

arc

193a
General

North New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board
1640 Old Pecos Trail, Suite H
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
505-989-1662 phone 505-989-1752 fax
800-218-5942
adubois@doeal.gov http://www.nnmcab.org

2001 APR 24 PM 12:30

RCRA PERMITS PROGRAM

April 16, 2001

Dear Board Member,

This month's meeting is in the Student Council Chambers, Baca Avenue and Ninth, New Mexico Highlands University, in Las Vegas. Just follow the signs to the University when you are coming into town. Then look for the Board signs to direct you to the meeting. Ann DuBois asked if you wanted a hotel room for after the meeting. If your plans change, please let her know.

We will conduct our Board business including committee reports before the presentation this month.

Agustin Garcia, Interim Chair, for the Monitoring and Surveillance Committee, has prepared a report for you. It is printed on orange paper. He will discuss these points during the meeting.

The Environmental Restoration Committee is presenting, for the first reading, a recommendation on Risk-Based Cleanup authored by Dorothy Hoard. A copy of the recommendation is printed on pink paper.

For the past few months, you received copies of proposed letters to Secretary Abraham to introduce the Site-Specific Advisory Boards. Please mark your comments on the enclosed copy on blue paper and give them to Ann DuBois. We want to have your input into this task, and need to submit our Board's comments in order for them to be incorporated into the final version of the letter. I urge you to consider the tone of the letter as it presently reads and whether you feel it is appropriate as a first correspondence from the SSAB's to the new DOE Secretary. We will have time in the agenda to discuss the letter.

We are delighted to welcome John Themelis, Deputy Assistant Manager, Environmental Program, Albuquerque Operations. He will give an overview of the FY2002 Environmental Programs budget. Enclosed are some background materials printed on green paper that will prepare you for this important discussion. There is growing concern among the Advisory Boards across the DOE Complex about the impacts to clean up schedules resulting from recently announced budget reductions. I urge you to be prepared to ask John about what the budget reductions will mean at LANL and how this Board can let its voice be heard.

Sincerely,

Menice AD

Menice S. Manzanares
Chair



13498

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board
1640 Old Pecos Trail, Suite H
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
505-989-1662 phone 505-989-1752 fax
800-218-5942
adubois@doeal.gov http://www.nnmcab.org

Highlands University
Las Vegas

**Board Meeting Agenda
April 25, 2001**

Board's Mission: The Office of Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board will provide the Department of Energy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management with policy information, advice and recommendations concerning EM environmental restoration, monitoring and surveillance, waste management, and technology development activities.

- 6:00 PM I. Call to Order by DOE**
Welcome
Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes – March
- II. Board Comments**
- 6:30 PM III. Public Comments**
- 7:00 PM IV. Board Business**
- A. Report from the Chair – Menice S. Manzanares
- B. Report from DOE – MJ Byrne
- C. Report from Monitoring and Surveillance Committee –
Agustin Garcia (*Information*)
- D. Report from the Environmental Restoration Committee –
Fran Berting (*Action*) – Recommendation on Risk-Based
Cleanup

E. Report from Community Outreach Committee –
Jim Johnston (*Information*)

F. Report from Waste Management Committee –
George Chandler (*Information*)

G. Budget (*Information*)

8:00 PM BREAK

8:15 PM V. Report

**EM Budget FY 2002: How the Board can Impact the Budget
Request**

9:00 PM Adjourn

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board
1640 Old Pecos Trail, Suite H
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
505-989-1662 phone 505-989-1752 fax
800-218-5942
adubois@doeal.gov http://www.nnmcab.org

Sagebrush Inn
Taos

**Board Meeting Minutes
March 28, 2001**

Board Members Present:

Menice S. Manzanares, Chair
Jim Johnston, Vice Chair
Fran Berting
Jim Brannon
George Chandler
David Chávez
Valerie Espinoza
Maxine Ewankow
June Fabryka-Martin
Richard Gale
Agustin Garcia
Dorothy Hoard
Angelina Valdez

Board Members Absent:

Myron J. Gonzales (Excused)
Don Jordan (Excused)

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Michael Baker, Acting Director, ER/LANL
James Bearzi, Bureau Chief, Hazardous Waste Bureau, NMED
MJ Byrne, Deputy Designated Federal Official, DOE/LAAO
Joe Vozella, Assistant Area Manager, DOE/LAAO

Guests:

Joni Arends, CCNS
Julie Wilson, Facility Manager, B Division, LANL
Sarah Zink, Communications Director, B Division, LANL

Facilitator:

Toby Herzlich

I. OPENING

MJ Byrne, DDFO, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum was established. Ms. Byrne turned the meeting over to Menice S. Manzanares, Chair.

She introduced the Mayor of Taos, Fredrick Peralta. He welcomed the Board, the DOE and LANL employees and members of the public. Mr. Peralta expressed his concern that LANL employees should function as public citizens as well.

Ms. Manzanares suggested that the Board Comments be postponed due to the interests of time.

Mr. Chandler moved, seconded by Mr. Johnston to approve the February minutes as amended. The motion was passed.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Herzlich suggested that the Board receive public comments before and after the presentation on the proposed Biosafety Lab Level 3. Ms. Manzanares accepted the suggestion to amend the agenda.

Roberta Flowers, P. O. Box 2784, Taos, NM 87571

Ms. Flowers expressed her concern about low-level contaminated materials that LANL dumped in the canyons. She felt that this action showed a disregard for the public. Ms. Flowers wanted safeguards for this proposed Biosafety Laboratory, Level 3. She said that LANL lied to the public before and will lie to the public again.

Suzanne Phillips, Carson, NM 87517 (505) 758-5532

Ms. Phillips expressed her concern about the proposed Biosafety Laboratory, Level 3 project. She said that if people produced something that kills or harms the public, they would go to jail. Ms. Phillips said that LANL is developing nuclear weapons and has no right to study the causes of infections. We are one people, and one planet. What we do to others, we do to ourselves. She asked that LANL put an end to this project.

Dr. A. J. Lewis, Gratitude House, 7 Freedom Road, Carson, NM 87517

Dr Lewis introduced himself as a psychologist, and a light and color therapist. He said that there is a crisis on this planet. We have to relate to the concerns of the planet and that there is little time left. Fossil fuel will run out soon and the energy problems that California is facing are the tip of the iceberg. Dr. Lewis said that chemicals are destroying us as a species and other species as well. We have no right to destroy the planet in the name of the bottom line. He asked that LANL ask the people how they feel about this project. There should be a national and international debate on this issue.

Joni Arends, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, 107 Cienega, Santa Fe, NM 87501, 505-986-1973.

Ms. Arends asked about the proposed Acid Canyon recommendation. She noted that the Board is chartered under Environmental Management. Ms. Arends said that hotspots were found in Acid Canyon park in 1967. Recently, NMED found more hotspots. She asked why Livermore cleaned up a park in California to 2.5 picocuries and that the Board proposed a different clean up standard. Ms. Arends noted that Los Alamos took an average to determine the contamination in the area but that California did not use this standard. She asked why there is a difference in how the cleanup standards are applied. She explained that Acid Canyon functions as a backyard for children and the public. The runoff goes to Pueblo Canyon, then the Los Alamos Canyon and then it flows into the Rio Grande.

Scott Thomas

Mr. Thomas asked what is the reason for Los Alamos that is known for nuclear weapons to take on the proposed Biosafety Level Three Laboratory. He asked that people say no to WIPP say no to this lab. Mr. Thomas felt that the project was dangerous and it should not happen.

Juan Montes, P. O. Box 920, Questa, NM 87556 505-586-1241

Mr. Montes said that this Advisory Board was chosen to represent the communities in northern New Mexico. He was involved in establishing this Board. Two years ago, DOE replaced the Board members. Mr. Montes asked to whom are the Board members accountable? People in the community remember this history and the Department's lies. He said that the Board does not represent the public. Mr. Montes asked where would anthrax go when it burns. The Cerro Grande fire demonstrated that it would go North.

Ms. Manzanares said that she is a fourth generation Taos resident. Her family raised sheep and cattle. She felt that the Board does represent the citizens, and gives the community an opportunity to hear this presentation on the proposed research Biosafety Laboratory. She asked that the public listen to this report.

III. REPORTS

**Proposed Biosafety Level Three Research Laboratory
Sandra Zink, Communications Director and Julie Wilson, Facility
Manager, B Division**

Sandra Zink, Communications Director and Julie Wilson, Facility Manager, described the proposed Biosafety Level Three research laboratory. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is now in progress. It will be either an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement. Then DOE will decide what to do with this recommendation. There will be additional poster

sessions for the public to hear about . The first one will be on April 10 at the Santa Fe Community College. Another poster session will be held in Española on April 24 at El Convento.

Dr. Zink talked about why LANL wants to do this work. LANL has been doing bio research for many decades. For example, during the Manhattan Project, the scientists studied how human tissue was effected by radiation. LANL formed a health research lab in the 1940's. The concern for today is that new threats are emerging. These threats include infectious diseases that are emerging and bacteria that are resistant to drugs. There also exists the threat of biological agents being used by terrorists to create chaos and fear in our society and there are examples of rogue nations (Iraq) who have developed biological agents for use in war.

Ms. Wilson talked the biosafety issues in everyday life e.g., safe handling of food, the isolation of sick people and animals, washing your hands, keeping a clean kitchen, vaccinating children, and wearing gloves. She described how the Centers for Disease Control define the four levels of biosafety. Level 1 involves school classroom work, and a clean kitchen. Level 2 is found in dentists' and doctors' offices with restricting access, and wearing glasses, gloves and coats. Level 3 involves surgical suites, research labs or pharmaceutical drug preparation with a combination of procedures and engineering controls like air handling, locking doors, access restrictions, biosafety cabinets, and the use of HEPA filters. Level 4 involves the handling of lethal organisms. The proposed lab would not involve any lethal organisms.

Ms. Wilson described the proposed floor plan and the requirements governing the lab and the engineering controls that would be used to protect the public and the workers. These controls include isolating the lab, using special air conditioning equipment separate from the rest of the building, special hand washing sinks and changing rooms, one-way path thru workers would exit, showers, biosafety cabinets with primary HEPA filtration and room exhaust systems. For general safety, there would be periodic disinfection and exhaust systems, daily and weekly cleaning procedures, worker health monitoring, periodic re-certification by Center for Disease Control, IBSO, the routine maintenance of the safety system and environmental monitoring.

Ms. Wilson said that this laboratory would not be involved with bioweapons research or production. The production volumes are too low for this lab to be converted to bioweapon research or production.

The benefits of this laboratory include 1) effective methods to identify organisms in rapid and effective manner, 2) ability to attribute organisms to bioterrorists, 3) the ability to produce rapid cultures to tell what is the organism, and 4) tell how come an organism has become drug resistant

Ms. Herzlich summarized the presentation by saying that it is not the intent of this facility to make weapons and that lethal organisms will not be present there. The laboratory will work with bacteria, viruses, and organisms

Mr. Johnston asked if the security level required the facility to be guarded. Ms. Wilson responded that the laboratory will not be guarded on 24 hours basis. The laboratory will conduct tours for people who want to see the work. There will be no cameras or exterior fence but there will be a palm reader and badge reader and cyber locks. Mr. Johnston asked what are the controls for terrorism. Ms. Wilson answered that the fence is the deterrent.

Ms. Hoard asked where does LANL get its sources for the organisms and how will they get to Los Alamos. Ms. Wilson responded that the cultures will be populated from other places where they have cultures. For example, from other universities or other countries. These cultures are either dried or frozen specimens. They come in small volume containers approved by the Department of Transportation and travel by United Parcel Service. These samples are from the soil, so you don't culture them but add chemicals to get to their DNA and then query the same.

Mr. Gale asked about what assurances and guaranties LANL is willing to give the public that the conditions that were described tonight will continue to exist and the laboratory will not be converted to weapons works. Dr. Zink said that LANL has a reputation that it is not trustworthy. She has worked in Los Alamos since 1994 and worked at the National Institute of Health before that. Dr. Zink worked previously in Los Alamos. Her perception is that LANL now has a different culture, a new mission, new people and a commitment to tell the public what is happening. The Board will keep LANL honest.

Ms. Wilson added that the laboratory cannot be converted to weapons work because the house is too small. She said that LANL is not doing bioweapons work. This project would have to go through the NEPA process again before any conversion could be done.

Dr. Zink addressed the issues in the Inspector General's report on LANL. The report highlighted communication problems between scientists and some DOE program managers. LANL is correcting these problems. The report found no evidence of any safety issue impacting the public or workers.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD PART II

Marty Meltzer, 35 Burma Rd, Ranchos De Taos NM 87557-0000, 505-737-0166

Mr. Meltzer introduced himself as a biologist. He thinks that it makes no sense to have concentrations of plutonium at LANL and compound the concerns by adding biohazards. His opinion is that science is corrupted by the competition for money and prestige.

Jean Nichols, La Comunidad, P. O. Box 237, Peñasco, NM 87553

Ms. Nichols said that she lives in Peñasco. The Cerro Grande fire demonstrated that her community is downwind of LANL. She said that the public thinks that this proposed laboratory is a done deal and it is not an open process. Ms. Nichols would like to see an Environmental Impact Statement developed on this deal. She knows about LANL's programs and she gets worried when something is called "safety".

Ms. Nichols would rather see LANL do bioremediation and use plants to take metals out the soil in Acid Canyon.

Ms. Nichols said that she is concerned about the research on influenza that LANL is proposing. She would rather that people keep healthy immune systems by LANL stop doing what it is doing. If LANL wanted to give assurances to northern New Mexico then everyone should have full health insurance.

Marilyn Huff

Ms. Huff introduced herself as a Taos resident. She thinks that LANL has not changed its culture and has a bad reputation. She feels it is a tainted place. If scientists tell the truth to the public, they will lose their security clearance.

Ms. Huff said that she was reading the Internet news today about a Bio lab in Utah that released a germ that infected the wildlife and is spreading very fast. She felt that any guarantee that LANL might give would be hard to believe.

James Bearzi, Chief, Hazardous Waste Bureau, NMED, 2044 A Galisteo Street, Santa Fe, NM 87502, 505-827-1557

Mr. Bearzi introduced himself as an ex-officio member of the Board. His Bureau regulates waste at LANL.

Mr. Bearzi talked about the importance of the public weighing during the permitting process. The Board is a way to publicly share this information. External regulators are there to assure public safety. As Ms. Wilson described, LANL must complete the permit process, and then be registered and certified by the Center for Disease Control before this proposed facility can open. He added that the facility must be re-certified either annually or every three years and public input is required.

Juniper Barck

Ms. Barck requested that the Board take the time to hear what the public's concerns about the biological laboratory and the fire. She asked about the fire protection systems and security. Ms. Wilson replied that currently LANL has no infectious organisms and they are working at Level 1 and 2 only. Ms. Barck suggested that this money should be spent

on health care for the general population. She was concerned that the proposed laboratory might attract terrorists. Ms. Barck was concerned that these laboratories could create diseases.

Pamela Harris, 109 Hondo Seco Road, Arroyo Seco NM 87514 (505) 776-1482

Ms. Harris introduced herself as a psychologist. She lived in the vicinity of Hanford and saw the death of many friends. Ms. Harris said that the plutonium production process makes an exhaust. These materials spread on the surrounding farmland and twenty years later, the diseases started showing up. She said that LANL is doing the most research on radiation diseases. On the NASA Internet site, there are pictures of the world taken at night by satellite. These pictures of the following countries show the contamination that they are getting from nuclear waste: Japan, Europe, the East Coast of the United States, and Russia.

Chooch

Chooch was a nurse for a long period of time. She saw doctors as healers killing people. She was sorry if people believed what they were being told about the proposed laboratory. Chooch felt that we are seeing the end of the world. The Hopi prophecy says that we are in end times.

Cliff Bain, P. O. Box 297, Arroyo Hondo, NM 87513 (505) 776-8486

Mr. Bain said that Los Alamos is the developer of global destruction. He felt that we would never recover for the harm done to the environment and to the children. Mr. Bain asked why are DOE, the Center for Disease Control and the National Institute of Health doing this work? He is concerned about the proximity of the proposed laboratory and military projects at LANL. Mr. Bain said that LANL has no interest in doing public health work. He will never trust what LANL does. Mr. Bain felt that diversification in New Mexico's economy is very important. He said that we don't want this project in our economy. Mr. Bain wanted LANL to fix what has been done to us. He felt that DOE brings terror to the planet

Nathaniel Evans, P. O. Box 3319, Taos, NM 87571

Mr. Evans asked if LANL is safe? Ms. Wilson responded that she thinks it is safe. He felt that the Cerro Grande fire was not the responsibility of LANL. Ms. Wilson said that LANL was responsible for its own property and it had no defense against the fire.

Mr. Evans felt that the proposed laboratory was not safe. He said that LANL was not truthful with the public.

Donne Whisenand, Citizens against Poisoning the Environment (C.A.P.E.), P. O. Box 1883, El Prado, NM 87529 (505) 776-2267

Ms. Whisenand wondered why is LANL mixing viruses with a nuclear facility. She suggested that the proposed laboratory be moved to another facility that is not near a nuclear weapons facility. Ms. Whisenand said that during fire, the television showed pictures of nuclear waste stored in tents and treetops were near by. She wondered what would have happened if the waste burned. Ms. Whisenand asked why LANL did not chop down the trees.

Diana Jackson, HCR 74, P. O. Box 24703, El Prado, NM 87529 (505) 776-5368

Ms. Jackson asked about the security for the proposed laboratory. Ms. Wilson responded that the facility would have low security and no cameras. She said that the security would be handled the same way as other laboratories certified by the Center for Disease Control and the National Institute of Health.

Ms. Jackson asked what would happen if the live organisms breach this security. Ms. Wilson said that the laboratory would not release any organisms. The physical security is the same as for industry. The work at the proposed laboratory would not be classified.

Soltn Kilcarr

Mr. Kilcarr asked about the disposal of waste and if federal or state regulators oversee this process. Ms. Wilson said that the use of an autoclave means that the material is no longer hazardous. Mr. Kilcarr said that the Caldwell systems made people in vicinity and workers sick.

Mr. Kilcarr asked what would happen in the event of a power outage and negative air pressure could not be maintained. Ms. Wilson responded that the layers of containment would mean that the material is not available. She added that the backup diesel power would maintain the negative air pressure.

Jesse Lowers, P. O. Box 553, Cvesfare, CO 81131

Mr. Lowers said that the Inspector General's report stated that LANL lacked oversight and procedures to mitigate risk. He asked what biological agents are in LANL and how could they get out. Ms. Wilson said that LANL has no select or live agents.

Jensen Clarke, 7124 Hwy 518 A TAOS NM 87571 (505) 751-7310

Mr. Clarke said that Rocky Flats stopped making pits so we get them. He said he was concerned about the orange smoke that was seen during the Cerro Grande fire. He asked who would take care of us if we were poisoned? Mr. Clarke said if this proposed laboratory is so safe, then put it in Albuquerque or in DC.

Ms. Herzlich asked the Board members to summarize what they heard from the public. Mr. Johnston said that he heard safeguards and security concerns and that the facility should have guards and cables to prevent terrorists from taking over. Dr. Berting said that the public was concerned about the physical security of the building and wanted LANL to conduct exercises to prevent terrorism. Ms. Hoard reported that the public felt that LANL lies and if something will get out, then get it out. Mr. Gale observed that the public wanted a barrier in the permitting process about the purpose of the proposed laboratory and LANL's intent to stay a medical research and prevent an expansion into weapons work. Mr. Chandler added that the public had a list of issues including security, restricted access, risks of fire and earthquake and the proposed laboratory did not seem consistent with LANL's mission. He continued that the possible burning of the waste at TA-55 was one of reasons for the evacuation of White Rock. The Board was concerned about this issue and passed a recommendation for the acceleration of this waste to WIPP.

Mr. Chandler continued that the oversight provided by the Center for Disease Control needed something more visible to include the public in addition the regulatory oversight. He added that the problems at TA-55 and not maintenance but facility infrastructure problems. Mr. Chandler was concerned about the proposed laboratory's design, operation and maintenance schedule so that in twenty years when it wears there will not be the same hazards as at TA-55.

Ms. Manzanares responded that she wanted to know the timetable for the feasibility study. Dr. Zink answered that the public input will continue through September when there will be a draft NEPA report for additional public input. Ms. Byrne requested that the Board receive a copy of the Environmental Assessment report in September. She asked if members of the public wanted a copy of the report how could they get this information. She agreed to share the Board's sign up list so people who requested the report could receive it.

Mr. Chandler asked how does this topic of the proposed laboratory fit into our charter? Ms. Manzanares answered that at a future meeting, the Board needs to address the scope and fit of its Charter

Ms. Hoard asked Dr. Zink to take this information back to LANL. Dr. Zink replied that B Division would like to continue the dialogue with the Board at a future meeting.

END OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD II

IV. BOARD BUSINESS

A. Chair Report

Ms. Manzanares asked the Board members to put on their calendars the dates of August 26-29 for the SSAB Chairs conference to be held at the Santa Fe Hilton. Soon the facilitators from each SSAB will send out a form survey to the SSAB Chairs to gather topics for the meeting.

Mr. Johnston announced some results from the Board's recommendation to Arrow- Pak recommendation that passed in January. The DOE Albuquerque Operations Office gave \$250,000 research and development funding with a possible \$1 million followup.

Mr. Johnston suggested that the public visit the Board website that has the Board's recommendations and DOE's responses.

Ms. Manzanares said that we have been trying to set a Retreat date. It has been difficult to coordinate everyone schedules.

B. DOE Report

Ms. Byrne invited Board members to participate in a WIPP tour offered during July, August or later. She invited Board members to attend a one-day radiation training that could include the public as well. Board members were asked to tell Ann Dubois if they were interested in either event.

Ms. Nash asked for Board members to join the Monitoring and Surveillance Committee. She requested that this Committee report first at the April Board meeting.

Ms. Byrne thanked Valerie Espinoza for suggesting someone for the Board. She asked Board members to join her to interview the prospective Board member on Friday, March 30 at the Santa Fe Office. Mr. Brannon and Mr. Johnston volunteered for the interview.

C. Environmental Restoration Committee

Dr. Berting highlighted a change in Committee meeting minutes on Material Disposal Areas. She asked the Board members to read these revised minutes.

Ms. Hoard introduced, for the second reading, the revised recommendation on Acid Canyon. The recommendation reads as follows:

"BACKGROUND: Acid Canyon was the location of wastewater outfalls from laboratory buildings and a liquid-waste treatment plant between 1944 and 1964. The wastewater streams contained radioactive contaminants. Despite the fact that intensive studies were done over the years, five previously undetected areas of elevated radioactivity ("hot spots") were discovered in Acid Canyon in 1999. Acid Canyon is a Los Alamos County park with unrestricted public access. The hot spots are located in a narrow gorge, not commonly used, but easily accessible to hikers.

A LANL Environmental Restoration Program (ER) risk assessment of the Acid Canyon contaminated area of 11,840 square feet (approximately a quarter acre) indicates that overall exposure does not exceed the Department of Energy (DOE) limit of 15 excess millirem per person per year (mrem/yr) for a recreational user. However, at the hot spot areas, totaling 538 square feet, the permissible dose may be exceeded under certain conditions involving lengthy exposure. The added exposure is due primarily to plutonium 239/240. Therefore, LANL ER is considering a cleanup of the radioactive hotspots at the direction of DOE.

The Northern New Mexico Citizen's Advisory Board (NNMCAB) understands that the DOE uses the as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) concept to determine levels to which to clean contaminated sites, and that "reasonable" cleanup levels are determined by cost/benefit analyses. LANL ER calculated four options for cleanup based on a dosage to a hypothetical person who played in the canyon 200 days per year for 1 hour per day.

1. No soil removal, resulting in an excess exposure to the hypothetical child of 12.7 mrem/yr.
2. Removal of approximately 65 cubic yards of soil that contains the highest levels of contaminants, which would reduce the calculated excess dose to 5.7 mrem/yr.
3. Removal of approximately 228 cubic yards of soil that exceeds the DOE single radionuclide soil guideline of 280 picocuries per gram, which would reduce the estimated excess dose to 3.1 mrem/yr.
4. Removal of approximately 880 cubic yards of soil containing virtually all the plutonium-contaminated sediments, which would reduce the estimated excess dose to 0.4 mrem/yr.

RECOMMENDATION: It has come to the attention of NNMCAB that deposits of sediments containing relatively high levels of radioactive contaminants recently discovered in Acid Canyon have caused public concern. The Board reviewed the ALARA Analysis for the South Fork of Acid Canyon and other documentation provided by DOE, LANL, and the New Mexico Environment Department.

The NNMCAB recommends to the DOE that the Department add to the baseline for LANL ER an additional cleanup in Acid Canyon. The board recommends that LANL ER remove approximately 228 cubic yards of soil, including the hot spots plus all other soil for which average plutonium concentrations exceeds DOE soil guidelines of 280 picocuries per gram.

The NNMCAB believes that the reduction of excess dose from 3.1 to 0.4 mrem/yr does not justify the additional costs in cleanup money, use of waste repository space, environmental damage caused by the cleanup itself, or the stress to local residents during an extended cleanup time."

Ms. Herzlich suggested a process for consensus that was adopted by the Board. Ms. Hoard talked about the options that the Committee considered. The range of options included 1) whether LANL should make this a pilot project, 2) whether not to clean up at all

Ms. Manzanares noted that the time was coming close to 9:00 PM. Ms. Byrne said that the Board meeting could go past 9:00 PM. Ms. Valdez moved, seconded by Mr. Johnston, to extend the meeting time to 9:15 PM. The motion passed.

Ms. Arends, CCNS, said that on Saturday, March 24, she went to Acid Canyon. She asked how the scenario of an "extended backyard" was chosen. She saw a bridge, trails, and an attractive nuisance for children. Ms. Arends asked the Board to consider a recommendation that supported a cleanup once and for all for the sixty years of accumulation of contaminated materials along a five-mile stretch in Acid Canyon. She asked that LANL and DOE find the \$1 million to protect the town's children. Ms. Arends asked for the reason that LANL chose to average the dose along the depth and across the length of the canyon. She said that at Livermore, they don't average and totally clean up each time. Ms. Arends suggested that LANL could use some of the Cerro Grande fire money to do this cleanup. She observed that if these hot spots were found on LANL property, they would be behind the fence.

Ms. Hoard explained that there is no safe standard for a child being exposed to radiation. Children are more effected by radiation than adults.

Ms. Arends said that NMED asked in November that the county post Acid Canyon to warn the public. She said that the water flowing in the creek could take the contamination to the Rio Grande. You can't explain to a child that you should not sit in a hotspot.

Mr. Brannon asked about the risk assessment and why was the extended backyard scenario used. Ms. Hoard explained that Acid Canyon could not be considered residential so LANL and NMED chose the extended backyard scenario.

Ms. Hoard added that it would take \$1 million to clean up to the level that the Board is recommending. That is not the cost of the whole cleanup. Ms. Hoard said that the cleaned up soil would go to Area G. Mr. Vozella said that another option might be commercial disposal. The decision would be made once the cleanup started.

Dr. Fabryka-Martin asked how sensitive is the risk scenario and she wondered what if the residential scenario were used. Mr. Chandler observed that if LANL cleaned up to background then this money will come out of other Environmental Management projects. He said that if the Board made this recommendation, the

clean up would cost more, take longer, and there is less chance of its being done due to cuts in the budgets by the new federal administration.

Dr. Berting clarified that the Board recommendation is that the hot spots be cleaned up and the hotspots are not averaged in the dose calculation. She added That the chosen scenario for a steep canyon is "extended backyard" and is the "worst case" not an "average". Mr. Vozella clarified that the "extended backyard" is a common sense way to get something in between residential and recreational scenarios.

Mr. Brannon asked if there were money in the baseline for this project. Mr. Vozella said that LANL would have to take money from other programs. He added that the work could be done next year. Mr. Vozella added that LANL is taking look at budget cuts that may put at risk doing this work

Ms. Ewankow asked if it were possible to do a bio remediation plan on Acid Canyon. Ms. Hoard responded that it is not possible for plants to do this work.

The Board passed the recommendation by consensus. Ms. Manzanares commended Dr. Berting, Ms. Hoard and the Committee.

V. BOARD COMMENTS

Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Bearzi, NMED, about the possibility of using Compliance Orders to push LANL. Mr. Bearzi said that NMED is considering all its options.

Mr. Brannon asked Mr. Bearzi about the letter sent that NMED sent to LANL about cleaning up "No Further Action" sites to residential levels. Mr. Bearzi explained that the New Mexico real estate laws do not make it possible to place restrictions on the land. There is no way to place the real estate controls to keep the land at an industrial level. He said that the draft bill to change the real estate law was not put into this legislative session. The Governor may add it to the agenda for the next 30-day session.

Ms. Hoard asked about which Committee would discuss the permit revisions for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Ms. Manzanares suggested that an Ad Hoc Committee be created for this purpose.

Ms. Byrne announced that the April Board meeting agenda would include a discussion on the Environmental Management budget.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Brannon moved, seconded by Ms. Hoard, that the Board adjourn. The Board approved the motion and adjourned at 9:30 PM.

The minutes are an accurate and complete summary of the matters discussed and conclusions reached at the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board meeting held on March 28, 2001.

Certified by:

Menice S. Manzanares, Chair

Date

Setting the Course for Reform and Change in the Future
Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham
April 9, 2001

Introduction

Good afternoon. I'm pleased to be here today to provide an overview of the Department's budget. It's the product of an enormous amount of work by many dedicated people here at Energy, the White House and the Office of Management and Budget.

So let me begin by thanking all of them for a job well done under difficult circumstances. I want to make sure the employees at the Department understand how much I appreciate their effort.

I also appreciate the work they've done as the Department faces a truly extraordinary collection of difficult and pressing issues. The list is too long to recount in full, but consider the following:

The Department has enormous responsibilities for our national security. We insure the capability of our nuclear deterrent in a dangerous world. We maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile and certify its reliability without testing.

The Department is charged with the security of our nuclear deterrence, including control of nuclear materials, information on weapons, and security at our labs.

We fund the most important scientific work in the world ... science that cures human disease ... discovers new materials ... explores the universe ... and uncovers mysteries inside the atom.

And oh, by the way, our nation faces an energy supply crisis, where rising natural gas prices punish consumers and forecasts look to rolling blackouts this summer.

And just to insure that life did not become too boring, the Department prepared its 2002 budget submission in near record time. It normally takes six months to prepare a budget. We did it in nine weeks.

Not only have our DOE employees had to cope with these challenges, which lie at the intersection of energy and national security, but the Department plays a leading role in the Administration's energy policy task force as well as in White House reviews of climate change and nonproliferation policies.

Only a group of truly superb professionals could have accomplished this. And we are lucky to have them because DOE is at the center of the questions that are really going to matter in the 21st Century.

We will find new sources of energy, we will lead the way in environmental protection, we will perform research that will improve human health and the environment, and we will fulfill our responsibilities to face security challenges in the post Cold War era. DOE has its eyes on the future.

The Budget Outlines our Vision

Our 2002 budget request is an important first step toward more fully realizing that future. In a sense, this budget acts as a prudent transition between what was left to us by the previous administration and where we will be headed in the budgets for 2003 and beyond.

We had a choice when we came into office. We could simply move forward with the previous administration's priorities, or we could initiate new policies and approaches that would begin the transition to a different vision reflecting our priorities of rebuilding and reforming our programs.

Thoughtful critiques, both inside and outside the Department, convinced us that a status quo budget, while it might be the safe road to take, in some cases, would simply perpetuate mistakes and waste money by locking us into programs we might wish to adjust in later budgets.

We chose to take a new approach and to prepare for the future.

In the limited time given us, we turned this budget as much as we could toward our ultimate goal of major DOE reform. We also initiated a broad range of strategic and policy reviews that would fully shape future budgets.

As a result, this budget begins to reflect our intention for serious reform in some important program areas. And make no mistake, change is coming.

Budgets must follow policy, which in turn must follow strategic thinking. Our policy reviews will provide such strategic guidance. These government-wide studies will evaluate our most critical tasks and will affect our Department more than any other in government. Few stones will go unturned.

The Department of Defense Nuclear Posture Review will shape our stockpile requirements. The National Security Council reviews of deterrence requirements and nonproliferation programs will shape our response to nuclear, biological and chemical threats.

The outcome of Vice President Cheney's Energy Policy Development Task Force will determine our energy policy and energy resources budgets for the next decade.

And I want to announce today that I have directed the Department to conduct a sweeping Environmental Management Mission Assessment to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used to achieve the overriding goals of a safer and speedier cleanup of our DOE weapons sites.

Assessments take time and an enormous amount of work. But we've not stood still. The budget we submit today is principled and a clear signal that the Department is moving in a different direction. It strengthens our ability to carry out our national security responsibilities. It meets our key priorities for health and safety. It advances our energy security, and supports the important scientific research for which we are responsible. It reflects the President's commitments and my priorities for reform.

We do all of this at the same time we maintain our flexibility to respond to the government-wide policy reviews now underway.

Some people will fault this approach, saying it changes too much or too little. But this is the right budget for this year; it's the responsible way to set us on a course toward a comprehensive change in the way we do business.

The FY 2002 Budget

Our FY 2002 budget requests funding at the level of \$19.2 billion, an increase over the previous Administration's 2001 request of \$18.9 billion and their 2000 request of \$ 17.8 billion. Our 2002 budget request is virtually the same as the final 2001 DOE appropriation level when you eliminate certain one-time-only 2002 expenditures such as the \$203 million needed to respond to the Cerro Grande fire. (\$19.2 vs. \$19.3).

Within the budget itself we have made some important adjustments that reflect our priorities and the transitional nature of this document.

Let me review some of these programs for you.

The Budget: Programs and Priorities

National Security

President Bush and Vice President Cheney pledged to reassert the importance of national security. That commitment is reflected in our budget. Our fiscal year 2002

request refocuses funding to meet vital national security needs, including investments to maintain our nuclear weapons arsenal, shore up an aging weapons infrastructure, and improve safeguards and security at all DOE facilities.

Everyone recognizes that we inherited a very difficult situation in the national security area, the area that -- including our cleanup commitments -- absorbs some 70 percent of our budget.

For more than 50 years, America's national security has relied on nuclear deterrence. It helped to win the Cold War and it will help keep the post Cold War peace. Under the Stockpile Stewardship Program we are responsible for maintaining the safety, security, and reliability of our nuclear weapons without testing. This is a significant challenge. And as I told Congress in my confirmation hearing, certifying the operational readiness of our stockpile is my most important responsibility.

This budget reflects the Administration's commitment to make immediate investments to support this responsibility. We are requesting a 14 percent increase for Directed Stockpile Work, which oversees the activities necessary to conduct the annual certification.

We are also improving the Department's efforts to reestablish our nation's capability for producing plutonium pits, the key component that provides fission energy in nuclear weapons. No new pits have been produced for our stockpile since the closing of Rocky Flats in 1989. That's unacceptable. We must have the capability to replace this critical weapons component if and when they are needed. This was forcefully conveyed in the recommendations of the Congressionally mandated Foster Panel. We've applied rigorous project management standards to this program by establishing milestones, full cost accounting and peer review.

Security throughout the Department of Energy demands attention. Everyone knows this. There is no debate. We are asking for a nearly 11 percent increase in funding for the Safeguard and Security program which concentrates on nuclear material control, security investigations, and counter-intelligence. Significantly, the 2002 budget request provides a 43 percent increase in funding for cyber-security to enhance protection of vital national security information and cutting edge research from our science programs.

The budget request also maintains the goals of our programs that address the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the disposition of nuclear weapons material. To most effectively meet this threat, and to ensure that our goals and objectives are clear, the Administration is currently developing a government-wide strategy for addressing this crucial issue. The National Security Council is currently conducting this review and its study will surely affect future budgets in this area.

Energy Resources

Let me turn now to a program area that is daily headline news ... energy resources.

The dominant fact confronting the Department today with respect to energy resources is growing concern about the mismatch between the supply and demand for energy over the next 20 years. California's supply crisis is a warning to the rest of the nation of what can happen when energy supply needs are ignored.

Demand for energy is rising across the board, but particularly for natural gas and electricity. At the same time, supplies are being limited by a regulatory structure that, in many respects, has failed to keep pace with advances in technology and an uncertain political environment that often discourages investment in desperately needed facilities.

What's more, our energy infrastructure is woefully antiquated and inadequate to meet our future needs.

President Bush has committed this administration to meeting these challenges -- a job that begins with the urgent task of developing and implementing a long-term national energy policy.

To accomplish this, the President created an Energy Task Force headed by Vice President Cheney. He has asked us to define a clear strategy -- a strategy that will allow environmentally responsible exploration and recovery of our domestic resources, enhance our commitment to conservation and energy efficiency, and encourage investment in new technology to further the development of renewable energy sources.

It should almost go without saying that our future budgets will be shaped in critical ways by the conclusions drawn by this Task Force. We have moved forward as far as possible without committing ourselves in the budget to spending that may well need to be changed once the Task Force completes its work.

And for those who will argue that we should just spend more money now on existing energy programs, let me say this: Continuing and expanding programs that have been in place as we drifted to the brink of an energy crisis does not appear to be a wiser course of action. What's more, we need a better measure of success.

For too long, critics have argued that our programs have produced few results. That is not fair. Many of our programs make sense and should be continued. On the other hand, some have produced few, if any benefits. The taxpayers sent us here to weed out the waste and to address growing problems of energy supply. The weeding begins in this budget.

But make no mistake, we won't just be downsizing. We intend to rebuild our energy resources programs so they are productive, so taxpayers receive a better value and so the programs deliver results measured against rigorous standards.

We have initiated a review of our energy resources programs to insure that we establish such clear measures of success.

First, there were programs we view as key priorities.

The President campaigned on the promise to help ensure that an adequate supply of home heating oil remains available for families in the northeast. So we are going to make the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve a permanent program, to help protect consumers from unexpected supply shocks.

Increasing energy efficiency is also important for low-income families. Many of these families live in poorly insulated homes, with antiquated heating systems that waste money and fuel. To address this problem, we've nearly doubled funding for the Weatherization Assistance grant, beginning an effort to add \$1.4 billion to the program over the next decade. Next year we will weatherize over 120,000 homes.

We also increased our science budget by \$30 million to fund biomass research, a promising renewable energy source.

But until renewable and new alternative energy sources bear fruit, we must maximize the use of current resources.

Fully half of America's electricity generators use coal and we have enough to keep those plants running for the next two-and-a-half centuries. But burning coal can have consequences for the environment. We can do something about that.

While DOE has had core research programs in clean coal technologies, there has been no federal effort since 1993 to move that research from the laboratory to full-scale tests.

For that reason, we are meeting the President's commitment to fund the Clean Coal Power Initiative at a level of \$2 billion over the next 10 years to spur innovation in coal-fired technology. We are beginning with a down payment of \$150 million in this budget.

Second, there were programs we believe are in need some adjustment.

One of these, the Partnership for a New Generation of Vehicles is an initiative I'm very familiar with, as it directly affects companies in my own state of Michigan. I supported it when I was a member of the Senate. But together with our automotive partners, we reviewed this program and agreed it was time to revisit its goals. Anyone

who drives can't help but notice the popularity of the sports utility vehicle. And if you drive an SUV you can't help but notice the cost at the pump.

And yet this program, initiated in 1993, was aimed at building only one type of automobile -- the mid-sized sedan. So we are streamlining and refocusing this program to give greater flexibility to the automakers and greater benefits to the taxpayer.

Now Detroit can use the benefits of the research and development work inspired by this program on promising, longer-term technologies for making a range of cleaner, more efficient vehicles and for broader energy applications for American consumers.

Meanwhile, we are holding funding steady for the truck R&D partnership to continue progress on heavier truck performance, an area of tremendous opportunity for increased fuel economy.

Third, there were programs that we believed should be modified -- while still protecting core competencies -- so that later budgets could take advantage of the results of the Cheney Task Force. For example our Hydrogen, High Temperature Superconducting, Geothermal, and Wind Energy Research programs are maintained at levels that provide a launching point for new initiatives following the recommendations of the Energy Task Force.

And finally there were programs that after a serious look, and as tested against our vision of the best possible program, appeared to be candidates for deep reductions or elimination. For instance, we have eliminated our program with industry for the Petroleum Vision. I could not justify beginning a program that supports an industry that is fully capable of funding such efforts themselves.

As I said earlier, we were sent here to weed out and then to begin to rebuild. I believe we have accomplished those goals in this budget.

Environmental Management

The Environmental Management program is responsible for the cleanup of 113 sites that taken together encompass an area of over two million acres -- equal to the size of Rhode Island and Delaware combined. At the beginning of FY 2001, the Department had completed active cleanup at 71 of these sites. But these are generally agreed to have been the least difficult.

Now comes the hard part. When I assumed this office I was told that the schedule calls for the remaining cleanup to take some 70 years at a cost of \$300 billion. That is not good enough. And I share the frustration of those living near these sites.

The question is this: do we follow that course or seek change? I seek change. And that begins with some very serious study.

As I announced earlier, we will begin immediately to conduct a complete assessment of our Environmental Management mission.

A number of reviews have been conducted over the last several years – including studies by the National Academy of Sciences and the Inspector General – that cite high costs, inefficiencies, and a lack of progress in parts of the cleanup program. Much of the Department's cleanup strategy was developed in the early part of the last decade. We've learned a great deal over these years and those lessons should be applied.

Accordingly, our top-to-bottom review will focus on what has prevented us from narrowing the cost and efficiency gap and whether our current strategies are suitable. What is more, DOE's own policies and procedures may well cause much of the inefficiency in the program. I want those identified. And they will change.

To find better ways to do business, our study will focus on a variety of issues including

- Opportunities to apply innovative contracting strategies
- The application of risk-based approaches to define the best cleanup remedies, and
- More rigorous project management.

This is an important step in shaping future budgets in this area. Comprehensive reform and the budgets to back it up will have to wait until this necessary assessment is complete.

In the meantime, our FY 2002 request for Environmental Management fulfills other critical goals that will lead us to accomplishing our cleanup objectives.

First, we focussed on cleanup of those sites such as Rocky Flats in Colorado and Fernald in Ohio that are on track for accelerated completion.

Second, for those sites where the timeframe for completion is much longer, we directed funding with a priority on the abatement of risks to human health, safety, and the environment. For example, we greatly increased funding for planning and construction of the waste vitrification plant in Hanford, Washington.

Finally, we are firmly committed to resolving the difficult management challenges involved with the safe disposal of radioactive waste. This budget contemplates nearly doubling our shipments of transuranic waste from sites distributed across the country to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico, including a level of shipments from the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory that will fulfill our important commitments to that state.

All of these programs in Environmental Management will be stronger and provide a greater return to the taxpayers as a result of our comprehensive management study.

Health, safety, and the environment will remain our focus. Each are strengthened by the steps we take today in this budget.

Additionally, we are committed to moving forward with the siting and construction of a safe final disposal site for our nuclear waste. And the budget provides sufficient funds to allow the Department to keep on schedule and continue its science-based approach to obtaining a national depository site.

My hope is to move more sites more quickly to a completion date or a more realistic schedule for completion. Sites where we have the greatest problems have to be the focus of our attention as we make progress toward getting this entire program on a better track.

Science

Unfolding the mysteries of science is one of our core missions. We can all take pride in it. DOE is the third largest funder of basic research in the United States and the largest government sponsor of the physical sciences. And the science we support is critical to many areas, from human health to quantum physics.

The President has told us that science is critical to American competitiveness around the world. We have responded by funding the Department's Office of Science, slightly above the 2001 level.

This funding supports over 6,500 of the nation's graduate students and postdoctoral researchers, the future of science in America. Over 15,000 researchers use the laboratories that this money helps design, build and operate.

The High Energy Physics program seeks to understand how nature operates at its most fundamental level and the Nuclear Physics program seeks to explain the behavior of atomic nuclei.

Our Basic Energy Science program brings together chemical, biological and other sciences to uncover fundamental knowledge that will help better utilize our energy resources.

DOE is a leader in computer science as well. Our Advanced Scientific Research program develops and deploys supercomputers for sophisticated modeling and simulations.

Just last year, our genome program announced its major contribution to a draft of the human DNA sequence, an awesome achievement with untold benefits. Our microbial research program eventually will help us find ways to better handle nuclear wastes, as well as ways to increase the production of inexpensive alcohol fuels from agricultural wastes.

And in this budget, we propose to fund the new “bringing genomes to life” initiative that will explore how genomes account for the functioning of cells. Our objective is to eventually learn how to use this information to address the Department’s missions in energy resources, the effect of energy use on humans, plants and animals, and in radioactive waste cleanup.

Conclusion

When I say that DOE has its eyes on the future, this is what I mean.

Reviewing the scope of this budget makes our national responsibilities crystal clear. We take those responsibilities seriously. That is why we have made the changes we have made. But it would also have been a mistake – and a costly one – had we decided to institute sweeping reforms now without the kind of strategic direction we will receive from a variety of wide range policy reviews. It is also why we have held back from some changes as well.

Little could have been gained, and much lost, had we elected to follow the previous administration’s priorities.

A more sensible course was obvious to us -- submit a budget, which clearly fulfills commitments and establishes key priorities, but which at the same time just as clearly signals our intention to rethink a host of programs. Transitions such as this take great effort.

But the national interest – our energy future and our national security – demand that we do no less.

Thank you.

Environmental Management

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2000 Comparable Approp.	FY 2001 Comparable Approp.	FY 2002 Request to Congress	FY 2002 vs. FY 2001	
Environmental Management					
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management..	4,586,227	4,965,955	4,548,708	-417,247	-8.4%
Defense Facilities Closure Projects.....	1,062,177	1,080,331	1,050,538	-29,793	-2.8%
Defense Environmental Management Privatization.....	82,609	-32,000	141,537	+173,537	+542.3%
Non-defense Environmental Management.....	301,579	279,195	228,553	-50,642	-18.1%
Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation.....	336,109	392,502	363,425	-29,077	-7.4%
Subtotal. Environmental Management.....	6,368,701	6,685,983	6,332,761	-353,222	-5.3%
Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund Discretionary Payments.....	-420,000	-419,076	-420,000	-924	-0.2%
Total, Environmental Management.....	5,948,701	6,266,907	5,912,761	-354,146	-5.7%

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The **Environmental Management (EM)** program manages the safe clean up of the environmental legacy from fifty years of operating the nation's nuclear weapons production and federally sponsored nuclear-related research. The program manages the remediation of sites contaminated by defense and civilian activities, and receives appropriations in separate defense and non-defense accounts.

The EM program strives to: protect worker health and safety to reduce risks; maintain compliance with all applicable requirements and enforceable milestones or schedules established in agreements; and to work cooperatively with regulators, stakeholders, local community officials, and Tribal Nations.

The FY 2002 budget addresses the major cleanup problems outlined in environmental agreements and other essential requirements. There are, however, individual sites where cleanup is being deferred in favor of reducing higher-risk problems elsewhere. This budget request places its first priority on protecting the health and safety of EM's workers and the public as well as continuing to mitigate high risks. Maintaining compliance is also a priority, and will require that we continue an open and frank dialogue with regulators to ensure that EM is pursuing the most efficient and cost-effective solutions to cleanup and compliance needs, and sequencing work appropriately. To address this challenge, EM is continuing to strengthen project management, ensuring that work is governed by sound scientific principles, and implementing contracting strategies that drive cleanup work to be completed safely, on-schedule, and within budget.

Consistent with this overarching philosophy, a number of key projects will receive particular emphasis in FY 2002, including:

- Design and construction of the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Project (formerly the Tank Waste Remediation System), a vitrification plant to immobilize the high-risk, highly radioactive waste at the Hanford Site in Washington—funding for this project has shifted from a privatization project to the Post 2006 Completion—Office of River Protection account;
- Vitrify highly radioactive waste at the Savannah River Site in South Carolina and a selection of technology to pre-treat a portion of that waste;
- Maintain schedule to cleanup and close the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site in Colorado and the Fernald Environmental Management Site in Ohio;

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

- Place the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Ohio safely in cold-standby;
- Ship transuranic waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico to support closure or compliance requirement, including shipments from the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory in support of the Idaho Settlement Agreement;
- Stabilize spent nuclear fuel or move spent nuclear fuel from wet to dry storage at a number of site across the EM complex; and
- Give priority to waste receiving sites (i.e., Nevada Test Site and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant) to maintain other sites' shipping schedules.

The Office of Environmental Management is funded through five separate appropriations accounts: **Defense Closure Projects** (FY 2001 \$1,080M; FY 2002 \$1,051M); **Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management** (FY 2001 \$4,966M; FY 2002 \$4,549M); **Defense Environmental Management Privatization** (FY 2001 - \$32M; FY 2002 \$141.5M); **Non-Defense Environmental Management** (FY 2001 \$279M; FY 2002 \$229M), and **Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation** (FY 2001 \$393M; FY 2002 \$363M).

In FY 2002, the request reflects the addition of new activities including: (1) the **Uranium Facilities Maintenance and Remediation** appropriation established by Congress in FY 2001; (2) a **Post-2006 Completion/Office of River Protection** program within the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriation; (3) an **Excess Facilities** program in both the defense and non-defense appropriations; and (4) **Safeguards and Security** activities in the Defense Facilities Closure Projects and Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management appropriations.

Defense Facilities Closure Projects

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2000 Comparable Approp.	FY 2001 Comparable Approp.	FY 2002 Request to Congress	FY 2002 vs. FY 2001	
Defense Facilities Closure Projects					
Site closure.....	1,001,524	1,025,680	1,004,636	-21,044	-2.1%
Safeguards and security.....	60,653	54,651	45,902	-8,749	-16.0%
Total, Defense Facilities Closure Projects.....	1,062,177	1,080,331	1,050,538	-29,793	-2.8%

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The **Defense Facilities Closure Projects** site closure account supports sites where the goal is to complete cleanup by the end of FY 2006, with no further DOE mission, other than surveillance and maintenance, is envisioned. Defense Facilities Closure Projects provides funding in two categories: Site Closure and Safeguards and Security. This account includes funding for projects managed by the Ohio Field Office i.e., (Mound, Ashtabula, Battelle Columbus Laboratory, Fernald) and the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRAM CHANGES (\$ in millions)

Defense Facilities Closure Projects (FY 2001 \$1,080.3; FY 2002 \$1,050.5)..... - \$29.8

Site Closure (FY 2001 \$1,025.7; FY 2002 \$1,004.6)..... - \$21.1

Ohio (FY 2001 \$406.3; FY 2002 \$376.0) - \$30.3

- **Ashtabula (FY 2001 \$16.2; FY 2002 \$9.7)** The Ashtabula Environmental Management Project site is owned and operated by Earthline Technologies (formerly the RMI Titanium Company) and is contaminated with radiological and hazardous materials resulting from previous operations for DOE to shape radioactive materials. The FY 2002 request will deactivate two facilities and support remediation work being performed. Upon completion, the site will be released to Earthline Technologies for unrestricted use. The decrease reflects a shift to higher priority activities. - \$6.5
- **Columbus Environmental Management Project (FY 2001 \$16.1; FY 2002 \$10.1)** The Columbus Environmental Management Project includes two geographic areas (King Avenue and West Jefferson). The original scope of decontamination activities at King Avenue has been completed. The **West Jefferson** site decommissioning effort involves three major buildings and approximately six acres of external grounds. The FY 2002 request: continues remote-handled transuranic waste shipments to the receiving site; initiates demolition of Building JN-3; continues characterization of West Jefferson external areas; provides project management support and required core environmental activities; and surveillance and maintenance activities. Upon completion, the site will be returned to the private owner. The decrease reflects a shift to higher priority activities. - \$6.0
- **Fernald (FY 2001 \$283.5; FY 2002 \$285.3)** The Fernald Environmental Management Project site encompasses 1,050 acres where high purity uranium metal products were produced at the site for DOE and its predecessor agencies from 1951 to 1989. Thorium was also processed, but on a smaller scale, and is still stored on-site.

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Uranium processing operations were limited to a fenced, 136 acre tract known as the Production Area. In FY 2002, the program will: continue facility shutdown of non-nuclear facilities; complete shipments of all nuclear materials; process two billion gallons of wastewater/groundwater; process and ship 92,570 cubic meters of waste pit material to the permitted disposal facility; submit Administration Complex Draft Implementation Plan and Integrated Remedial Design Package for Area 3B/Area 4B to the Environmental Protection Agency; and draft the Remedial Action Work Plan for the Waste Retrieval Operations. A net increase supports: additional decontamination and decommissioning; additional activities associated with the accelerated waste retrieval project currently under contract; and the start of Title I and II design for the Silos 1 and 2 waste remediation contract. If the contractor can complete the overall project by December 2006, they can earn the maximum incentive fee.+\$1.8

- **Mound (FY 2001 \$90.5; FY 2002 \$70.9)** The Miamisburg Environmental Management Project manages the Mound Plant, located on 306 acres in Ohio. The plant was built in the late 1940's to support research and development, testing, and production for the Department's defense nuclear weapons complex and energy research program, until 1994. The request will continue: critical path activities to support deactivation and decontamination of the Mound tritium complex; off-site disposition of transuranic waste and off-site disposition of remediation-generated low-level waste; and complete one soil release site assessment and one soil release site cleanup. The decrease reflects a shift toward higher priority activities.-\$19.6

Rocky Flats (FY 2001 \$619.4; FY 2002 \$628.6).....+ \$9.2

The Rocky Flats Plant was established by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1951 as one of seven production plants in the U.S. Weapons Complex. The Rocky Flats Plant played an integral part in the nation's nuclear defense in that it manufactured nuclear weapons components from materials such as plutonium, beryllium, and uranium. The current Rocky Flats mission encompasses the management of the site waste and special nuclear materials and their removal from the site. This includes deactivation, decommissioning and demolition of the site facilities; and cleanup, closure and conversion of the site for beneficial use in a manner that is safe, responsible, physically secure, and cost-effective. The FY 2002 request maintains site closure for FY 2006.

The request will: continue D&D activities and packaging of 620 "3013" containers of plutonium metal/oxide; shipment of 2,824 cubic meters of transuranic waste to the **Waste Isolation Pilot Plant**; provide for site-wide landlord/infrastructure activities; and store, treat, and dispose of mixed low-level waste, low-level waste, and hazardous waste off-site. The net increase reflects enhanced deactivation and remediation activities.

Safeguards and Security (FY 2001 \$54.6; FY 2002 \$45.9)..... - \$8.7

The Safeguards and Security Program ensures appropriate levels of protection for EM facilities and cleanup sites. The FY 2002 request provides for protection of DOE security concerns, anticipates evolving threats, and maintains a balance of the security mission with the operation of the Fernald, Miamisburg, and Rocky Flats sites. The decrease reflects reconfiguration of activities to reduce the footprint of protected areas at Rocky Flats.

Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2000 Comparable Approp.	FY 2001 Comparable Approp.	FY 2002 Request to Congress	FY 2002 vs. FY 2001	
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management					
Site/project completion.....	1,011,424	1,070,489	911,986	-158,503	-14.8%
Post 2006 completion					
Waste treatment and immobilization plant.....	105,673	376,171	500,000	+123,829	+32.9%
Other office of river protection.....	334,739	379,557	312,468	-67,089	-17.7%
Other post 2006 completion.....	<u>2,364,918</u>	<u>2,418,047</u>	<u>2,107,733</u>	<u>-310,314</u>	<u>-12.8%</u>
Total, Post 2006 completion.....	2,805,330	3,173,775	2,920,201	-253,574	-8.0%
Science and technology.....	229,766	252,112	196,000	-56,112	-22.3%
Excess facilities.....	—	—	1,300	+1,300	N/A
Safeguards and security.....	196,554	202,996	205,621	+2,625	+1.3%
Program direction.....	<u>361,706</u>	<u>363,196</u>	<u>355,761</u>	<u>-7,435</u>	<u>-2.0%</u>
Subtotal, Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Mgmt.....	4,604,780	5,062,568	4,590,869	-471,699	-9.3%
Less security charge for reimbursable work.....	—	-5,244	-5,391	-147	-2.8%
Use of prior year balances and other adjustments.....	<u>-18,553</u>	<u>-91,369</u>	<u>-36,770</u>	<u>+54,599</u>	<u>+59.8%</u>
Total, Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Mgmt.....	4,586,227	4,965,955	4,548,708	-417,247	-8.4%

Site/Project Completion

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Defense Site/Project Completion account provides funding for projects expected to be completed by FY 2006 at sites or facilities where a DOE mission will continue (e.g. nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship) beyond FY 2006. The principal Defense EM cleanup sites are managed by: the Albuquerque; Idaho; Oakland; Richland; and Savannah River Operations Offices; and the Office of River Protection which focuses on cleanup of tank wastes near the Columbia River in Washington.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRAM REQUEST (\$ in millions)

Site/Project Completion (FY 2001 \$1,070.5; FY 2002 \$912.0)..... - \$158.5

- **Albuquerque (FY 2001 \$61.5; FY 2002 \$39.5)** The Albuquerque Operations Office supports cleanup activities at: the **Kansas City Plant**, Missouri; the **Pantex Plant**, Texas; **Sandia National Laboratory**, California and New Mexico; the **Pinellas Plant**; Florida; and the **South Valley Superfund Site**, New Mexico. The FY 2002 request continues: groundwater treatment and monitoring at the Kansas City and Pantex Plants; remediation at Sandia National Laboratory, including the excavation of the Chemical Waste Landfill and the Classified Waste Landfill; and annual payments for Pinellas post-contract medical, pension, and other contractor worker benefits. The net decrease reflects transfer of funds to higher priority activities, completion of all previously planned remediation projects at the Pantex Plant, and a reduction in legal expenses needed for contractual obligations with the plant operator for the South Valley Superfund Site. - \$22.0
- **Idaho (FY 2001 \$99.1; FY 2002 \$58.7)** The Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory safely manages the disposal of on-site mixed low-level, low-level, hazardous, and other wastes. The FY 2002 request: continues treatment and disposal of mixed low-level, low level and hazardous wastes; completes final design and initiates construction activities for the **Cathodic Protection System**; and completes funding for the **Health Physics**

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Instrument Laboratory. The net decrease reflects: the transfer of transuranic waste activities to Post 2006 Completion; support for higher priority activities; and completion of the Electrical and Utility Systems Upgrade Project. - \$40.4

- **Oakland (FY 2001 \$2.0; FY 2002 \$0.8)** The Oakland Operations Office manages waste cleanup activities at the **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory**. The FY 2002 request initiates full-scale operation of the **Decontamination and Waste Treatment Facility**. The decrease reflects completed construction of the Decontamination and Waste Treatment Facility - \$1.2
- **Richland (FY 2001 \$475.7; FY 2002 \$419.6)** The Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site treats, manages cleanup activities at facilities associated with the production of nuclear materials during the Cold War. The FY 2002 request focuses on cleanup outcomes and includes: packaging of stabilization plutonium; continued surveillance and maintenance activities to ensure safe operation of associated facilities for stored special nuclear materials; support for International Atomic Energy Agency non-proliferation activities at the **Plutonium Finishing Plant**; continued stabilization of plutonium nitrate solutions; continued limited clean-out of B Cell; and continued centralized program and surveillance and maintenance activities to ensure safe operation of the **K Basins**, fuel conditioning facilities and equipment, and the canister storage building. Projects will be restructured to direct funded infrastructure, emergency preparedness, analytical services and information resources. The decrease supports higher priority activities at the Office of River Protection..... - \$56.1
- **Office of River Protection (FY 2001 \$1.3; FY 2002 \$2.0)** The Office of River Protection maintains safe operation of the underground high-level waste storage tanks at the Hanford site and manages construction and operation of a tank waste complex to clean up Hanford's highly radioactive tank wastes. The increase reflects a full year of design activities. + \$0.7
- **Savannah River (FY 2001 \$430.9; FY 2002 \$391.4)** The Savannah River Site treats and disposes of legacy materials and wastes resulting from nuclear materials produced during the Cold War. The FY 2002 request: continues management and stabilization of "at risk" spent nuclear fuel and nuclear materials in the **F and H Areas** in support of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendations 94-1 and 2000-1, and decontamination of Building 772-F; initiates construction of the **Americium/Curium Vitrification project**; upgrades the old **HB-Line ventilation system**; stabilizes plutonium scrub alloy from Rocky Flats and receives transuranic waste from Mound. The net decrease reflects completion of the following projects: upgrade of the H-Tank Farm Storm Water Systems, Regulatory Monitoring and Bioassay Lab; Tank Farm Support Services lines; CFC HVAC Chiller Retrofit project; and the K-Area Nuclear Material Storage Modification subproject. It also reflects cancellation of the Actinide Packaging and Storage Facility subproject; and support for higher priority activities. - \$39.5

Post 2006 Completion

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Post 2006 Completion account focuses on projects currently planned to require funding beyond FY 2006. The principal Defense EM cleanup activities will be carried out by: the Albuquerque, Idaho, Nevada, Oakland, Oak Ridge, Richland, and Savannah River Operations Offices; the Carlsbad Field Office; and the Office of River Protection, which focuses on the cleanup

of tank wastes near the Columbia River in Washington. A variety of multi-site activities are also supported, including the EM program's contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRAM REQUEST (\$ in millions)

Post 2006 Completion (FY 2001 \$3,173.8; FY 2002 \$2,920.2) - \$253.6

- **Albuquerque (FY 2001 \$89.6; FY 2002 \$75.7)** The Albuquerque Operations Office manages cleanup activities at **Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)**, the Albuquerque Nuclear Materials Stewardship Office and the Off-Site Recovery Program. The FY 2002 request: continues to store, sort, segregate, and repackage transuranic waste; characterize and store mixed low-level waste; and continues remediation activities, groundwater investigations and deep well installations at LANL. The Off-Site Source Recovery Program will continue to recover excess sealed sources from DOE's Naval Reactors program. The request also provides for Agreements-In-Principle and supports the Albuquerque Nuclear Material Stewardship Project. A net decrease reflects a shift toward higher priority activities. - \$13.9
- **Carlsbad (FY 2001 \$190.9; FY 2002 \$164.6)** The Carlsbad Field Office manages the **Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP)** for safe disposal of transuranic waste and maintains an effective system for the transportation of transuranic waste. The FY 2002 request for the WIPP will fully support contact-handled mixed transuranic waste shipments from: **Rocky Flats, Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, Savannah River** and the **Argonne National Laboratory-East**. WIPP will maintain a receipt rate of 14 contact-handled transuranic waste shipments per week during FY 2002. The net decrease reflects a reduction in the number of shipping sites and scope of the WIPP Disposal Phase Certification and Experimental Program..... - \$26.3
- **Idaho (FY 2001 \$303.5; FY 2002 \$276.6)** The **Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory** manages and disposes of high-level radioactive waste, transuranic waste, and spent nuclear fuel. The FY 2002 request continues: characterization, treatment, and disposal of transuranic waste to **WIPP**; remediation, waste management, landlord/infrastructure activities; analysis of spent nuclear fuel; and initiates conceptual design for a sodium-bearing waste treatment project. The decrease reflects: changes in priorities within the cleanup program and new planning of specific assessment and cleanup activities; review planned General Plant Projects work scope; and completion of the Three Mile Island-2 spent nuclear fuel transfer. - \$26.9
- **Nevada (FY 2001 \$87.2; FY 2002 \$82.8)** The Nevada Operations Office manages waste cleanup activities at inactive sites and facilities contaminated as the result of historic nuclear testing activities conducted at the **Nevada Test Site, Tonopah Test Range, Nellis Air Force Range** in Nevada, and eight other locations in five states. The FY 2002 request: supports modeling of underground test areas; completes 22 release site assessments and three remedial actions; characterizes, segregates, and repackages TRU/Mixed TRU; maintains the capability to dispose both on-site and off-site low-level waste; and continues Agreements-In-Principle and grants. The decrease reflects reduced drilling for data collection purposes. - \$4.4

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

- **Oakland** (FY 2001 \$47.5; FY 2002 \$34.5) Activities managed through the Oakland Operations Office, plan and implement remediation and waste treatment, storage, and disposal activities at the **Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL)** in California and the **Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory** in New York. The FY 2002 request supports ongoing projects at LLNL including: continued operation and maintenance of groundwater treatment; and commercial disposition of mixed low-level waste and low-level waste. The decrease reflects: completed installation of several groundwater treatment systems and characterization phases for a majority of operable units at Site 300; and reduced characterization activities at the Separations Process Research Unit at the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory. - \$13.0

- **Oak Ridge** (FY 2001 \$277.4; FY 2002 \$244.1) Activities managed by the Oak Ridge Operations Office, direct and monitor environmental restoration, waste management operations, and materials stabilization activities on the Oak Ridge Reservation and at several off-site locations. The FY 2002 request supports: continued disposition of legacy waste at the Oak Ridge Reservation; management and integration activities for the **Environmental Management Waste Management Facility** privatization project; disposal of low-level waste and mixed low-level waste at commercial facilities; and remediation, surveillance, and maintenance activities at Y-12, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and the East Tennessee Technology Park. Funding for FY 2002 also supports: the transport of six shipments of spent nuclear fuel to the **Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory**; remedial action at ORNL Main Plant Surface Impoundments A and B; removal of contaminated sediments in direct contact with groundwater adjacent to **White Oak Creek**; continued conversion of uranium on sodium fluoride traps to an oxide for repackaging and storage; and initiation of flush and fuel salt removal of the **Molten Salt Reactor**. The net decrease reflects: completion of the Bethel Valley Metal Recovery Facility D&D; completion of significant early actions at ORNL; and support for higher priority activities. - \$33.3

- **Richland** (FY 2001 \$222.5; FY 2002 \$164.6) Activities managed by the Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site, clean up soil contamination along the Columbia River in the central area; decontaminate and decommission surface facilities; and monitor, mitigate, and remediate chemical and radioactive contaminants that have migrated into the vadose zone and groundwater beneath the site. The FY 2002 request supports: cleanup and safe disposal of surface contamination along the **Columbia River**; monitoring, mitigation, and remediation of chemical and radioactive contaminants that have migrated into the vadose zone and groundwater beneath the site; management of large volumes of liquid and solid wastes generated as a result of site cleanup; management of the site infrastructure for the duration of the cleanup; providing hazardous materials and emergency response training at the **HAMMER** facility; and implementation of the science and technology roadmap for the integration of vadose zone and groundwater activities. The decrease supports higher priority activities at the Office of River Protection. - \$57.9

- **Office of River Protection** (FY 2001 \$755.7; FY 2002 \$812.5) The Office of River Protection manages the safe operation of the underground high-level waste storage tanks in Hanford, WA; and construction and operation of the tank waste complex to complete the cleanup of Hanford's highly radioactive tank waste. The FY 2002 request maintains **Tank Waste Characterization** program capability and capacity to support safe operations including caustic and comparability analysis; mitigates tank safety issues for high priority Watch List tanks; continues to operate, maintain, and upgrade tank farm facilities to safely receive and store waste; operates the single-shell tank interim stabilization program; continues design activities for waste retrieval

systems; and provides program management services and oversight for the **Waste Treatment Immobilization Plant**. The plant design will be continued and some long-lead materials will be procured with requested funds. The increase continues design and initiates construction activities for the **Low Activity Waste Facility**, the **Pretreatment Facility**, and the **High-Level Waste Facility** components of the plant.+\$56.8

- **Savannah River (FY 2001 \$702.7M; FY 2002 \$586.0M)** Activities managed by the Savannah River Site treat and dispose of the legacy materials and wastes resulting from the production of nuclear materials during the Cold War. The FY 2002 request continues: management of spent nuclear fuel; stabilization and storage of nuclear materials; surveillance and maintenance activities; receipt of foreign (33 casks) and domestic (21 casks) research reactor spent nuclear fuel; vitrification of at least 150 canisters of high level-waste at the **Defense Waste Processing Facility**; operation of a **Melt and Dilute Technology Demonstration Facility** for treatment of spent nuclear fuel; design and start construction of a **Salt Processing Pilot Plant** facility; disposal of mixed, low-level and hazardous waste; completion of five site release assessments; and landlord activities. The net decrease reduces funding for environmental remediation, waste management activities, high-level waste removal, and support activities. - \$116.7
- **Multi-Site (FY 2001 \$77.8; FY 2002 \$58.8)** Multi-Site activities provide management and direction for various crosscutting EM and DOE initiatives; establish and implement national and departmental policy; and conduct analyses and integrate activities across the DOE complex. The FY 2002 request supports: Headquarters technical support efforts; Environmental and Regulatory Analysis; Hazardous Waste Operator (HAZWOPER) training; and Emergency Preparedness. The decrease reflects: transfer of the stewardship program to the Science and Technology program, a reduction in the need for safety expertise to meet requirements of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Recommendation, reduced training under the DOE Hazardous Worker Training Grant Program, and a shift toward higher priority activities. - \$19.0

D&D Fund deposit (FY 2001 \$419.0; FY 2002 \$420.0) +\$1.0
 These funds provide the EM Program's contribution to the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.

Science and Technology

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The **Science and Technology** program develops new technologies to improve environmental cleanup capabilities. The Science Program conducts basic research to provide new approaches to solve the Department's environmental cleanup problems. Through the application of technological discoveries, this basic and applied research program offers the promise of accelerated cleanup at reduced cost. The program conducts four major focus areas including: Transuranic and Mixed Waste (formerly Mixed Waste); Radioactive Tank Waste; Subsurface Contaminants; Deactivation and Decommissioning; and Nuclear Materials. The Transuranic and Mixed Waste focus areas address the technical needs identified for management of high-level waste and closure of tanks. The Subsurface Contaminants focus area provides solutions that address difficult remediation problem areas. The Transuranic and Mixed Waste focus areas develop technologies that address the mixed low-level and mixed transuranic waste needs. The Deactivation and Decommissioning focus area addresses development, demonstration and deployment of new and innovative deactivation and decommissioning technologies.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRAM REQUEST (\$ in millions)

Science and Technology (FY 2001 \$252.1; FY 2002 \$196.0) - \$56.1

- **Radioactive Tank Waste Remediation (FY 2001 \$55.6; FY 2002 \$55.8)** Request focuses on systems to retrieve and transfer sludges and tank waste residues to enable continued processing and tank closure and improve high-level immobilization processes through increased waste loading, new canister decontamination methods and advanced melter design. + \$0.2
- **Subsurface Contaminants (FY 2001 \$40.7; FY 2002 \$32.5)** Request supports work in dense non-aqueous phase liquids to better understand long-term movement and fate of these contaminants; technologies to improve longer-life surface caps, landfill stabilization, and verification and monitoring systems; and characterization, monitoring, modeling and analysis of source contaminants. - \$8.2
- **Transuranic and Mixed Waste (FY 2001 \$31.9; FY 2002 \$23.1)..... - \$8.8**
Request supports work to characterize radionuclide components in boxes destined for disposal to WIPP or another RCRA subtitle C facility, and development of a high temperature treatment systems option.
- **Deactivation and Decommissioning (FY 2001 \$27.1; FY 2002 \$17.5)**
Request focuses on multi-site deployment of improved and innovative technologies for underwater visual inspection; improved technologies to deactivate and decommission radionuclide separation facilities; and improved innovative technologies to deactivate and decommission fuel and weapon component fabrication facilities. - \$9.6
- **Nuclear Materials (FY 2001 \$7.9; FY 2002 \$9.5)..... + \$1.6**
Request focuses on developing improved processes to stabilize plutonium left in the weapons production pipelines; development of aqueous processing technologies for residue materials; and development of stabilization, characterization, and packaging technologies for storage and disposal of spent nuclear fuel.
- **Environmental Management Science Program (FY 2001 \$36.9; FY 2002 \$32.1)..... - \$4.8**
Request provides funding for longer-term basic research to solve intractable problems that threaten the successful closure of DOE sites.
- **Idaho Environmental Systems Research and Analysis (FY 2001 \$21.0; FY 2002 \$0.0)..... - \$21.0**
The program supports problem-driven research based on the technology needs and gaps that have been defined by the scientific community in partnership with the sites. No activity is planned for FY 2002.
- **Small Business Innovative Research Program and Technology Applications (FY 2001 \$23.0; FY 2002 \$17.4) - \$5.6**
Decreases reflect completion of activities and changes in estimated Small Business Innovative Research assessments.
- **EM Long-Term Stewardship (FY 2001 \$8.0; FY 2002 \$8.0)..... \$0**
Request supports policy and planning; training; outreach; operation, maintenance, and monitoring of physical and institutional controls; and information management.

Excess Facilities (FY 2001 \$0; FY 2002 \$1.3) + \$1.3

The Defense Excess Facilities Transfer Program is initiated to manage the final disposition of excess contaminated physical facilities to generate significant risk and cost reductions. This program will facilitate the cross-program transfer of excess contaminated facilities from the Offices of Defense Programs and Nuclear Energy, and associated deactivation and decommissioning activities. In FY 2002 the program will support: surveillance and maintenance activities for the Explosive Machinery and Weapons/Explosive Assembly Building 12-024 Complex and Inert Storage Building 12-025, Explosives Filter Area 11-044, and Zone 10 facilities at the **Pantex Plant**; the Critically Experimental Lab (9213) and the Plating Shop (9401-02) at **Y-12**; and the Plutonium Fuel Form Facility, Plutonium Extraction Facility, and Old Met Lab at **Savannah River**. The increase reflects the comparable transfer of funding from the former "owner" of the facility.

Safeguards and Security (FY 2001 \$203.0; FY 2002 \$205.6) + \$2.6

The Safeguards and Security program ensures appropriate levels of protection for EM facilities and sites. The increase reflects additional protective force staffing access control functions for the Savannah River Technology Center and purchase of capital equipment items and/or general plant project requirements.

Program Direction (FY 2001 \$363.2; FY 2002 \$355.8) - \$7.4

The Program Direction account supports the federal workforce responsible for the overall direction and administrative support of the EM Program, including both Headquarters and field personnel. The Program Direction account provides funding for salaries, benefits, travel, training, support services, and other related expenses for 2,708 FTEs; 2,254 (or 83 percent) of these FTEs are located in field offices.

Defense Environmental Management Privatization

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2000 Comparable Approp.	FY 2001 Comparable Approp.	FY 2002 Request to Congress	FY 2002 vs. FY 2001	
Privatization initiatives, various locations.....	126,609	90,092	141,537	+51,445	+57.1%
Use of prior year balances.....	-44,000	-25,092	—	+25,092	+100.0%
Rescission.....	—	-97,000	—	+97,000	+100.0%
Total, Defense Environmental Management Privatization...	82,609	-32,000	141,537	+173,537	+542.3%

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Privatization projects are funded in a non-traditional manner where the contractor assumes most of the up-front risk for a project. DOE attempts to obtain the best price for the desired products and services by using open competition to award fixed-price contracts. The selected contractor is responsible for and owns development of the technologies, equipment, and facilities necessary to deliver the end product. The contractor does not receive payment until specified goals are met and services are rendered. Current privatization projects include: the Idaho Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage Project; the Idaho Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Facility; the Oak Ridge Transuranic Waste Treatment Project, the Oak Ridge Environmental Management Waste Management Facility, and the Remote-Handled Transuranic Waste Transportation Services Project for WIPP. In addition, the Department proposes two new privatization projects in FY 2002: the Paducah and Portsmouth Disposal Facilities.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRAM REQUEST (\$ in millions)

Paducah Disposal Facility, Oak Ridge (FY 2001 \$0.0; FY 2002 \$13.3)+\$13.3
 The facility will be an on-site disposal cell with an initial capacity of 600,000 cubic yards for near-term remediation waste. It will be a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) compliant, above-grade earthen structure. The contractor will design, construct, operate and cap the disposal facility.

Portsmouth Disposal Facility, Oak Ridge (FY 2001 \$0.0; FY 2002 \$2.0).....+\$2.0
 If on-site disposal is selected as an alternative in a Record of Decision, the request proposes to authorize the construction of a suitable facility.

Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project, Idaho (FY2001 \$65.0; FY 2002 \$40.0).....- \$25.0
 This project will treat and manage 65,000 cubic meters of alpha and TRU mixed waste located in retrievable storage at the INEEL Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC). Cumulative funding through FY 2002 provides for approximately 65 percent of the funding needed for the physical construction phase of this project based on the awarded fixed-price contract. Funding for the construction phase will continue to be requested through 2004.

Spent Nuclear Fuel Dry Storage Project, Idaho (FY 2001 \$25.1; FY 2002 \$49.3).....+ \$24.2
 The project will provide licensed interim dry storage for three types of Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) at INEEL. Currently the fuel resides in facilities at INEEL, various universities, and at foreign research reactors. This project would place SNF containing approximately 55 metric tons of heavy metal into interim dry storage. Cumulative funding through 2002 provides 44 percent of the capital funding needed. Funding for the construction phase of this project will continue to be requested through 2007.

Transuranic Waste Treatment Project, Oak Ridge (FY 2001 \$0; FY 2002 \$10.8).....+ \$10.8
 This project began in August 1998 for the processing of waste for final disposal. Cumulative funding through FY 2002 provides for 100% of the funding needed for the physical construction phase.

**Environmental Management Waste Management Facility, Oak Ridge
(FY 2001 \$0; FY 2002 \$26.1) + \$26.1**

This project began in December 1999 to design, construct, operate, and cap up to 1.3 million cubic yards of waste. Cumulative funding through FY 2002 provides for 42 percent of the capital funding needed. Funding for the construction phase of this project will continue to be requested through FY 2005.

Non-Defense Environmental Management

(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2000 Comparable Approp.	FY 2001 Comparable Approp.	FY 2002 Request to Congress	FY 2002 vs. FY 2001	
Non-Defense Environmental Management					
Site closure.....	63,560	52,997	43,000	-9,997	-18.9%
Site/project completion.....	116,328	90,631	64,119	-26,512	-29.3%
Post 2006 completion.....	129,278	135,603	120,053	-15,550	-11.5%
Excess facilities.....	—	—	1,381	+1,381	N/A
Subtotal, Non-Defense Environmental Management.....	309,166	279,231	228,553	-50,678	-18.1%
Use of prior year balances.....	-7,587	-36	—	+36	+100.0%
Total, Non-Defense Environmental Management.....	301,579	279,195	228,553	-50,642	-18.1%

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The EM Program manages and addresses the environmental legacy resulting from civilian nuclear energy research. The nuclear energy R&D of the Department, and its predecessors generated waste, pollution, and contamination which pose unique problems, including unprecedented volumes of contaminated soil and water, and a vast number of contaminated structures. Sites on the Non-Defense side of the EM program include: the **Grand Junction Office** in Colorado; the **Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action** groundwater projects at various locations mostly in the West; and the **Weldon Springs Site** in Missouri.

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROGRAM REQUEST (\$ in millions)

Site Closure (FY 2001 \$53.0; FY 2002 \$43.0).....- \$10.0
 Site Closure projects will result in the closure of specific sites by 2006, after which, no further Departmental mission is envisioned except for long-term surveillance and maintenance. This account includes funding for the Weldon Spring Site in Missouri.

- **Oak Ridge (FY 2001 \$53.0; FY 2002 \$43.0).....- \$10.0**
 The Oak Ridge Operations Office manages the **Weldon Spring Site Remedial Action Project** in Missouri. The FY 2002 request completes the Weldon Spring Remedial Action Project and final site restoration. The post remediation activities require long-term surveillance and maintenance.

Site/Project Completion (FY 2001 \$90.6; FY 2002 \$64.1).....- \$26.5
 The Site/Project Completion account provides funding for projects where cleanup is expected to be completed by FY 2006, at sites or facilities with a continuing DOE mission beyond FY 2006. This account includes projects and sites for the Albuquerque, Chicago, Idaho, Oakland, and Richland Operations Offices.

- **Albuquerque (FY 2001 \$0.5 FY 2002 \$1.4).....+\$0.9**
 The Albuquerque Operations Office supports cleanup activities at the **Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute** in New Mexico. The FY 2002 request continues groundwater monitoring of former environmental restoration sites. The increase supports on-site disposal of hazardous and mixed low-level waste.
- **Chicago (FY 2001 \$44.4; FY 2002 \$32.4).....- \$12.0**
 The Chicago Operations Office manages EM activities at the Argonne National Laboratory-East (ANL-East) in Illinois, ANL-West in Idaho, and the Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) in New York. The goal is to complete remediation of all currently baselined scope activities for Chicago managed sites by FY 2006, and transfer long-term surveillance and maintenance activities to the landlord programs after completion of site cleanup activities. The FY 2002 request supports: remediation and groundwater activities, surveillance and maintenance and characterization for the **Brookhaven Graphite**

Research Reactor at BNL; facility decommissioning and remediation at **ANL-East**; and operation and maintenance activities for soil remediation and monitoring at **ANL-West**. In addition, Potentially Responsible Party payments will be made against DOE's portion of Princeton University Site A/B remediation costs as a Potentially Responsible Party. The net decrease reflects completion of activities and support of higher priority activities.

- **Idaho (FY 2001 \$29.5; FY 2002 \$14.9)**.....- \$14.6
The Idaho Operations Office manages non-defense cleanup activities at: the **Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL)**, **Grand Junction Office**, the **Monticello Mill site**, and the **Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action Groundwater** project. The FY 2002 request supports interim remedial action and groundwater monitoring for the Monticello mill site, the inactive uranium mill sites, and activities conducted by the Grand Junction Office. At INEEL, activities include initiation and transfer of **Power Burst Facility and Materials Test Reactor** spent nuclear fuel to the Idaho Nuclear Technology and Engineering Center, and continued surveillance and maintenance of the Power Burst Facility and the Materials Test Reactor Canal. Decrease reflects completion of activities at **Monticello Projects** and reflects support of higher priority activities.
- **Oakland (FY 2001 \$14.7; FY 2002 \$13.9)**..... - \$0.8
The Oakland Operations Office manages cleanup activities at the **Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL)**, the **General Atomics Facility**, the **Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research (LEHR)**, and the **Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC)**. The FY 2002 request: continues monitoring, maintenance, and operation of groundwater treatments systems at LBNL and SLAC; completes remedial and D&D activities at the LEHR and LBNL; and supports surveillance and maintenance of the irradiated fuel materials at General Atomics. The decrease reflects support of higher priority activities.
- **Richland (FY 2001 \$1.5; FY 2002 \$1.5)**.....\$0
The Richland Operations Office manages the cleanup and surveillance and maintenance activities for buildings formerly used by DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy. The FY 2002 request supports stabilization and deactivation of Building 309 and the Plutonium Recycle Test Reactor.

Post 2006 Completion (FY 2001 \$135.6; FY 2002 \$120.0)- \$15.6
The Post 2006 Completion account focuses on cleanup projects currently planned to require funding beyond FY 2006. This account includes projects and sites at the Albuquerque, Chicago, and Oakland Operations Offices.

- **Albuquerque (FY 2001 \$3.8; FY 2002 \$2.5)**..... - \$1.3
The Albuquerque Operations Office supports the recovery of public and private-sector sealed radioactive sources to the **Los Alamos National Laboratory**. The FY 2002 request supports preparation of DOE performance objectives for Greater-than-Class-C Low-Level Waste for review by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and recovery and storage off-site of 1,000 sealed sources. The decrease supports higher priority activities.
- **Idaho (FY 2001 \$5.1; FY 2002 \$5.4)**.....+ \$0.3
The Idaho Operations Office supports the Long-Term Surveillance and Maintenance Program at the Grand Junction Office. The FY 2002 request provides for continued surveillance and maintenance activities including the **Atlas Site in Moab, Utah**. The increase supports surveillance and maintenance activities.
- **Oakland (FY 2001 \$ 17.6; FY 2002 \$13.5)**- \$4.1

ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Oakland Operations Office manages remediation and waste treatment, storage, and disposal activities at the **Energy Technology Engineering Center (ETEC)**, and the **General Electric Vallecitos Nuclear Center (GE)** in California. The FY 2002 request supports: facility deactivation, cleanup and landlord activities for ETEC; and surveillance, maintenance and negotiation of a cost-shared arrangement with GE. The reduction reflects support of higher priority activities.

- **Ohio (FY 2001 \$105.6; FY 2002 \$95.1)**..... - \$10.5

The Ohio Field Office supports cleanup activities at the **West Valley Demonstration Project** in New York. The FY 2002 request will: complete deactivation of the Vitrification Facility; continue construction for the **Remote Handled Waste Facility**; continue waste retrieval from the head-end cells and other decontamination efforts; initiate deactivation of a spent fuel pool, and continue low-level waste shipments. The net decrease reflects the completion of high-level vitrification and the Spent Nuclear Fuel storage and shipment program.

- Excess Facilities (FY 2001 \$0; FY 2002 \$1.4)**..... + \$1.4

The Excess Facilities Transfer Program is initiated to manage the final disposition of excess contaminated physical facilities to generate significant risk and cost reductions. This program will facilitate the cross-program transfer of excess contaminated facilities from the Office of Science and the associated deactivation and decommissioning activities. The FY 2002 request supports surveillance and maintenance activities for the **High Flux Beam Reactor** at Brookhaven National Laboratory, and the **Research Services (Building 9735)** and the **Hot Storage Garden (Building 3597)** at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. The increase reflects the comparable transfer of funding from the former "owner" of the facility.

- Multi-Site Activities (FY 2001 \$3.5; FY 2002 \$3.5)**..... \$0

The FY 2002 request continues support for the Packaging Certification and Transportation Safety program to better coordinate DOE-wide non-defense program efforts.

**Recommendation to the Department of Energy
Risk-Based Cleanup of Environmental Restoration Sites
at Los Alamos National Laboratory**

BACKGROUND: The Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board (NNMCAB) understands that the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) uses five criteria used to select cleanup options for hazardous waste sites: a) long-term effectiveness and permanence; b) treatment to reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume; c) short-term effectiveness; d) whether the remedy can be implemented; and e) cost. Other criteria include state and community acceptance. Concerning decisions for cleaning up contaminated sites at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), members of the NNMCAB understand the following.

- LANL uses theoretical calculations to determine the health risks that hazardous materials might inflict, such as chronic sickness or the occurrence of cancer.
- LANL decisions to clean up contaminated sites are based on the following risk levels: a) for carcinogens, the chance that one person in 100,000 might develop an excess cancer; b) for radioactive material, a dose of 15 millirem per year above background radiation, which is approximately 325 millirem per year; c) for noncarcinogens, a level determined by (EPA) above which adverse effects might occur.
- LANL risk-based calculations are based on expected land use. Land uses may include residential, farming, recreational, industrial, office workers, childcare, etc. Native American and other special uses are included in the risk calculations when appropriate.
- Cleanup plans generally must be approved by a regulatory agency, such as the New Mexico Environment Department. In evaluating LANL cleanup plans, NMED may use different guidelines in determining health risks. NMED may require more thorough cleanup before agreeing that no further action is necessary.
- Risks to the environment, including plants and animals, are considered in evaluating cleanup alternatives.

The NNMCAB understands that Department of Energy (DOE) decisions for radioactive cleanups are based on the as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) concept. The ALARA approach chooses cleanup alternatives using current standard cleanup methods under current costs. The NNMCAB assumes that DOE actively pursues the development of improved cleanup methods. The NNMCAB agrees that ALARA decisions are an appropriate means of determining how much to clean up hazardous sites. The NNMCAB further agrees that when a cleanup reaches the ALARA optimum for a particular site, further cleanup may not be beneficial to the public or to the environment.

RECOMMENDATION: The NNMCAB recommends that risk-based decisions are not the only factor in deciding to clean a site and that ALARA calculations are not based solely on minimizing cost. Other considerations may be the presence of hot spots, the presence of physical hazards in connection with regulated hazardous material, the

potential for release to more sensitive areas, public concerns and perception of risk, alignment with Long Term Environmental Stewardship goals, etc.

The NNM CAB further recommends the following considerations be explicitly addressed in cleanup plans and that the information be available to the public prior to reaching decisions for cleanups.

- What hazardous materials are present and for which materials is the cleanup conducted? Will all regulatory requirements and public agreements be met by the cleanup?
- What land use was used to calculate risk and what are other likely land uses? Have Native American uses been included in the assessment, if appropriate?
- How does the decision relate to the DOE Long Term Environmental Stewardship Plan? What actions taken now will reduce the cleanup burden on future generations? What happens if more contaminated spots are discovered after the cleanup is completed?
- What will become of the material removed from the site, and how will it be transported? Is the material being disposed in a place that exposes other people to the hazards?
- What will become of the hazardous material left on the site after the ALARA cleanup is completed?
- What disturbance and damage will be inflicted upon the environment while doing the cleanup, and what actions are proposed to mitigate adverse effects?

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board
1640 Old Pecos Trail, Suite H
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
505-989-1662 phone 505-989-1752 fax
1-800-218-5942 toll free
tnash@doeal.gov http://www.nnmcab.org

**Environmental Restoration Committee
9 April 2001 at Johnson Controls, Espanola**

Committee Members Present:

Fran Berting, Chair
Dorothy Hoard
Jim Brannon (via phone)

Committee Members Absent:

George Chandler
Maxine Ewankow
Angelina Valdez

Resource People:

Ted Taylor, DOE LAAO
Eliza Frank, NMED
Woody Woodworth, DOE LAAO
John Hopkins, LANL ER
MJ Byrne, DDFO, DOE LAAO
Terra Nash, ATA Services

INTRODUCTION: Dr. Fran Berting opened the meeting at 6:15pm. Introduction of all attendees was not necessary. Fran asked for any comments before the meeting got started. Dorothy asked that the March meeting minutes be changed as her comments may have been misquoted. Terra also noted that Angelina's name was missing from the listed committee members. *Terra will make the changes and re-issue them by e-mail.*

MDA H CMS: John handed out copies of the Corrective Measures Study for MDA H that was submitted by DOE and LANL to NMED on March 30, 2001. Although this document does not specifically state that it is a draft, it essentially is. *LANL and DOE would like any comments that the committee could provide*, but wanted them to keep in mind that NMED is also in the process of commenting on it also.

John provided an overview of the document. Items covered in the overview were the area maps, a summary of items disposed of, current day risks, objectives for the corrective action, the site conceptual model, identified data needs and the initial list of alternatives. Also noted were the monthly progress reports and the criteria for choosing/justifying a remedy.

It was noted that the lithium hydride disposed of in MDA H could be reactive if it came in contact with water.

Many questions were asked about the borehole information provided and need for additional boreholes. The older boreholes (drilled in mid 90's) have been backfilled but the information from the core samples is included in the RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) report. (The RFI is being drafted and is expected to be issued before next month's meeting.) The newest borehole is not backfilled and additional sampling is taking place there. The major finding with the boreholes is the

presence of a tritium water vapor plume. Additional sampling will take place to identify the extent of the plume. There are also four boreholes near MDA J and low levels of tritium vapor have been found there and are assumed to have come from MDA H. No tritium has been disposed of in MDA J, which is located a few hundred feet west of MDA H.

Ted pointed out Section 4 of the CMS report that covers the alternatives for corrective action. This section provides 8 alternatives for consideration at this time. DOE and LANL are looking for feedback on the alternatives and would like any suggestions for technologies that they may have overlooked. A memo will be issued and posted on the LANL ER web requesting any possible alternatives that the HPT may have overlooked. The LANL ER web page is <http://erproject.lanl.gov>.

MDA WORKSHOP PLAN: The workshop will be co-sponsored by the NNM CAB ER Committee, DOE and LANL. The tentative date for the workshop was chosen as June 19th with the alternative date of June 20th. *Terra will check with Carmen Rodriguez of LANL ER to verify that one of these two dates will not conflict with any other major meetings or events.* The workshop will be held at the DOE Los Alamos Area Offices and take place from approximately 4 to 7 or 8 PM. The format of the workshop will be a poster session format with stations set up so that individuals can wander around the area and talk to the experts in various topic areas. Two summary sessions will occur, one half way through the workshop and one at the end. It was requested that the experts stationed at the posters try to summarize the questions that were most often asked during the meeting to create a follow up document. *Woody also requested that the HPT have some time (45 minutes) at the June Board Meeting to brief the board on the workshop outcome and other items dealing with the entire MDA review process.*

A mailer will be sent out with the date of the workshop inviting the public to the workshop. The mailer should be sent to the ER and NNM CAB mailing list (making sure to not send duplicate mailers to people on both lists). Carmen's services were also offered for helping to create posters for the workshop.

Possible stations for the workshop are as follows:

- Techcon – stabilization
- Steve Dwyer, Sandia – landfill covers
- RFI Report
- Excavation
- Monitoring
- NNM CAB in general
- ER Committee's workplan and involvement with MDAs

The goals of the workshop (from the HPT perspective) are to present the problem to the public, explain the process that is required, show the alternatives and get feedback from the public.

The public involvement with the CMS can also be used as part of the NEPA public involvement. The DOE is hoping to combine the CMS process with the NEPA process with an end result of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

RECOMMENDATION ON RISK BASED ANALYSIS BY DOROTHY HOARD: Dorothy got a couple of new comments on the last version of the risk based analysis recommendation and made

some more revisions. The comments were attached to the revised recommendation that she handed out.

To address John Young's comments in the first paragraph, the references to what New Mexico does regarding the analysis process was changed from New Mexico to LANL. Angelina Valdez also had a comment about what is done if hot spots or additional areas of contamination are found after the clean up. Dorothy added another bullet in the additional recommended issues that the ER committee would like DOE to address on every risk assessment to include this. The location of one sentence in the document was changed for the purpose of clarification.

Several comments were made about this recommendation and how well it was thought out and written.

Dorothy moved to present this recommendation to the Board at the April 25th meeting. Jim Brannon seconded the motion. The motion passed. *This will be put on the agenda for April's Board meeting with a time allotment of 20 minutes.*

NEXT MONTH: The HPT will share the new borehole data and the technical memo requesting assistance on screening alternatives. It was decided that the ER committee would continue to focus on MDAs through June and then move on to the topic of Long Term Stewardship.

An agenda item needs to be added next month to include time for a detailed discussion on how the ER committee wants to use their funds for a subject matter expert. Specifically what do we want the SME to review, answer what questions and report back to the committee in what format?

AJOURN: Fran adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

ACTIONS:

1. *Terra will make the changes to March ER Committee Meeting Minutes and re-issue them by e-mail.*
2. *The ER Committee members will review the Corrective Measures Study for MDA H and provide LANL and DOE with comments at the next meeting, May 14th.*
3. *Terra will check with Carmen Rodriguez of LANL ER to verify that June 19th will not conflict with any other major meetings or events. If that date does have a conflict then check June 20th. An Email will be sent out to confirm the actual date.*
4. *Terra will ensure that the HPT will have some time (45 minutes) at the June Board Meeting to brief the board on the workshop outcome and other items dealing with the entire MDA review process.*
5. *Terra will ensure that the Risk Based Analysis Recommendation will be put on the agenda for April's Board meeting with a time allotment of 20 minutes.*

Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board
1640 Old Pecos Trail, Suite H
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
505-989-1662 phone 505-989-1752 fax
1-800-218-5942 toll free
tnash@doeal.gov <http://www.nnmcab.org>

Report
From Agustin Garcia
Pro-Temp Chair Monitoring and Surveillance Committee
Dated: January 23, 2001

It is with profound concern that I submit this report to the Citizens' Advisory Board. It would seem timely and appropriate that at the dawning of a new millennium, out of concern and duty, it should be of utmost importance and priority, to ensure that our environment is restored to its original status before it became polluted and contaminated by science and technology, sometimes under the guise of progress.

It is ironic that in our goal and duty as citizens, to protect our environment, we find ourselves looking more and more to the media for information on what is occurring. We need only to read our newspapers and almost weekly we read an article concerning some form of pollution or contamination.

Consider the recent newspaper article on some of our rivers being polluted by residues from anti-depressants, painkillers and other prescribed medicines.

However, the most disturbing statistics or facts to consider are the following:

- On every continent more people are adopting the American consumer life-style of convenience and abundance
- Americans, only five percent (5%) of the world's population, consume one-fourth (25%) of its oil
- Americans use more water and own more cars than anybody else
- Americans waste more food than most people in sub-Saharan Africa eat

In the last century, Americans transformed two percent (2%) of their country with pavement; an area the size of Georgia lies under asphalt. If everybody on earth consumed as much oil as the average American, the world's known reserves would be gone in a decade.

Water, the essential for survival, is fast becoming (especially in the Southwest) something we must protect and conserve. Consider that through diversion, the Colorado River, by the time it reaches its mouth in the Sea of Cortez has no water in it.

What has all this to do with Monitoring and Surveillance? Simply that in our own backyard we (our scientists and experts) are developing technologies that may or will require more monitoring than we can perceive.

Let us remember that what we are presently attempting to rectify took 50 years of reckless and wanton waste disposal.

Let us pause and ponder and reflect as to our responsibilities to the present and to the future.

Agustin R. Garcia
Monitoring and Surveillance

Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board

**Fernald
Hanford
Idaho
Nevada**

**Northern New Mexico
Oak Ridge
Paducah**

**Pantex
Rocky Flats
Savannah River**

March 5, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary, Department of Energy
1800 E Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20405

Dear Secretary Abraham:

We congratulate you on your appointment as Secretary for the Department of Energy. We are members of the Department's Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Boards who are concerned with environmental cleanup, stabilization and disposition of radioactive and hazardous materials and waste, and long-term stewardship at the Department's nuclear weapons and research facilities.

We represent regions of this country that supported the initial and continuing effort to safeguard this nation through the development and deployment of defense nuclear weapons. Our regions now face the complex and demanding task of cleanup of legacy defense nuclear waste and contamination that transcends individual Administrations.

We recognize that you are under tremendous pressure to reduce DOE spending. We submit, however, that federal spending for nuclear waste cleanup should not be considered discretionary. In most cases, legally binding cleanup commitments are in place with state and federal environmental regulators. Even where they are not, DOE should fund those actions necessary to reduce current and future risks in accord with the values and needs of local communities. Individual businesses would not be permitted to avoid their environmental responsibilities simply because they had other funding priorities. The federal government should do no less than it demands of all citizens, on behalf of us all.

In addition, if the Administration ever hopes to make a compelling case for the use of nuclear power as a component of our energy program, the Administration must:

- demonstrate its ability to successfully clean up past nuclear waste problems,
- demonstrate its ability to successfully manage nuclear waste in the future, and
- assure Americans of the safe operation of nuclear power plants.

We urge you to continue to be an advocate for adequate funding to meet the Department's responsibilities as good stewards for the land, the air and water. We invite you to our respective regions to show the progress that has been made and what remains to be done.

Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board

**Fernald
Hanford
Idaho
Nevada**

**Northern New Mexico
Oak Ridge
Paducah**

**Pantex
Rocky Flats
Savannah River**

February 28, 2001

The Honorable Spencer Abraham
Secretary
Department of Energy
1800 E Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20405

Dear Secretary Abraham:

We would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your recent appointment as Secretary for the Department of Energy. We are members of the Department's Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Boards who are concerned about environmental cleanup, stabilization, disposition of radioactive and hazardous materials and waste, and long-term stewardship at the Department's nuclear facilities.

We represent regions of this country that supported the initial and continuing effort to safeguard this nation through the development and deployment of defense nuclear weapons. It was in support of this effort that our regions now face the complex and demanding task of cleanup of legacy defense nuclear waste and contamination that transcends individual Administrations. This Administration will be confronted with a myriad of funding requests for worthwhile endeavors but none will be as deserving as preserving the well being of future generations by cleaning up the legacy defense nuclear waste and contamination left by our nuclear weapons development effort.

The Environmental Management program must realize significant increases in funding over the next few years to meet its legally binding cleanup commitments with our respective regions. These increases are driven by the construction of facilities necessary to initiate a final cleanup solution and the continuation of current cleanup activities at the agreed upon pace. We expect this Administration to request and actively support funding adequate to meet or exceed legal requirements, reduce current and future risks, and in accord with values and needs of local communities. We expect that the Department will protect the public, workers and the environment.

We look forward to your commitment to meeting the Department's responsibilities as good stewards for the land, the air and water. We invite you to our respective regions to show the progress that has been made and what remains to be done.

Individual Chair Signatures

FY2001 Budget
Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board

Expenses	Budget	Actual Costs	% Spent	Remaining
Office Rent	\$30,000.00			
September Utilities		57.80		
October Rent		890.00		
November Rent		890.00		
December Rent		890.00		
December Utilities		150.42		
January Rent		890.00		
January Utilities		76.39		
February Rent		890.00		
February Utilities		76.39		
March Rent		890.00		
March Utilities		92.56		
April Rent		890.00		
April Utilities		78.75		
May Rent		890.00		
Subtotal		\$7,652.31	26%	\$22,347.69
Office Supplies	\$1,500.00			
Miscellaneous supplies - Nov		108.66		
Subscriptions - Journal North		191.52		
Board Meeting Signs		418.00		
Office Supplies		79.04		
Office Supplies		21.36		
Conv. Ck fee		6.27		
Check Fee		1.20		
Office Equipment		1329.96		
Digital Camera		1365.82		
Vacuum Cleaner		94.48		
Plaque Kits		199.10		
Laptop Computer		2315.00		
Office Supplies		92.29		
Printer Repair		47.90		

FY2001 Budget
Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board

Expenses	Budget	Actual Costs	% Spent	Remaining
Audio Tapes		11.94		
Office Supplies		84.89		
Ink cartridges		52.99		
Camera Cable		39.95		
Office Supplies		71.10		
Copier Paper		7.99		
Copier Paper		23.97		
Coding Labels		8.26		
Newspaper Subscriptions		287.10		
Pocket Folders		19.50		
Office Supplies		10.80		
Office Supplies		18.59		
Copier Paper		80.00		
Subtotal		\$6,987.68	466%	-\$5,487.68
Phone	\$4,500.00			
Manzanares - October		16.94		
US West - October		222.09		
Pager - October		12.00		
Pager - November		12.00		
Qwest - November		229.81		
Qwest - December		220.05		
Pager - December		12.00		
Qwest - January		223.35		
Pager - January		24.00		
Qwest - February		257.76		
Pager - February		24.00		
Pager - March		24.00		
Qwest - March		220.12		
Subtotal		\$1,498.12	33%	\$3,001.88
Postage	\$1,500.00			

FY2001 Budget
Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board

Expenses	Budget	Actual Costs	% Spent	Remaining
November		154.00		
November		187.00		
February		68.00		
Subtotal		\$409.00	27%	\$ 1,091.00
Publicity	\$6,000.00			
Monitor - October		95.76		
New Mexican - October		150.08		
Journal North - October		90.25		
Garrity Group - Channel 13 news clip		45.53		
New Mexican - November		150.08		
Journal North - November		143.64		
Monitor - November		95.76		
New Mexican - January		157.74		
Monitor - January		109.30		
Journal North - January		101.50		
Monitor - February		111.00		
Journal North - February		143.40		
New Mexican - February		194.57		
Radio Ads for March meeting KTAO		150.00		
New Mexican - March		157.74		
Monitor - March		103.14		
Journal North - March		101.50		
New Mexican - Office Space		642.46		
New Mexican - April		157.74		
Journal North - April		152.25		
Las Vegas Optic - April		76.12		
Monitor - April		144.28		
Subtotal		\$3,273.84	55%	\$2,726.16
Meeting Expenses	\$200.00			
December Rental at White Rock		15.00		
April Rental at Highlands University		100.00		

FY2001 Budget
Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board

Expenses	Budget	Actual Costs	% Spent	Remaining
Subtotal		\$115.00	58%	\$ 85.00
Retreat	\$10,000.00			
Consultants from 1999 Retreat		3626.83		
Subtotal		\$ 3,626.83		\$ 6,373.17
Board Training	\$1,500.00			
Subtotal				\$ 1,500.00
Board Travel				
Monthly Board Meetings	\$6,000			
Alejandro 9/27		27.30		
Berting - 10/25		16.26		
Berting - 10/25		9.76		
Berting - 11/15		6.50		
Berting - 1/24		27.60		
Berting - 2/28		13.80		
Berting - 3/28		183.54		
Brannon - 12/13		181.68		
Brannon - 1/24		186.30		
Brannon - 3/28		137.66		
Chandler - 9/27		16.26		
Chandler - 10/25		16.25		
Chandler - 11/13		16.26		
Chandler - 1/24		27.60		
Chandler - 2/28		13.80		
Chandler - 3/28		183.54		
Espinoza - 3/10 Orientation		17.26		
Espinoza - 3/28		185.54		
Fabryka-Martin - 3/28		185.54		
Feehan - 10/25		22.76		
Feehan - 11/15		22.76		
Gale - 2/28		19.67		
Gale - 3/28		191.75		

FY2001 Budget
Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board

Expenses	Budget	Actual Costs	% Spent	Remaining
Galpin - 8/23		57.20		
Galpin - 9/27		22.76		
Galpin - 10/25		21.46		
Galpin - 11/15		22.76		
Garcia - 10/25		15.60		
Garcia - 11/15		22.76		
Garcia - 12/13		26.00		
Garcia - 1/24		34.50		
Garcia - 2/1 Board member Interviews		34.50		
Garcia - 3/26/01		29.67		
Garcia - 3/28/01		179.40		
Hoard - 3/28		183.54		
Johnston - 9/27		18.20		
Johnston - 10/25		9.76		
Johnston - 11/15		22.76		
Johnston 12/13		14.63		
Johnston 1/24		3.45		
Johnston - 2/28		17.94		
Johnston - 3/10 Board member Interviews		27.60		
Johnston - 3/28		186.30		
Jordan 2/28		166.26		
Jordan 3/10 New Member Orientation		76.60		
Manzanares - 9/22		68.91		
Manzanares - 9/27		138.76		
Manzanares - 10/04		44.86		
Manzanares - 10/25		145.75		
Manzanares - 11/15		218.05		
Manzanares - 1/12		45.50		
Manzanares - 1/24		223.30		
Manzanares - 2/1 Board member interviews		51.76		
Manzanares - 2/20		175.35		

FY2001 Budget
Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board

Expenses	Budget	Actual Costs	% Spent	Remaining
Manzanares - 2/28		140.83		
Maruska - 8/23		65.66		
Switlik - 2/28		10.35		
Valdez - 3/28		159.46		
Subtotal		\$4,391.58	73%	\$1,608.42
National SSAB Board Meetings	\$5,000			
Armijo 11/05		847.45		
Brannon - 10/25-10/27 Stewardship Conference		762.63		
Brannon - 2/8-9 SSAB Chairs Meeting		437.08		
Hoard - 2/8-9 SSAB Chairs Meeting		820.95		
Johnston - 2/8-9 SSAB Chairs Meeting		662.72		
Manzanares - 11/5 Transportation Symposium		675.12		
Manzanares - 2/8-9 SSAB Chairs Meeting		679.39		
Subtotal		\$4,885.34	98%	\$114.66
Travel Subtotal		\$9,276.92	186%	-\$4,276.92
Environmental Restoration Committee	\$47,400.00			
Subtotal				\$ 47,400.00
Community Outreach Committee	\$11,600.00			
Printing for Newsletter 2/9		150.45		
Website Maintenance		191.40		
Web Registration		70.00		
Subtotal		411.85	4%	\$ 11,188.15
Monitoring & Surveillance Committee	\$32,600.00			
Reference Books		85.50		
Armijo 12/13		131.60		
Garcia - 11/15		22.76		
Garcia - 11/8		34.45		
Subtotal		\$188.81	1%	\$32,411.19
Waste Management Committee	\$35,500.00			
Subtotal				\$ 35,500.00

FY2001 Budget
Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board

Expenses	Budget	Actual Costs	% Spent	Remaining
Staffing	\$76,858.74			
October		11646.85		
November		8493.32		
December		12143.59		
January		9473.20		
February		8716.99		
March		2667.31		
Subtotal		\$53,141.26	69.14%	\$23,717.48
Staff Travel	\$4,000.00			
DuBois 10/1-12/15		325.37		
DuBois 12/16 - 3/14		220.91		
Subtotal		\$546.28		\$ 3,453.72
Facilitator	\$7,000.00			
Subtotal				\$ 7,000.00
Subtotal	\$270,158.74	\$87,127.90	32%	\$183,030.84
8% Contingency	\$6,970.23			
Subtotal				
DOE Headquarters - SSAB Chairs Meeting	\$10,000.00			
Grand Total	\$277,128.97	\$87,127.90	31%	\$190,001.07