, 2014 1:00 p.m. to 5:15 p.m. La Fonda on the Plaza Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
	Minutes
Meetin	g Attendees
-	ment of Energy
	Pete Maggiore, DOE Assistant Manager, Environmental Projects Office
	Lee Bishop, Deputy Designated Federal Officer
3.	David Rhodes, DOE Environmental Projects Office
4.	Christina Houston, DOE Environmental Projects Office
NNMCA	AB Members
1.	Carlos Valdez, NNMCAB Chair
2.	Doug Sayre, NNMCAB Vice-Chair
3.	Nona Girardi
4.	Stephen Schmelling
	Irene Tse-Pe
	Manuel Pacheco
	Bob Villarreal
	Joey Tiano
	Bonnie Lucas
	Tessa Jo Mascareñas
	Mona Varela
	Allison Majure
	Ashley Sanderson
	Angel Quintana
15.	Alex Puglisi
_	AB Student Members
	Deidre Roybal
2.	Alicia Bowyer

NN	MC	AB Excused Absences
	1.	Mary Friday
	2.	Gerard Martinez
	3.	Danny Mayfield
NN	MCA	AB Absences
	1.	Adrian Chavez, Sr.
	2.	Joseph Viarrial
NN	MCA	AB Support Staff
	1.	Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
	2.	Bridget Maestas, Administrative Assistant
	3.	William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach
Gue	ests	
	1.	Patti Jones, Los Alamos National Security
	2.	Gloria Castillo, BRS
	3.	Jerry Fuentes, BRS
	4.	Michele Jacquez-Ortiz, U.S. Senator Tom Udall's Office
	5.	Peter Krumpe, U.S. Senator Tom Udall's Office
	6.	Roy McKinney, Portage, Inc.
	7.	Ken Kisiel, Portage, Inc.
	8.	Floyd Archuleta, Portage, Inc.
	9.	Gil Vigil, Eight Northern Pueblos
	10.	Scott Kovac, Nuke Watch New Mexico
	11.	Don Hancock, SW Research
	12.	Kaitlin Martinez, Los Alamos National Security
	13.	Hvtce Miller, Santa Fe County
	14.	Joshua Sanchez, U.S. Senator Tom Udall's Office
	15.	John Severance, Los Alamos Monitor
	16.	Rick Carpenter, City of Santa Fe
	17.	Governor Terry Aguilar, Pueblo de San Ildefonso
	18.	Laura Day, Project Time & Cost, LLC

34 *All NNMCAB meetings are recorded. Audio CD's and Video DVD's have been placed on file for review

35 at the NNMCAB office, 94 Cities of Gold Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 87506. The written minutes are

36 intended as a synopsis of the meeting.

1	Minutes	
2	Ι.	Call to Order
3		The Bi-monthly meeting of the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board
4		(NNMCAB) was held on July 30, 2014 at La Fonda on the Plaza, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Mr.
5		Lee Bishop, Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) stated that on behalf of the
6		Department of Energy (DOE) the meeting of the NNMCAB was called to order at 1:09 p.m.
7		Mr. Bishop recognized Mr. Carlos Valdez the NNMCAB Chair. The Chair presided at the
8		meeting.
9 10		The meeting of the NNMCAB was open to the public and posted in The Federal Register in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.
11 12	١١.	Establishment of a Quorum (11 Needed) a. Roll Call
13		
L4 L5		Mr. William Alexander conducted roll call as the members arrived. At the call to order 15 members were present.
L6 L7		b. Excused Absences
18		Mr. Alexander recorded that the following members had excused absences: Ms.
19		Mary Friday, Mr. Gerard Martinez, and Mr. Danny Mayfield.
20		Wary Thady, Wit. Octara Wartinez, and Wit. Danny Wayneid.
21		c. Absences
22		Mr. Alexander recorded that the following members were absent: Mr. Adrian
23		Chavez, Sr., Mr. Joseph Viarrial.
24 25		Welcome and Introductions
26		Mr. Valdez welcomed the members and the public to the meeting. He asked for
27		introductions from the board members and all attending guests.
28 29	IV.	Approval of Agenda
30 31		The board reviewed the agenda for the July 30, 2014 meeting.
32		Mr. Joey Tiano made a motion to approve the agenda as presented; Mr. Doug Sayre
33		seconded the motion. The motion to approve the agenda as presented was unanimously
34		passed.
35 36	V.	Approval of Minutes
37	ν.	The Board reviewed the minutes from the May 21, 2014 meeting. By ongoing instruction
38		from DOE Headquarters, the minutes were previously reviewed and certified by the
		NNMCAB Chair.
39 40		
+0 11		Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments from the Board, with no comments from the
42		Board Mr. Valdez asked for a motion.
13 14		Mr. Sayre made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Mr. Tiano seconded the
45 46		motion. The members voted all in favor to approve the minutes from the May 21, 2014 meeting as presented.
47		

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	VI.	Old Business a. Consideration and Action on Draft Recommendation Mr. Valdez opened the floor for discussion on Draft Recommendation 2014-02 "Institution of Measures to Help Ensure WIPP and LANL Transuranic Disposal Operations Remain Continually Operational," Mr. Valdez noted that the recommendation had been on the agenda for an extended period and that changes to the recommendation had been discussed at the July 9, 2014 Combined Committee meeting. With no additional discussion on the recommendation Mr. Valdez asked for a motion. Mr. Manuel Pacheco made a motion to approve the recommendation as presented; Mr. Alex Puglisi seconded the motion. The Board voted all in favor, the
13		motion to approve Draft Recommendation 2014-02 as presented passed.
14 15		h Muitton Donorto
15 16 17 18 19		b. Written Reports Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments on the written reports. He noted that the Executive Director's report contained important dates for the upcoming meetings and tours.
20		With no comments on the written reports Mr. Valdez moved on to the next agenda
21		item.
22		
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30		c. Logistics for Rocky Flats Tour Ms. Menice Santistevan stated that the itinerary for the upcoming Rocky Flats tour would be provided to those members who would be attending the tour. Ms. Santistevan noted that the dates for the tour were August 19, 2014 through August 21, 2014. Additionally, she stated that the group would be departing from the Santa Fe Place Mall at 9:00 a.m. on the 19 th . She noted that photography would be allowed during the tour so members were welcome to bring their cameras.
31 32 33 34		Mr. Bishop stated that Rocky Flats is a good analog for the process that is proposed for the clean-up of TA-54. He noted that touring the Rocky Flats site would help to put the proposed solutions for TA-54 into perspective.
35		d. Other Items
36		Mr. Valdez asked the members if there were additional items to be addressed.
37		Seeing none, Mr. Valdez moved on to the DDFO update.
 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 	VII.	Update from DDFO Mr. Bishop stated that the situation at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) regarding the suspect waste containers was that all the remaining containers at LANL are under segregation and monitoring. He noted that a sampling plan to obtain additional samples is being written and that LANL is also working on a plan for quenching the drums. Mr. Bishop stated that the change out of the HEPA filters at WIPP has been completed. Additionally, he noted that the ventilation underground is being modified to segregate the

1	panel where the event occurred. Mr. Bishop stated that WIPP is also working to complete
2	Project Reach. WIPP has procured a 45 foot long carbon fiber pole and gantry system, that
3	will be used to obtain remote visual information on the waste array where the event
4	occurred. He noted that the fabrication of the carbon fiber pole should be completed in six
5	weeks.
6	Mr. Bishop noted that the suspect drums that are at Waste Control Specialists (WCS) in
7	Andrews, Texas have been stored in 55 gallon drums in steel over packs. Additionally, he
8	noted that the over packs have been placed into concrete vaults filled with one inch river
9	rock, and temporarily stored in the federal cell under one foot of sand.
10	
11	Dr. Nona Girardi asked about the WIPP update that had been released last week on the
12	water reaching the ropes and sump pumps. She asked for clarification on what that meant.
13	
14	Mr. Bishop responded that the torrential rains have caused some infiltration into the
15	mine from the vent shaft and salt shaft. He noted that the removal of the water is mainly a
16	house keeping issue not a large problem.
17	
18	Mr. Bob Villarreal asked about the investigations that are underway and has there been
19	any new information in the form of actual data for the cause of the incident.
20	
21	Mr. Bishop responded that there are many theories as to what occurred, he noted that
22	until samples can be taken from the ruptured drums and the daughter drums there are
23	likely to only be theories. He noted that there are multiple avenues and theories that are
24	being tested, by a multitude of researchers.
25	
26	Mr. Villarreal asked what was meant by "the waste was not permitted."
27	
28	Mr. Bishop responded that he felt that would be a better question for Mr. Jeff Kendall
29	from the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED).
30	
31	Ms. Allison Majure asked about how drum 68680 located at LANL is being observed.
32	
33	Mr. Bishop responded that drum 68680 has been moved to Dome 375. He noted that
34	Dome 375 is a permacon that has HEPA ventilation and fire suppression. Additionally, he
35	stated that real-time temperature monitoring is conducted on the drum, in addition to daily
36	head space gas sampling. He noted that there is no physical barrier between personnel
37	inside the dome and the drum.
38	
39	Ms. Bonnie Lucas asked how often the HEPA filters in the drums are changed.
40	
41	Mr. Bishop stated that the manufacturer recommends that the filters be replaced after
42	six head space samples are taken; however since it's a passive filter they are intended to be
43	used for an extended period.
44	·

1	VIII.	Nev	w Business
2		a.	Report from Nominating Committee
3			Mr. Valdez asked Mr. Schmelling to review the nominating committee's results for
4			the NNMCAB.
5			
6			Mr. Schmelling noted that the committee had received three names for
7			participation in the election. He noted that Mr. Doug Sayre was the only nominee for
8			Chair. Mr. Schmelling stated that Mr. Manual Pacheco and Ms. Allison Majure were
9			nominees for Vice-Chair.
10			
11		b.	Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for FY'15
12			Mr. Valdez opened the floor for additional nominations.
13			
14			Mr. Tiano nominated Mr. Puglisi for Chair.
15			
16			Mr. Puglisi respectfully declined the nomination.
17			
18			Mr. Manual Pacheco stated that he wished to remove his name from the list of
19			candidate for Vice-Chair.
20			
21			Mr. Valdez closed the floor to nominations and noted that the current nominees
22			were Mr. Sayre for Chair and Ms. Majure for Vice-Chair.
23			
24			Mr. Pacheco made a motion to elect Mr. Doug Sayre as Chair and Ms. Allison
25			Majure as Vice-Chair by acclimation; Mr. Schmelling seconded the motion. The Board
26			voted all in favor to elect the new officers by acclimation.
27			
28		с.	Other Items
29			Mr. Puglisi asked what DOE's priorities were in regard to the 2005 Consent Order
30			(CO).
31			
32			Mr. Bishop responded that yes, DOE would be placing more emphasis on the CO;
33			he asked Mr. David Rhodes if he would elaborate on the issue.
34			
35			Mr. Rhodes responded that DOE/LANL had submitted roughly 45 documents to
36			NMED requesting extensions because the work had been artificially constrained to a
37			June 30, 2014 due date. The date was in anticipation of the completion of the 3706
38			campaign. He noted that the extensions had been universally denied and that DOE is
39			waiting to see what actions NMED will take. Additionally, he noted that with the denial
40			of the extensions, DOE is past the document submittal date.
41			
42			Mr. Puglisi responded that he would like to know where DOE would be turning its
43			attention to furthering the CO, until it is renegotiated or removed, whatever NMED
44			decides to do.
45			

1 2		Mr. Rhodes stated that the next priorities are groundwater, then surface water, and then other related clean-up activities.
3		
4		Dr. Girardi asked if there are any fines and if that would be covered out of the 1.9
5 6		million dollar bonus that was sent to the WIPP contractor.
7		Mr. Rhodes responded that is a difficult question to answer. He noted that it
8		depends on the action that is taken by NMED to levy any fines they give. Additionally, he
8 9		
		stated that until language is received from the state it is very difficult to tell who is
10		responsible for the fees.
11		Nue Dualisi called if the NININGAD sould get a presentation on which estivities under
12		Mr. Puglisi asked if the NNMCAB could get a presentation on which activities under
13		the CO, DOE would be pursuing.
14		
15		Mr. Rhodes stated that DOE is working on its FY'15 plan and noted that the
16		NNMCAB should have more detail in the near future.
17 =	11/	Pueblo de San Ildefonso Environmental Issues
18	IX.	
19		Mr. Valdez asked Ms. Irene Tse-Pe if she would introduce Governor Terry Aguilar to the
20		NNMCAB.
21		Ma. The Demonstrated that is conducting the work of the Decaderal events and
22		Ms. Tse-Pe responded that in conducting the work of the Board and over the past
23		meetings, it has been recognized that the Pueblo de San Ildefonso is one of the key parties
24		affected by LANL. She noted that there had been a great deal of concern and interest in the
25		Pueblo's perspective. Ms. Tse-Pe stated that Governor Aguilar is in his second term as
26		Governor of the Pueblo, She stated that he is a Graduate of UNM School of Law. Ms. Tse-Pe
27		noted that as a community member she felt very fortunate to have him at the Pueblo.
28		
29		Governor Terry Aguilar thanked Ms. Tse-Pe for the introduction. Governor Aguilar used
30		google maps to show the NNMCAB members where the Pueblo de San Ildefonso is located
31		in relation to LANL. Governor Aguilar noted that the Pueblo lands abut the DOE/LANL land.
32		The Governor stated that Pueblo de San Ildefonso has a close relationship with DOE/LANL.
33		The Governor stated that the Pueblo lands are downhill from LANL so anything that
34		affects LANL is going to affect the Pueblo, everything from fires to traffic. The Governor
35		noted that recently the Pueblo had signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that
36		establishes the relationship between the Pueblo and DOE. Additionally, he noted that the
37		MOU contains protocols for access to Pueblo lands and discoveries. The Governor stated
38		that trespassing is one of the biggest issues that the Pueblo has.
39		The Governor noted that the chromium issue is one issue that the Pueblo is looking at.
40		He noted that the MOU will be used to work on the chromium issue and how the problem
41		will be handled. He stated that ultimately, what affects the Pueblo will affect other parties in
42		the long run. The Governor noted that the Pueblo's Environmental Director Raymond
43		Martinez will be there for a long time. The Governor noted that one of the reasons he had
44		made Mr. Martinez the Environmental Director is that he will still be there in the future to
45		deal with the issues even if political powers shift.
46		

1		Mr. Valdez asked Governor Aguilar what his understanding of the location of the
2		chromium plume and does the Pueblo have any monitoring wells in place to monitor the
3		plume.
4		
5		The Governor responded that the Pueblo was made aware of the plume in May of 2013.
6		He noted that it was his understanding that the plume was coming down from Mortandad
7		canyon in the groundwater. Additionally, he noted that the Pueblo was informed that there
8		was a possibility that the plume may be coming onto the Pueblo land. The Governor stated
9		that to date a well has not been drilled on Pueblo land for the detection of chromium. He
10		noted that the Pueblo, DOE, and NMED are addressing the issue.
11		
12		Mr. Sayre asked Governor Aguilar if the MOU could be shared with the NNMCAB.
13		
14		The Governor stated that he was not sure, from the Pueblos stand point he would need
15		to go through the Pueblo. Additionally, he noted that it would depend if the MOU was
16		public record from DOE's perspective.
17		
18		Mr. Maggiore responded that a training program was being built to bring the federal
19		and contractor staff up to speed on the requirements of the MOU. Additionally, he noted
20		that the MOU subjects DOE to compliance with a wide variety of Tribal Laws. Mr. Maggiore
21		noted that if it is the pleasure of the NNMCAB, that he would be happy to provide
22		information on the MOU.
23		
23 24		Mr. Villarreal asked where the Pueblo stands on the issue of waste next to the Pueblo
25		lands.
26		
27		The Governor responded that the Pueblo doesn't want new generation activities on TA-
28		54; however, at the same time the Pueblo also has a dependency on DOE. He noted that the
29		Pueblo has always wanted the waste to be removed from TA-54; the Pueblo does not want
30		anything that is going to impact any of the surrounding communities. The Governor stated
31		that the Pueblo lets DOE know what the Pueblo's position is; however, the Pueblo does not
32		always disclose this information to the public.
33		
34		Governor Aguilar thanked the NNMCAB for allowing Ms. Tse-Pe to be on the Board. The
35		Governor stated that it was tough for Ms. Tse-Pe to be on the NNMCAB as she is also on the
36		Pueblo Council. Governor Aguilar thanked the NNMCAB for inviting him to speak.
37		r deblo eourien. Governor / gundr thanked the rivitie b for inviting him to speak.
38		With no additional questions Mr. Valdez moved to the break.
39 40	Х.	Presentation on Technical Area 21
40 41	Λ.	a. Technical Area 21
42		Mr. David Rhodes from DOE Los Alamos Field Office gave a presentation entitled
43		"Technical Area 21 Integrated Closure Strategy." An electronic copy of the presentation
44		may be obtained from the NNMCAB website; <u>http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov/7-</u>
45		presentations/presentations.htm. Video of the presentation is also available on the
46		NNMCABs YouTube Channel (NNMCAB).

2 Mr. Sayre asked what the Generals Tanks were comprised of. 3 Mr. Rhodes responded that he believed that the tanks were made of carbon steel. 5 Mr. Schmelling asked where the material that is excavated would be disposed of. 6 Mr. Schmelling asked where the material that is excavated would be disposed of. 7 Mr. Rhodes responded that if it is characterized as TRU, WIPP is currently the only 9 disposal option; however, if it is characterized as low level there are a few options for 10 disposal. 11 Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked 13 if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary. 14 Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat 16 contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level 17 that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of 18 LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs 19 subcontracts process would likely be utilized. 20 Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for 21 Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for	1	b.	Questions
3Mr. Rhodes responded that he believed that the tanks were made of carbon steel.5Mr. Rhodes responded that he believed that the tanks were made of carbon steel.6Mr. Schmelling asked where the material that is excavated would be disposed of.7Mr. Rhodes responded that if it is characterized as TRU, WIPP is currently the only9disposal option; however, if it is characterized as low level there are a few options for10disposal.11Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked13if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary.14Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat15Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat16contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for21TA-21.22TA-21.23Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for24TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			
5Mr. Schmelling asked where the material that is excavated would be disposed of.7Mr. Rhodes responded that if it is characterized as TRU, WIPP is currently the only disposal option; however, if it is characterized as low level there are a few options for disposal.10disposal.11Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary.14Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for TA-21.23Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support the proposed remedies.	3		
6Mr. Schmelling asked where the material that is excavated would be disposed of.778Mr. Rhodes responded that if it is characterized as TRU, WIPP is currently the only9disposal option; however, if it is characterized as low level there are a few options for10disposal.111212Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked13if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary.141515Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat16contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for21Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for22TA-21.24Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			Mr. Rhodes responded that he believed that the tanks were made of carbon steel.
8Mr. Rhodes responded that if it is characterized as TRU, WIPP is currently the only disposal option; however, if it is characterized as low level there are a few options for disposal.11Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary.14Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for TA-21.23TA-21.24Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support the proposed remedies.	6		Mr. Schmelling asked where the material that is excavated would be disposed of.
 disposal option; however, if it is characterized as low level there are a few options for disposal. Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary. Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs subcontracts process would likely be utilized. Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support the proposed remedies. 			
10disposal.11Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked13if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary.14Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat16contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for22TA-21.23Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			
11Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked13if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary.14Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat16contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for21Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for23TA-21.24Mr. Rhodes responded that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			
12Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked13if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary.141515Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat16contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for21Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for23TA-21.24Mr. Rhodes responded that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			·
 if the current work force would be utilized or if additional workers would be necessary. Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs subcontracts process would likely be utilized. Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for TA-21. Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support the proposed remedies. 			Ms. Tse-Pe asked what the process is for remediating soils. Additionally, she asked
1415Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat16contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for22TA-21.23Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			
15Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat16contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for22TA-21.23Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			,
16contaminated soils. Currently the soil is being excavated and removed down to a level17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for22TA-21.23Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			Mr. Rhodes responded that right now LANL is not using technologies to treat
17that passes the soil screening level. Mr. Rhodes stated that right now a combination of18LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs19subcontracts process would likely be utilized.20Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for22TA-21.23Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			
 LANL performing the work and also subcontracts for additional workers through LANLs subcontracts process would likely be utilized. Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for TA-21. Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support the proposed remedies. 			, -
 subcontracts process would likely be utilized. Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for TA-21. Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support the proposed remedies. 			
2021212223242425252626			
21Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for22TA-21.23Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			
22TA-21.232424Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			Mr. Sayre asked if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be required for
232425262627282929292929292020212223242526262728292929202021222324252627282929292929202020212223242525262728292929292920202021222324252526272829 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
24Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			
25TA-21. He did however note that a supplemental analysis may be required to support26the proposed remedies.			Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not believe that an EIS would be required for
26 the proposed remedies.			
28 Ms. Majure asked how large the glass monolith was for the vitrification that had			Ms. Maiure asked how large the glass monolith was for the vitrification that had
29 taken place at Material Disposal Area V.			
30			and provide the spectrum of
31 Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not currently have that exact number.			Mr. Rhodes responded that he did not currently have that exact number.
32			
33 Mr. Schmelling asked if there was any evidence of groundwater contamination			Mr. Schmelling asked if there was any evidence of groundwater contamination
34 below TA-21.			
35			
36 Mr. Rhodes noted that currently the only contamination that is below TA-21 is a			Mr. Rhodes noted that currently the only contamination that is below TA-21 is a
37 shallow vapor plume located near Material Disposal Area T.			
38			
39 Mr. Puglisi asked what types of outfalls were located in TA-21.			Mr. Puglisi asked what types of outfalls were located in TA-21.
40			
41 Mr. Rhodes responded that the outfalls were all piped outfalls, and any			Mr. Rhodes responded that the outfalls were all piped outfalls, and any
42 contaminated soil was excavated to a depth that would satisfy the NMED soil screening			
43 levels.			
44			·····

1	XI.	Up	date from Liaisons
2		а.	Los Alamos National Laboratory
3			Mr. Jeff Mousseau from LANL submitted an update to the NNMCAB entitled
4			"Associate Directorate for Environmental Programs Update for July 30, 2014." An
5			electronic copy of the information may be obtained from the NNMCAB website;
6			http://www.nnmcab.energy.gov/7-presentations/presentations.htm.
7			
8			Mr. Pacheco asked if the rebound was akin to a recharge of the casing or down the
9			well.
10			
11			Mr. Mousseau responded that he thought that it was down the well.
12			
13			Mr. Pacheco asked if the retaining structure at TA-18 was going to be
14			decommissioned.
15			
16			Mr. Mousseau stated that he did not know the answer but he would find out.
17			
18			Mr. Sayre asked what the highest chromium concentration was so far.
19			,
20			Mr. Rhodes responded that the peak that had been seen so far were 800ppb.
21			
22			Mr. Sayre asked what happened to the chromium once it is pumped out of the
23			groundwater.
24			
25			Mr. Mousseau stated that the chromium is captured in ion exchange columns and
26			once the column is at capacity they are returned to the manufacturer for disposal.
27			
28		b.	Department of Energy
29			Mr. Pete Maggiore provided the NNMCAB with an update on the current budget
30			situation. He noted that the budget for FY'14 was 225 million dollars. Mr. Maggiore
31			stated that the proposed FY'15 budget from the President was 225 million dollars with
32			the house mark at 175 million dollars and the senate mark at 250 million dollars. He
33			stated that currently DOE is not sure what the FY'15 budget will end up at and there is
34			also the possibility of a Continuing Resolution.
35			Mr. Maggiore stated that DOE/LANL had sent a letter to NMED and self-disclosed
36			two areas of non-compliance. The first area was unpermitted treatment, and secondly
37			failure to reevaluate acceptable knowledge determination. Mr. Maggiore also noted
38			that if any additional areas are discovered that DOE/LANL would immediately self-
39			disclose the information to NMED.
40			
41		c.	New Mexico Environment Department
42			Mr. Jeff Kendall from NMED attended the meeting as Secretary Ryan Flynn's
43			representative. Mr. Kendall noted that on May 16, 2014 there was visual evidence that
44			the breached drum at WIPP was a LANL drum. He noted that there are multiple groups
45			that are working on identifying what happened with the drum. Mr. Kendall stated that
46			NMED had submitted a RCRA request for information in June and that NMED was

1		currently reviewing the information that it had received. Additionally, he noted that a
2		supplemental request for information had been submitted in July. At this point NMED
3		does not know specifically what the cause of the drum breach was.
4		Mr. Kendall stated that the Accident Investigation Board had released the WIPP
5		underground back to the control of the Carlsbad Field Office, with the exception of
6		Panel 7, room 7. Mr. Kendall stated the NMED is still working on the expedited closure
7		of Panel 6.
8 9		Dr. Girardi asked what was being done to investigate if there are drums with similar or different combinations that might result in a similar event.
10		of different combinations that might result in a similar event.
11		Mr. Mousseau responded that without knowing what the initiator was it is hard to
12		know what combination caused the problem. He noted that the controls that he had
13		discussed earlier were put in place in an effort to keep a second incident from occurring.
14		Additionally, he stated that once the root cause is identified, a path forward can be
15		determined.
16		
17		Mr. Kendall noted that WIPP has certain requirements for receipt of waste; he
18		noted that before WIPP reopens there will be a detailed analysis of the requirements for
19		receipt.
20		
21		Ms. Majure asked why there was a change from inorganic absorbent to organic
22		kitty litter.
23		
24 25		Mr. Mousseau responded that testing was done back in 2010 that had provided recommendations for the absorbent that should be used. He noted that a technical
25 26		specification had been proved for the packing of waste; he noted that the report had
20		listed kitty litter/zeolite. Mr. Mousseau noted that it could have been more specific.
28		
29		Mr. Puglisi asked if all of the information obtained by NMED was being placed on
30		the website.
31		
32		Mr. Kendall responded that yes, the information is posted to the website as quickly
33		as possible.
34		
35	XII.	Public Comment Period
36		Mr. Valdez opened the public comment period at 4:43 p.m.
37		NAVING AN ANTICIDA NO. NAVING AND
38		Mr. Kovac of Nuke Watch New Mexico thanked the NNMCAB for working on the
39 40		complicated issues. He stated that the geology under LANL is complicated and to unknown. He asked that the NNMCAB consider recommendations to not leave any waste in place.
40 41		The asked that the NNNCAB consider recommendations to not leave any waste in place.
42		With no additional comments Mr. Valdez closed public comment at 4:44 p.m.
43		
44 45	XIII.	Wrap-up Mr. Valdaz anapad the floor for commonts from the members. He asked that the
45 46		Mr. Valdez opened the floor for comments from the members. He asked that the members address whether all their questions on presentations were answered and if they
40 47		had any requests for future presentations.
		וומע מוזץ ובקעבשנש וטו וענעוב אובשבוונמנוטווש.

1	
2	Ms. Deidre Roybal, Ms. Alicia Bowyer, and Ms. Alyssa Schreiber stated that after
3	working at LANL as a student they have a better understanding of the information
4	presented.
5	
6	Ms. Majure thanked everyone for a good meeting and noted that all of the questions
7	that she had were answered.
8	
9	Ms. Mona Varela stated that all of the information that has been provided has been
10	helpful and noted that she has been learning a lot.
11	
12	Ms. Tessa Jo Mascareñas stated that she had learned a great deal during her first
13	meeting.
14	
15	Mr. Sayre thanked everyone for a great meeting and the great venue for the meeting.
16	Additionally, he stated that he would like to see more information on the campaign
17	approach to the CO.
18	
19	Mr. Pacheco stated that the meeting had been very informative. Mr. Pacheco noted that
20	Governor Aguilar had given a great presentation and that he would like to see him back
21	again. Mr. Pacheco noted that he would like to see information provided on the acronyms.
22	
23	Mr. Villarreal noted that the meeting had been good, and that he would like to see the
24	board take another look at 33 Shafts.
25	
26	Ms. Tse-Pe thanked the NNMCAB for having the Governor present; she also thanked
27	everyone for a great meeting.
28	
29	Mr. Schmelling noted that the two presentations had been very informative and
30	thanked everyone for a good meeting.
31	
32	Dr. Girardi thanked the presenters and noted that it was good to hear the perspective of
33	one of the lab's neighbors.
34	
35	Mr. Maggiore and Mr. Mousseau congratulated Mr. Sayre and Ms. Majure on their
36	election as Chair and Vice-Chair of the NNMCAB.
37	
38	Mr. Valdez welcomed the students and thanked all the members and staff for a great
39	meeting. Additionally, he congratulated the new officers on their new positions.
40	
41	Mr. Bishop noted that he appreciated everyone for attending the meeting today. He
42	noted that the NNMCAB has the Norman Rockwell of diversity.
43	

1 XIV. Adjournment

2 3 4

5

9

Adjournment

- Mr. Valdez noted that the next NNMCAB Board meeting would be held September 24, 2014 as the Sagebrush Inn in Taos from 1:00 p.m. to 5:15p.m.
 - With no additional business to discuss, Mr. Bishop adjourned the meeting at 5:31 p.m.

6 Respectfully Submitted,

Carlos Avalos

- 7 Carlos Valdez, Chair, NNMCAB
- 8 *Minutes prepared by William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach, NNMCAB

10 Attachments

- 11 **1.** Final NNMCAB Meeting Agenda for 07/30/2014
- 12 2. Final NNMCAB Meeting Minutes for 05/21/2014
- 13 3. Report from Carlos Valdez, Chair, NNMCAB
- 14 4. Report from Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
- 15 5. NNMCAB Draft Recommendation 2014-02 "Institution of Measures to Help Ensure WIPP and
 16 LANL Transuranic Disposal Operations Remain Continually Operational"
- 17 6. Presentation by David Rhodes, DOE, "Technical Area 21 Integrated Closure Strategy"
- 18 **7.** Update from LANL, Environmental Programs, Jeff Mousseau
- 19 **Public Notice:**
- 21 *All NNMCAB meetings are recorded. Audio CD's and Video DVD's have been placed on file for review
- 22 at the NNMCAB office, 94 Cities of Gold Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 87506. The written minutes are
- 23 intended as a synopsis of the meeting.
- 24 *Reference documents listed in the attachments section of these minutes may be requested for
- 25 review from the NNMCAB Office by calling (505)989-1662.