

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42



Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board Meeting

November 18, 2015

1:00 p.m. to 5:15 p.m.

New Mexico Highlands University

Student Union Building

Las Vegas, New Mexico 87701



Minutes

Meeting Attendees

Department of Energy

1. Doug Hintze, Manager, Department of Energy, Environmental Management Los Alamos Field Office
2. Lee Bishop, Co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer
3. David Nickless, Department of Energy, Environmental Management Los Alamos Field Office

NNMCAB Members

1. Doug Sayre, NNMCAB Chair
2. Gerard Martínez y Valencia, NNMCAB Vice-Chair
3. Stephen Schmelling, Chair Environmental Monitoring & Remediation Committee
4. Angelica Gurulé, Chair Waste Management Committee
5. Michael Valerio
6. Carla Abeyta
7. Carlos Valdez
8. Angel Quintana
9. Max Baca
10. Danny Mayfield
11. Tessa Jo Mascareñas
12. Irene Tse-Pe
13. Joey Tiano
14. Rod Sanchez
15. Mona Varela

Student Representatives

1. Alyssa Schreiber
2. James Valerio

NNMCAB Excused Absences

1. Nona Girardi

- 1 2. Ashley Sanderson
- 2 3. Michael Whiting
- 3 4. Mary Friday
- 4 5. Joshua Madalena
- 5 6. Diahann Lopez-Cordova
- 6 7. Alex Puglisi
- 7 8. Ashlee Herrera (student)

8

9 **NNMCAB Absences**

10 None

11

12 **NNMCAB Support Staff**

- 13 1. Menice Santistevan, Executive Director
- 14 2. Bridget Maestas, Administrative Assistant
- 15 3. William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach

16

17 **Guests**

- 18 1. Dave Funk, Los Alamos National Security
- 19 2. Lindi Douglass, Regional Coalition of LANL Communities
- 20 3. Scott Kovac, Nuke Watch New Mexico
- 21 4. Charles Broom ARES Corporation
- 22 5. Steven Horak, PT&C, LLC.
- 23 6. Peter Hyde, Los Alamos National Security
- 24 7. Bob Dodge, Public
- 25 8. Stephen Salas, U.S. Congressman Ben Ray Lujan's Office

26 ***All NNMCAB meetings are recorded. Audio CD's and Video DVD's have been placed on file for review**
27 **at the NNMCAB office, 94 Cities of Gold Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 87506. The written minutes are**
28 **intended as a synopsis of the meeting.**

1 **Minutes**

2 **I. Call to Order**

3 The Meeting of the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNMCAB) was held
4 on November 18, 2015 at New Mexico Highlands University, Student Union Building, Las
5 Vegas, New Mexico. Mr. Lee Bishop, Co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer (CDDFO) stated
6 that on behalf of the Department of Energy (DOE) the meeting of the NNMCAB was called to
7 order at 1:04 p.m.

8 Mr. Bishop recognized Mr. Doug Sayre, the NNMCAB Chair. Mr. Sayre presided at the
9 meeting.

10 The meeting of the NNMCAB was open to the public and posted in The Federal Register
11 in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

12 **II. Establishment of a Quorum (13 Needed)**

13 **a. Roll Call**

14 Mr. William Alexander conducted roll call as the members arrived. At the call to
15 order 15 members were present.

16 **b. Excused Absences**

17
18 Mr. Alexander recorded that the following members had excused absences: Dr.
19 Nona Girardi, Mr. Joshua Madalena, Ms. Diahann Lopez-Cordova, Mr. Michael Whiting,
20 Ms. Ashley Sanderson, Ms. Mary Friday, Mr. Alex Puglisi, and Ms. Ashlee Herrera.

21 **c. Absences**

22 Mr. Alexander recorded that no members were absent.

23 **III. Welcome and Introductions**

24 Mr. Sayre welcomed the members and the public to the meeting. He asked for
25 introductions from the board members and attending guests.

26 **IV. Approval of Agenda**

27 The board reviewed the agenda for the November 18, 2015 meeting, Mr. Sayre opened
28 the floor for questions or comments.

29 Mr. Tiano made a motion to approve the agenda as presented; Ms. Varela seconded the
30 motion. The motion to approve the agenda as presented was unanimously passed.

31 **V. Approval of Minutes**

32 The board reviewed the minutes from the September 30, 2015 meeting. By ongoing
33 instruction from DOE Headquarters, the minutes were previously reviewed and certified by
34 the NNMCAB Chair. Mr. Sayre opened the floor for questions or comments.

35 Ms. Quintana made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Mr. Schmelling
36 seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes as presented was unanimously
37 passed.

1 **VI. Old Business**

2 **a. Written Reports**

3 Mr. Sayre opened the floor for questions on the written reports. Mr. Sayre gave a
4 brief overview of the chairs written report. He noted that the members should also
5 review the Executive Director's report for important dates of upcoming meetings and
6 events, in addition to an update on the membership and NNM CAB activities.
7

8 **b. Other Items**

9 Mr. Sayre opened the floor for discussion on old business that the members might
10 have.
11

12 Ms. Gurulé noted that she would like to understand what is included in the 2005
13 Consent Order (CO). Ms. Gurulé asked for a presentation or information from DOE on
14 what is in the existing 2005 CO. She asked that the information include: time to
15 complete project, cost of project, and risk to human health and environment.
16

17 Mr. Hintze responded that DOE is working on completing the Settlement
18 Agreements, noting that after that is complete, DOE would begin on a draft of the
19 revised CO. Mr. Hintze noted that DOE could provide the NNM CAB with the
20 information that is in the CO at a future meeting.
21

22 Mr. Schmelling noted that he would like to see a summary of the CO that would
23 make it easier to understand what is included in the CO, as it is such a long complex
24 document.
25

26 Mr. Baca requested that DOE summarize some of the legal language in the
27 document as well, to make it have some commonsense language that is easier to
28 read.
29

30 Mr. Hintze responded that DOE could provide the presentation in a format that
31 incorporates the NNM CABs requests, possibly in the February time frame.
32

33 **VII. New Business**

34 Mr. Sayre opened the floor for discussion on any new business that the members might
35 have. With no new business to discuss, Mr. Sayre moved to the next item on the agenda.
36

37 **VIII. Update from Deputy Designated Federal Officer**

38 Mr. Bishop noted that the NNM CAB had hosted a public meeting for the Chromium
39 Environmental Assessment (EA). Additionally, noting that the comment period for the
40 Chromium EA had closed on Friday, November 13, 2015. Mr. Bishop noted that Mr.
41 Schmelling has submitted comments on the EA as a member of the public, not as a NNM CAB
42 member. Mr. Bishop stated that the Floodplaine Assessment public comment period would

1 be closing on Friday, November 20, 2015. Additionally, stating that hopefully the
2 department would be looking at a decision document on the Chromium EA in the very near
3 future.

4 Mr. Bishop noted that in spring of 2016 the NNMCAB would have a couple of
5 opportunities to send members to conferences. He noted that the available conferences are
6 Waste Management in March, and Environmental Justice (EJC) in April. Mr. Bishop noted
7 that members that are interested in attending should submit a request to the NNMCAB
8 Executive Committee.

9
10 Ms. Tse-Pe stated that when she attended the EJC she found the conference to be
11 informative and insightful, with good representation from the regions across the United
12 States. She noted that it helped her broaden her perspective on many issues.

13
14 Mr. Bishop noted that Student Representative, Alyssa Schreiber, had accepted a
15 position at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Mr. Bishop presented Ms. Schreiber with a
16 certificate of appreciation for her service on the NNMCAB.

17
18 Ms. Schreiber stated that she had enjoyed the experience on the NNMCAB. Additionally,
19 noting that she would recommend the NNMCAB to students as it is a great opportunity.

20
21 Mr. Valdez asked for an update on the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).

22
23 Mr. Bishop responded that WIPP has a new Site Manager, Mr. Todd Shrader, he noted
24 that he had worked with Mr. Shrader at Yucca Mountain. Mr. Bishop stated that WIPP is
25 looking at start-up sometime in the next year; however, they have not committed to a date
26 at this point. Additionally, noting that WIPP is in the process of undergoing a readiness
27 review for start-up operations. Mr. Bishop stated that WIPP has most if not all the mine
28 open now, with some areas that require protective clothing. He also noted that WIPP is in
29 the process of updating the ventilation system to increase airflow in the mine and get it
30 ready for limited operations.

31
32 Mr. Valdez asked if WIPP is operated as a nuclear site or as a mine.

33
34 Mr. Bishop responded that it is operated under two sets of rules, and must comply with
35 both the mine safety regulations and the nuclear site safety operations.

36
37 Mr. Valdez asked about the fact sheets that had been generated on sites at LANL and if
38 they could be provided to the NNMCAB.

39
40 Mr. Bishop responded that he would take the action to get those fact sheets to the
41 NNMCAB.

1 Mr. Schmelling asked how broadly the DOE looks at the safety assessments that are
2 conducted, do they focus on WIPP or the Complex.

3
4 Mr. Bishop responded that he is on a detail to HQ supporting the assessments. He noted
5 that it is really both of those. The WIPP personnel are looking at the WIPP site safety
6 analysis and HQ is looking at the national program and how it can be improved, so that the
7 events like the WIPP incident don't reoccur.

8
9 Mr. Mayfield asked if there was an update on the WIPP permitting.

10
11 Mr. Bishop responded that he had not been updated on that issue. Noting that if the
12 board is interested in the topic, it was a possibility that Mr. Stroble could provide that
13 information at a NNMCAB meeting in 2016.

14
15 Mr. Mayfield asked if there was an account of the stock pile of waste across the
16 complex.

17
18 Mr. Hintze responded that LANL is the only site that is currently approaching the
19 capacity for storage, followed by the Lawrence Livermore Site. Additionally, noting that the
20 other sites had already reduced their inventory prior to the WIPP incident and were not
21 having a storage issue.

22
23 **IX. Presentations**

24 **a. Southwest Research and Information Center**

25 Mr. Don Hancock, Southwest Research and Information Center (SRIC); gave a
26 presentation to the NNMCAB on "How Does the WIPP Shutdown Impact New Mexico,
27 Idaho, and South Carolina?" An electronic copy of the presentation may be obtained
28 from the NNMCAB website; <http://www.energy.gov/em/nnmcab>. Video of the
29 presentation is also available on the NNMCAB's YouTube Channel (NNMCAB).

30
31 **b. Questions**

32 Mr. Valdez asked if DOE has any plans to dig new panels to accommodate the
33 waste that still needs to be shipped.

34
35 Mr. Hancock responded that most of the waste that still needs to be shipped is
36 waiting in storage or in the process of being exhumed and repackaged for shipment.

37 Mr. Hancock also noted that there are possible plans for panels 9 and 10 at WIPP.

38
39 Mr. Baca asked what the fiscal impact on jobs in New Mexico was with WIPP being
40 shut down.

1 Mr. Hancock responded that with the need to restart WIPP the expenditures at
2 WIPP have actually gone up. Additionally, noting that there have been no layoffs at
3 WIPP, but rather an increase in personnel.
4

5 Mr. Baca asked if the \$250 million for WIPP comes out of the \$6 billion DOE
6 budget.
7

8 Mr. Hintze responded that he would need to verify; however there may have been
9 supplemental funding for the WIPP Budget in the past. Additionally, stating that now
10 that you are coming into a steady state budget the funding all comes out of the \$6
11 billion DOE receives for its budget.
12

13 Mr. Schmelling asked if the SRIC is an advocacy organization and what would you
14 like to see being done differently with the available budget.
15

16 Mr. Hancock responded that yes SRIC is an advocate on some occasions. He noted
17 that many of the questions on WIPP reopening need to be discussed in detail and
18 resolved before WIPP begins operations. Additionally, noting that SRIC believes that
19 public involvement increases safety at DOE sites across the complex.
20

21 Ms. Gurulé asked about the financial aspects of operating WIPP, noting that the
22 \$250 million comes out of the \$6 billion for the budget, is that also LANLs piece of the
23 budget.
24

25 Mr. Hancock responded that \$6 billion is simply not enough to address all of the
26 issues across the DOE complex. Mr. Hancock responded that until more money is
27 available the \$6 billion is split between the sites and for one site to have money
28 another site gets shorted.
29

30 Mr. Hintz responded that the \$250 million is not extra for WIPP it is WIPPs budget,
31 noting that if there is a budget increase then yes it comes out of the \$6 billion for the
32 overall budget. Additionally, Mr. Hintze stated that the Mixed Oxide Fuel (MOX)
33 facility is under the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) not
34 Environmental Management (EM) so any questions on the MOX Facility would need to
35 be addressed by NNSA.
36

37 Mr. Mayfield asked where SRIC would suggest that a repository should be located.
38

39 Mr. Hancock responded that the SRIC advocates to get the waste out of the ground
40 and moved to a permanent disposal area. Mr. Hancock noted that WIPP is the third of
41 the deep geologic repositories, which have not been able to successfully complete
42 their mission without problems. He noted that WIPP is a pilot plant and that there

1 needs to be multiple repositories not just one. Additionally, stating that WIPPs
2 purpose was to figure out the problems that can occur with this type of facility and
3 how to correct those problems.
4

5 Mr. Mayfield asked if there is a funding mechanism in the newly generated waste
6 that helps to fund the reopening of WIPP or any other repository that may come
7 online.
8

9 Mr. Hintze responded that sites continue to generate Transuranic Waste (TRU) and
10 some of that will be sent to WIPP. He noted that money from the yearly budget for
11 newly generated waste is from the waste generators, since from their perspective
12 they were not responsible for the failure of WIPP to execute correctly. Mr. Hintze
13 noted that most of the newly generated waste is NNSA waste and the WIPP facility is
14 an EM facility so NNSA does not necessarily have a responsibility for reopening WIPP.
15

16 Mr. Martínez y Valencia asked if DOE was looking at deep bore disposal.
17

18 Mr. Bishop responded that at this point DOE is not looking at deep bore, and the
19 Los Alamos Site does not have any information on deep bore disposal.
20

21 Mr. Hancock noted that it is the Office of Nuclear Energy that has a proposal to
22 move forward with bore holes; however, they have not identified what sites will be
23 part of the project.
24

25 Ms. Gurulé asked what best practices are being implemented to reduce the waste
26 that is currently being stored.
27

28 Mr. Bishop responded that repacking of legacy waste is currently curtailed. He
29 noted that for new gen waste under NNSA, packaging procedures to get the most
30 volume for dollar have been implemented. Additionally, Mr. Bishop noted that there
31 is a balance between radioactivity and volume that must be considered to get the
32 most out of the shipments.
33

34 **c. Los Alamos National Security**

35 Mr. Dave Funk, Los Alamos National Security, gave a presentation to the NNM CAB
36 on "Treatment of Remediated Nitrate Salts." An electronic copy of the presentation
37 may be obtained from the NNM CAB website; <http://www.energy.gov/em/nnmcab>.
38 Video of the presentation is also available on the NNM CAB's YouTube Channel
39 (NNMCAB).
40

1 **d. Questions**

2 Mr. Baca asked if more waste was produced when the drum contents are mixed
3 with water and zeolite. Additionally, who makes the determination on which method
4 is best?

5
6 Mr. Funk responded that the volume of waste will depend on the recipe that is
7 determined to be viable to remove the D001 characteristic. Mr. Funk noted that
8 effectiveness is the highest priority with volume coming in second. Mr. Funk noted
9 that there is no real natural means to remediate the material.

10
11 Mr. Sayre asked for clarification on how big the freezer editions are.

12
13 Mr. Funk responded that the freezers will hold three standard waste boxes, noting
14 that the freezers are about the size of a transportainer.

15
16 Mr. Valdez asked about the RCRA permitting not allowed in Material Disposal Area
17 (MDA) G?

18
19 Mr. Funk responded that MDA G is permitted for storage not for treatment, so a
20 permit modification will be needed to perform remediation of waste material at MDA
21 G.

22
23 Mr. James Valerio asked what the cations were to the nitrate salts that are in the
24 drums.

25
26 Mr. Funk responded that there is a wide variability, noting that some examples are
27 chromium, sodium, potassium, aluminum, iron, and many other trace elements.

28
29 Mr. James Valerio asked why the anion is not switched to something that does not
30 provide as much oxygen.

31
32 Mr. Funk noted that the techniques from a chemistry standpoint that can be used
33 to capture the plutonium in the ion exchange are limited. He noted that the nitrate
34 method was one of the best methods to achieve this.

35
36 Ms. Gurulé asked about why the zeolite or cementation process was chosen over
37 the other options that were proposed, such as incineration.

38
39 Mr. Funk responded that the incineration method is very difficult to permit if not
40 impossible. Additionally, he referenced problems with the open air incinerator that
41 LANL had previously used for other projects, and the public view on that particular
42 method.

1
2 Ms. Gurulé asked if LANL had followed up with what other countries may be doing
3 to resolve similar issues.
4

5 Mr. Funk noted that LANL had not looked into what other countries were doing to
6 resolve similar issues. He stated that LANL had looked at a wide array of methods that
7 are available in the United States and that extensive review had been done to ensure
8 those methods were viable.
9

10 Mr. Michael Valerio asked about the cementation process of the salts, asking if a
11 monolithic block is created in the process that has a relative hardness.
12

13 Mr. Funk responded that a monolithic block is created; however the structural
14 integrity of the block is not necessarily important.
15

16 Mr. Michael Valerio asked how long the concept of cementing the salts had been
17 used.
18

19 Mr. Funk noted that at LANL the process was first developed in the 1980's and that
20 it is a combination of Portland cement at high pH to make sure that the cement does
21 not dewater.
22

23 Mr. Bishop noted that in 1991 cementation was implemented at TA-55 at LANL and
24 is the process that is used to disposition the nitrate waste.
25

26 Mr. Mayfield asked for clarification on the possibility of needing to reengineer the
27 glovebox.
28

29 Mr. Funk stated that there are two 55 gallon bag out ports and no easy way to get
30 the cement into the glovebox. Noting that an easy means to get the cement into the
31 box would need to be engineered/modified for the glovebox. Additionally, noting that
32 safety measures for the box would be needed such as fire suppression and non-
33 sparking tools.
34

35 Mr. Mayfield asked about mitigation of concerns for the drums that are currently
36 stored.
37

38 Mr. Bishop responded that the drums are stored in what is considered to be a safe
39 configuration, and that the drums are actively monitored for temperature and head
40 space gas sampling.
41

42 Mr. Mayfield asked why the drums can't be placed in WIPP in the remote handled
section.

1
2 Mr. Funk responded that the reason that it is not allowed is that ignitable TRU
3 waste is not allowed on the road, so there is no way to transport the drums safely to
4 WIPP.

5
6 Mr. James Valerio asked if filling the drums with an inert gas would neutralize the
7 autocatalytic processes.

8
9 Mr. Funk responded it would not sufficiently neutralize the autocatalytic process
10 and would also pressurize the drum, which may cause additional complications.

11
12 **X. Update from Liaisons**

13 **a. Update form U.S. Department of Energy**

14 Mr. Doug Hintze, DOE, EM-LA, Site Manager provided the update for the members.
15 He stated that the Bridge Contract went into effect on October 1, 2015 with a 14 day
16 transition period. He noted that EM-LA is very satisfied with the way the Bridge
17 Contract is progressing. Mr. Hintze noted that EM is in the process of developing an
18 acquisition process to implement the follow on contract. Additionally, stating that the
19 Bridge Contract end date is 2017.

20 Mr. Hintze noted that the budget request for FY'17 is \$189 million for LANL for EM
21 cleanup, he noted that the government is currently under a Continuing Resolution
22 that is in effect till December 11, 2015. Additionally, noting that an appropriation is
23 anticipated to be in place before that date. Mr. Hintze noted that the NNM CAB had
24 held a special meeting to hear about the Consent Order (CO) process that is proposed
25 for the newly revised CO. He noted that a draft of it is anticipated out after the
26 Settlement Agreements are signed, noting that the draft of the CO may be available
27 early in calendar year 2016.

28 Mr. Hintze stated that a contract for Natural Resource Damage Assessment at LANL
29 had been awarded and that project had kicked off two weeks ago. He noted that the
30 project/assessment is expected to run for multiple years. Mr. Hintze noted that the
31 public comment for the Floodplane Assessment and the Chromium Assessment had
32 closed, and that EM-LA is currently working to address the comments that were
33 submitted.

34
35 Mr. Baca asked if the public comments that were submitted would be available to
36 the public.

37
38 Mr. Bishop responded that 108 comments were received and would be part of the
39 administrative record; however, a comment response document is not required for
40 Environmental Assessments.
41

1 Mr. Schmelling asked if the well on the Pueblo de San Ildefonso is installed and
2 who is collecting that data.

3
4 Mr. Bishop responded that yes the well is in place and data sets have been
5 returned from the samples. He noted that the Pueblo has primacy over that data and
6 that they had not yet given EM-LA permission to release the data to Intellus.

7
8 **b. Update from Los Alamos National Security**

9 Mr. Funk provided the update for LANL. He noted that the contract transition had
10 gone very smoothly, noting that it had been very successful and the transition had
11 been very well executed. Mr. Funk noted that he would focus on the nitrate salts as
12 that is his area of expertise. Mr. Funk noted that Area G is currently in warm standby
13 mode while the safety basis for the area is reviewed. Additionally, noting that the
14 RANT and WCRRF are in cold standby awaiting the restart of operations. He noted that
15 an assessment is being conducted at WCRRF to identify the time required to restart
16 the facility in the event it is needed to process the nitrate salt waste.

17 Mr. Funk noted that DOE/LANL is scheduled to go over its Corrective Actions Plan,
18 for the NNM CAB. He stated that the plan was required by the WIPP event
19 investigation. Additionally, noting that LANL will be supporting the actions on the
20 interim measures on the Chromium plume.

21
22 Mr. Sayre asked when the Corrective Actions Plans would be available.

23
24 Mr. Hintze stated that they should be available by January 2016.

25
26 Mr. Sayre asked about the nitrate salt drums that were already at WIPP and what
27 would need to be done with them.

28
29 Mr. Funk noted that all the drums that were at WIPP were already emplaced and
30 no further action would be necessary.

31
32 Mr. Hintze noted that at the NNM CAB meeting on the 12th of November he had
33 committed to providing a presentation on the Life Cycle Baseline. He stated that the
34 Life Cycle Baseline is at HQ for approval, and once it is approved he would be
35 providing the NNM CAB with that presentation.

36
37 **XI. Public Comment**

38 Mr. Sayre opened the floor for public comment at 4:20 p.m., he invited Mr. Scott Kovac
39 from Nuke Watch New Mexico to address the board.

1 Mr. Kovac noted that he did not really have any comments to offer today. He would like
2 to urge the NNM CAB to make a good recommendation on the upcoming revised CO,
3 including milestones and deliverables.
4

5 With no additional public comment, Mr. Sayre closed the public comment period at 4:21
6 p.m.

7
8 **XII. Wrap-up and Comments**

9 Mr. Sayre opened the floor for wrap-up comments from the members.

10
11 Mr. Baca thanked everyone for attending today's meeting at NMHU and stated that
12 everyone was welcome in Las Vegas and he would enjoy hosting additional meetings.
13

14 Ms. Schreiber thanked everyone for the great meeting and urged the NNM CAB to
15 continue to provide good recommendations in the future.
16

17 Mr. Tiano, Ms. Tse-Pe, Ms. Varela, Mr. Martínez y Valencia, Ms. Gurulé, Mr. Michael
18 Valerio, Mr. James Valerio, Ms. Quintana, and Mr. Valdez stated that they wished Alyssa
19 well and thanked everyone for the good information and great meeting. The members also
20 noted that the venue was great. Additionally, the members thanked the staff for a well
21 thought out meeting.
22

23 Mr. Martínez y Valencia also asked for a presentation on climate change precautions
24 that LANL is looking at implementing.
25

26 Mr. Bishop responded that he looked into that and will try to make that presentation
27 happen in the spring of 2016, as an informational presentation.
28

29 Mr. Schmelling and Ms. Gurulé noted that a CO presentation would be very useful for
30 the NNM CAB in making an informed recommendation.

31
32 **XIII. Adjournment**

33 Mr. Sayre noted that the next Combined Committee meeting would be at the NNM CAB
34 office in Pojoaque on January 13, 2016. He thanked the presenters and members for
35 attending today's meeting.
36

37 Mr. Bishop thanked Alyssa for her service and the members for taking the time to come to
38 today's meeting. Mr. Bishop also took the time to thank Mr. Paul Torrez for providing the
39 new EM-LA logo. With no additional business to discuss Mr. Bishop adjourned the meeting
40 at 4:32 p.m.

1 **Respectfully Submitted,**



2 **Doug Sayre, Chair, NNM CAB**

3 ***Minutes prepared by William Alexander, Technical Programs and Outreach, NNM CAB**

4
5 **Attachments**

- 6 1. **Final NNM CAB Meeting Agenda for 11/18/2015**
 - 7 2. **Final NNM CAB Meeting Minutes for 09/30/2015**
 - 8 3. **Report from the Chair, Doug Sayre**
 - 9 4. **Report from the Executive Director, Menice Santistevan**
 - 10 5. **Los Alamos Field Office Legacy Cleanup Information for November 2015**
 - 11 7. **Presentation by Southwest Research and Information Center, Don Hancock, "How Does the**
 - 12 **WIPP Shutdown Impact New Mexico, Idaho, and South Carolina?"**
 - 13 8. **Presentation by Los Alamos National Security, Dave Funk, "Treatment of Remediated Nitrate**
 - 14 **Salts."**
-

15
16 **Public Notice:**

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

18 **at the NNM CAB office, 94 Cities of Gold Road, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 87506. The written minutes are**

19 **intended as a synopsis of the meeting.**