



REGIONAL COALITION OF LANL COMMUNITIES

City of Española – Los Alamos County – Rio Arriba County – Santa Fe County
City of Santa Fe – Taos County – Town of Taos – Pueblo of Ohkay Owingeh – Pueblo of Jemez

Rio Arriba Council Chambers

1122 Industrial Park Road
Española, NM 87532

June 12, 2015

9:00a-11:00a

Meeting Minutes

A. Call to Order – Mayor Lucero – 9:00a-

Attendance: Chair, Mayor Alice Lucero, City of Espanola; Vice Chair, Councilor Andrew Gonzales, Town of Taos; Commissioner Henry Roybal, Santa Fe County; County Councilor Kristin Henderson in place for Steve Girrens, Los Alamos County Council; Commissioner Mark Gallegos, Taos County; Governor Earl Salazar, Pueblo of Ohkay Owingeh; and Governor Raymond Loretto, Pueblo of Jemez; Rio Arriba County Commissioner Barney Trujillo

B. Confirmation of Quorum - Mayor Lucero – Confirmed.

C. Approval of Agenda – Mayor Lucero – All approved.

D. Approval of Meeting Minutes - 9:15a (Tab A – In board packet) – Approved.

Chair Alice Lucero: [The] next item is approval of the minutes. Is there a motion to approve the minutes?

Andrew Gonzales: So moved.

AL: Is there a second?

Henry Roybal: Second.

AL: Okay, it's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes under discussion, are there any items that need to be corrected—okay, hearing none. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying 'aye'.

All: Aye

AL: All opposed say *ensign*—motion carries. The motion was approved unanimously.

E. Discussion/Action Items

AL: We go onto discussion items. The first one is to hear from our New Mexico Congressional delegations, each delegation on their updates. So—who do we have here today? I saw Michelle—oh okay—(pause)—okay, thank you for being here.

1. Representative from Congressman Lujan's office: Good morning Madam Chair and commission. The only thing I have this morning is that we'll be hearing from Christine Gelles this morning, but I just wanted to make mention of two things that are impacting New Mexico: the Environmental Management contract as well as the M&O (management and operating) contract for Sandia National Labs. I discussed this with Andrea a couple of weeks ago and the Congressman is taking input from the community right now. There's an open comment period for the Sandia issue, but if any of you do have any feedback that you would like to provide to our office, we're welcoming that feedback. As far as what you'd like to see in those contracts moving forward, and that's all I have this morning. Thank you.

AL: Thank you very much. Okay, anyone else? Yes, please. And identify yourself for the record, thank you.

Paul, representative from Senator Martin Heinrich: Good morning, my name is Paul from Senator Martin Heinrich's office and it's a pleasure to be here this morning. First of all I wanted to thank you for your letter in regards to the Manhattan Project and for implying the need to highlight the employees from this area, and I wanted to thank you for that. The second thing that we wanted to point out is that Senator Heinrich is on the Energy Committee as you all know and the two bills that I wanted to give a quick update of that had appeared this week before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee were the Microlab bill which provides the \$50 million, or approximately \$3 million per Lab to create space where the Lab staff, academia, and industry can collaborate outside of defense as well as the Maturation or Voucher bill that also had a hearing this week. This is the Bill that gets the tech transfer, and I just wanted to give you that update, thank you.

AL: Thank you very much. Michelle? Okay, I knew I'd seen you.

Michele, representative from Senator Tom Udall's office: Good morning Madam Chairwoman and members of the Coalition. Since the last meeting there's been progress in defining the appropriations and allocations that will affect New Mexico and LANL. Cleanup funding reflects cessation of work at WIPP. Cleanup funding is below the President's request, and far below the Senator's request. It's more than the House mark, however. There is good support for New Mexico programs related to the Labs, water projects, military bases, and veterans. There are strong allocations and funding levels associated with the work up at LANL. Senator Udall supported an unsuccessful amendment to end sequestration—and I won't go into what sequestration means—but most simply it's basically, these triggers that when appropriations hit a certain amount, there's going to be, across the board, a decrease by a set percentage, and it would be very detrimental to New Mexico, so he supported an amendment was voted down, but when the funding bills go to the full Senate, Sen. Udall will continue to ending sequestration but I just wanted to make the Coalition aware that sequestration is the big battle in terms of these funding bills right now. The National Defense Authorization Act is scheduled to come up early next week for reauthorization, so we'll know more next week.

AL: Okay Michelle, may I ask, what is the amount of money they're appropriating for cleanup?

Michelle: I think Christine [Gelles] has that number here.

AL: Okay Michelle, may I ask, what is the amount of money they're appropriating for cleanup?

Michelle: I think Christine has that number here.

AL: Thank you very much Michelle. Now, anyone else from the Congressional Delegation? Okay, thank you all for being here. And now we have a presentation by Christine Gelles, acting

manager of Environmental Management at the Los Alamos field office. Christine.

- Christine Gelles:** Thank you. Good morning Everybody. Thank you Mayor. I'd like to begin with providing my apologies for not being able to attend your last meeting as scheduled and planned, so thank you for your understanding and your patience and for providing me a second opportunity to meet with you. I have had the opportunity to meet with a number of the members of the Coalition during the three months that I've been here acting as the manager of the new EM Los Alamos field office. And it's been a pleasure but I'm really looking forward to this dialogue here as part of your formal proceedings.

This presentation was structured to respond to a number of items that Andrea had identified that the Coalition was interested in hearing about, and then I included two items that a month ago would have been quite contemporary in light of recent developments. The AIB report and the WIPP settlement principles. They're not quite as newsworthy today, but I'll go ahead and summarize them quickly.

A quick update on our transition. As I mentioned, our office is new. I'm standing up the Environmental Management (EM) office and I think many of you are aware of the rationale behind this. This is consistent with the organizational approach that we have proven over 25 years that works best for us to conduct the most well planned and executed environmental cleanup activities. So we're looking to bring many of our lessons learned from around the complex to inform and improve our cleanup pace here in Los Alamos.

It became operational March 22nd, 2015. A permanent manager is being recruited even before I arrived here in Los Alamos, and it's gone through its hiring process and a selection will be made in the very near term. How quickly that new individual will arrive is a function of who that is and how many steps of approval and processing it has to go through, but I've committed to Mark Whitney, our acting assistant Secretary from Environmental Management that I will remain here as long as needed and then provide for a period of transition overlap as well so that there is a minimal amount of disturbance to the progress that we're beginning to see here in standing up this new EM organization.

We have several staff recruitments to add to the federal workforce in the EM Los Alamos field office. Two vacancies are posted right now, and two additional vacancies will be posted in the near future. I have a temporary detail from the NNSA organization to fill, and the deputy manager jobs, so there are a total of seven additional hires that are planned in the near term, and then we're also doing a detailed work force analysis that will build out the broader organization and add the competencies that EM will need to be as self-reliant as possible. In the meantime, we have a wonderfully collaborative relationship with the NNSA field office so that we can ensure that we're remaining very integrated.

In terms of contracts and acquisitions, I've heard from one of the Congressional Delegates that there's interest in this, and I can certainly understand that. So our cleanup activities for FY15, are continuing to be implemented by LANS, the laboratory M&O contractor through the MNO contract that NNSA manages. We are continuing our discussions with LANS to establish our own environmental management contract with them that hopefully will become effective at the start of the next fiscal year, so on October 1 and would provide for them to do business with us directly for a period of up to two years, maybe a little bit longer. We haven't negotiated the deal but we're getting close to that. So basically LANS would pose us two contracts with the DOE; one with the NNSA for the broad laboratory missions and one for EM. Then, in parallel, we're conducting the detailed acquisition planning for some competitive cleanup contracts. We started that process in early March with an Industry Day that was extremely well attended and just this week Jack [sic], a high level acquisition official at Headquarters EM made a statement that confirms what I've been telling folks here locally, and that's that we have an acquisition strategy that's nearing completion and that will be shared publicly and will shed some light on how many

contracts we intend to pursue and a general sense of what the pace of those contracts would be. But, it's an important process that takes up to about two years to carefully plan, compete, and award contracts that are well defined enough that we can ensure there will be no confusion about what work needs to be completed on what schedule. So, while we're taking the time to do that we're looking forward to having LANS continue to perform well in legacy cleanup work over that same period of time.

As I mentioned, we're working closely with NNSA. We have a very formal memorandum of understanding between our two field offices that is nearly ready for signature that details in quite a lot of specificity who's responsible for what and how we're going to work together. Until such time, we're able to build our EM LA federal organization such that we have the necessary nuclear safety oversight officials on board and fully qualified we're going to continue to rely on the NNSA field office to provide nuclear safety oversight of EM cleanup activities including those that involve the legacy transuranic waste. There won't be any significant shift in how those activities are overseen from a safety and compliance perspective in the near term.

The WIPP Accident Investigation Board (AIB) report: I won't spend a lot of time on this because there's been a number of public forums and you're probably even fatigued on this topic, but the AIB report being published in April was a very important accomplishment for us because it finally allowed for us to begin to move past the events and into the necessary corrective actions. There were 24 conclusions of need and 40 judgments of need, and 22 of those judgments of need were directly related to LANL. Some of them are Federal responsibilities and some of them are contractor responsibilities, but in total there will be five corrective action plans developed that will be synthesized and all of them are nearing a level of maturity that they will likely be submitted to the EM headquarters safety office that chartered that AIB review probably within the next several weeks or maybe a month. We try to get corrective action plans in place within a couple of months of the final issuance of an Accident Investigation Board report. There's a link [here](#) and if you want to get into details I'll be happy to take any questions on those items. I just want to assure you that we are aggressively moving forward with corrective actions that are responsive to the concerns identified in the AIB report and those processes were already beginning to be defined before the AIB report was published. We weren't waiting for this report to tell us, we had a number of other reviews that had informed us.

WIPP settlements - This is an amazingly important event that occurred on April 30th. The signing of the principles of agreement has set the framework for us to resolve the potential significant fines associated with the noncompliances that occurred both at WIPP and at Los Alamos. NMED has shown extreme leadership in coming to the table with us and the DOE is extremely pleased with the structure of these principles of agreement. What we've been doing since they were published on April 30th is we've resumed technical discussions with the NMED staff so that we could basically spell out, again in great detail, exactly what actions will be taken to satisfy the deficiencies that were identified in the administrative compliance orders that were issued in 2014 against WIPP and New Mexico and we remain hopeful that all of those efforts will conclude such that there will be a final stipulated order and the final settlement will be signed between the two parties within the relatively near future.

Another important point about the principles of agreement is they acknowledged that upon the settlement of this agreement the two parties could begin to resume conversations about renegotiating the consent order, the 2005 consent order. We all know that the current consent order is not an attainable completion date. To complete all of the legacy cleanup by the end of this fiscal year, we need to come up with an updated and risk-informed replacement agreement. This agreement what we hope we'll be sending up before this calendar year, working with NMED to accomplish this task.

I was asked to provide a summary of our Fiscal Year 15 appropriation and we are nearly $\frac{3}{4}$ of the

way through our spending this fiscal year, so we don't have to spend a lot of time on here but some of the key points:

Our total funding amount was \$189.6 million and this breaks it down by the four major projects that organize the EM cleanup scope. 1) Solid waste PBS-0013 is where the transuranic waste activities are. 2) Some of the groundwater remediation includes some of our interim measure to address the chromium plume contamination. 3) And then we have PBS-0040D which is, of course, decontaminating and decommissioning activities and that's a very low level of effort right now because it's not the high-risk work. 4) And then PBS 101 miscellaneous programs is where we provide funding for our Los Alamos Pueblo Project, our natural resources damage assessment activities, and of course the funding for this very important Coalition. Again we don't have to go into this in detail, I know you have the slides, but these four or five bolded bullets outline what the major work areas are this fiscal year, ensuring the protection of the water, ensuring the safe management of our nitrate salt and transuranic waste inventory as well as the other TRU waste that is currently above ground in Area G, continued storm water sampling and monitoring, and then work that is required by our regulatory agreements to address contamination and aggregate areas, and then the very minimal effort of Area D and Area D activities in TA-21.

On this slide, I just wanted to share with you what our vision is for trying to bring together all of the necessary dynamic factors so that we can really optimize our future cleanup investments here. This is really bringing to bear the lessons learned from other EM cleanup sites. We need to revise our legacy cleanup. We need to ensure that it includes all of the necessary scope. Our previous Baseline did not, for instance, include all of the required activities to address the Chromium Plume because when we first developed it we didn't fully understand the extent of the Chromium Plume contamination. We need to develop our acquisition plan that I referenced and develop detailed requests for proposals that outline what scope we will want these future contractors to do. We need to align the regulatory requirements, not just the settlement negotiations to resolve the administrative compliance orders, but again the renegotiation of the consent order if we're able to proceed with that. And then we need to allocate, well we need to obtain and then allocate appropriately the appropriate resources, and that's the people, the human capital, as well as the budget. We need absolutely transparent alignment with our tribal and community stakeholders about what we're going to plan to do. All of these things have to come together simultaneously. That's what makes this such an interesting position for me, a great opportunity to try and inform this planning and resolve some technical issues at the same time. There's also a multi-year budget planning exercise underway at EM headquarters to inform the FY 17 budget formulation. We're in the process of formulating our FY17 budget request right now, and as I mentioned we're continuously working on the acquisition planning efforts. There will have to be iteration on all five or six of these points here over the course of the next six or nine months before everything becomes fully aligned but I'm confident that we can continue with dialogue and ensure that we're providing information as needed to keep you informed of that.

So this gets to the question of the FY16 budget. Our request to Congress was \$188.6 million for the cleanup activities. That was exactly \$1 million less than what we had received in FY15 and this is how it breaks down amongst the four projects. I can tell you that when we developed this budget request we didn't fully understand the—we hadn't yet received the AIB report—we didn't fully understand the degree of science and evaluation and permitting that would be necessary to address the nitrate salt portion of the TRU inventory so there may need to be some adjustment among these projects but we'll work with Congress and the office of budget management to do that once there's a final appropriation. Now whereas the House Appropriations mark did not provide our full request, it cut us by \$8.6 million, so the House provided \$180 million. The Senate marked us at our request level. Once the two Chambers conference, we expect to receive somewhere between \$180 million and \$188.6 million. I'm certainly hoping and I'm providing all the necessary information to justify getting the full requested amount. Even that amount will present a challenge for us given the emergent work scope of what we have a defined process for working with NMED to ensure that our priorities are aligned as we decide how to spend whatever the ultimate appropriated amount is. The general priorities will remain the same as they're

reflected in the framework agreement that was signed between the parties in 2011 and that's that we're going to ensure the protection of the surface and groundwater, continued interim measure for the chromium plume; we're going to fully characterize it and try to keep it from migrating beyond the border of the site boundary, the safe and secure management of the transuranic waste and the planning and treatment of the nitrate salts and the continued progress in soil remediation planning and remediation as we need to to satisfy our existing Consent Order obligations.

Now, I'm not certain we have time to go into each of these slides but I know the Coalition was interested in the Chromium project and I understand that there's likely to be a request to have a more technical presentation provided by Dan Katzman from LANS sometime in the future and I fully support that and encourage you to hear from him because he's a master of this project and I think he can really illuminate. I can give you a quick highlight of this and then if you have some questions we can follow up as appropriate. The Chromium Plume is going to be addressed in two phases. The first phase is what we call the interim measure, it's sort of a bias for action where we need to drill some wells, take some samples, and really understand the exact concentrations of the chromium, really characterize the plume. We also want to conduct some pumping activities so we can change the way the plume is currently flowing and migrating potentially across the boundary of the laboratory. The second phase, which is in the future, is after we develop and propose a remedy to the regulators and they accept it, will be to actually begin to mitigate and remove the Chromium contamination from the aquifer. We're right now in the first phase, that's what we're spending our PBS-0030 soil and groundwater remediation dollars on today. The FY15 budget allocation did include \$4.6 million for what called a line-item construction project that was requested because we wanted to ensure we had congressional authorization to begin that project. That would address that second phase of the final remedy, and at the time we made that request which dates back to calendar 2014 we really thought we would be further along and ready to implement that ultimate mitigation step and we're not there. The regulatory process and the characterization process have to go hand in hand and we just need more time to get there. So that \$4.6 million dollars that was appropriated this year into that line-item is just going to be held in reserve until such time that we get to the second phase.

And here are some of our near-term activities. We're extracting core holes, we're basically establishing narrow wells where we get in and get a sample of the plume and understand exactly more about the characterization and contamination. We do have one extraction well that we call "CrEX-1" that's installed and complete and it did do some pumping in 2014 and we hope to receive the necessary permits so that we can resume pumping later this calendar year. And we're developing an environmental assessment that evaluates the environmental impacts of the additional field activities that we need to do. That would include the addition of two additional extraction wells, one for interim measure and one for characterization. There will be ion exchange treatments units set up adjacent to those wells so that water that is extracted will be treated before it's either applied to the land or ideally before it's re-injected through an injection well and that reinjection is what would create the movement of the plume. An installation project of up to six of these injection wells but again that's subject to the completion of this environmental assessment which I've reviewed in draft and we hope to publish for public comment later this calendar year. And this is a very preliminary schedule and the schedule details are subject to the regulatory process, the completion of the [sic] as well as the availability of budget. We can go through those details if you would like.

I know that there's interest in the legacy TRU program so we are continuing to safely store all the waste, the nitrate salt waste that we're remediating and contain the incompatible materials remain isolated in accord with the isolation plan that was accepted by NMED and there are no ongoing issues. We're working on some supplemental pooling as well, corrective action development and implementation is underway, and we continue our surface water management program as I mentioned before, and EPA has issued a draft on individual permit for public comment that was extended through June 26 and it is expected that that revised IP will be available to us later this year.

And those were my comments Mayor, thank you for the time.

AL: Well thank you for taking the time to present to us this morning, such good information. We appreciate you coming.

CG: Thank you, are there any questions?

AL: Are there any questions from the board members?

AG: Yes, I think we should take you up on the offer to get the Chromium project update with regards to—I know when I first got the in depth presentation done on the project and what that meant with water flow, so if we could schedule that I think it would be great.

CG: It would be our pleasure.

AL: I have a question also, some of these positions that are being created in the environmental management division, are they going to be local hires from within the region, or are they going to be from Washington, or—

CG: So it remains to be seen. We have some detailed processes by which we have to conduct federal hiring so the ones that have been posted today are full and open but some of them are in positions that, to the extent that there's a person in the local area who is qualified—who meets the qualifications for that position—we can hire that person very quickly. Some of the positions, however—like the nuclear safety positions—are ones where we know there is not a capability in the current federal workforce here locally because NNSA has vacancies in the same area and we know we need to add bodies to this, so I think by necessity they need to nationwide searches, but we're absolutely not precluding the evaluation of local candidates and where we can do what we call quick-hire or direct-hire where we can use qualified candidates from this regional area we'll absolutely do that. Maybe I should explain. The two jobs that are out right now, one is for a permitting specialist who will be responsible for interfacing with our regulators and maintaining those regulatory documents that EM is going to be solely responsible for, but they will work very closely with the existing incumbent NNSA permitting manager that remains an NNSA employee. The second is a contracting officer specialist who will help us manage the EM contract that we establish with LANS as well as with the other contracts that we're planning for. Those two are open right now.

The ones that I expect to be completed in the next couple of weeks; one is a facility representative, a safety oversight position. Similarly, there are some facility reps in the NNSA organization that are helping to evaluate the EM facilities where cleanup work is done but we need a net increase both on the NNSA and EM side of more facility reps out there. They are critically important to ensure that we're doing the kind of oversight that the AIB identified we weren't always doing. So it's really part of our corrective action plan, and then an actual higher graded, higher level contracting officer position, to again work with, manage that contracting officer specialist and manage our EM projects. We will be hiring our own attorney, that's a vacancy that we're working on in the future. A senior nuclear safety official is another vacancy we're working on, and then a waste management position as well, so these are our near term hires, our highest priority hires to fill in where we have just absolutely nobody who's qualified to provide those services today, or to augment where we don't have sufficient staff right now.

AL: Thank you.

CG: Thank you.

AL: That's very good information. Anyone else?

AG: One more question, you don't have proposed dates yet for when those monitoring stations will be placed outside the current areas where you guys have them? I think they're going onto San Ildefonso property, is that correct?

CG: So we have a monitoring well we're about to begin fieldwork on on the San Ildefonso property, as we call it, "SIMR-2". And so we had to work with the Pueblo to establish the appropriate access rights though, and we received the appropriate access permit late last month, and we began mobilization earlier this month and I think drilling activities might begin as early as next week with the well being installed before the end of the summer, so that's very near term. The establishment of the additional wells that are on the Lab property proper are dependent on the completion of that environmental assessment that I mentioned because we needed to evaluate the consequences of the additional construction road and traffic activity and we needed to especially consider the potential impact to the cultural assets that are in that are in Mortandad Canyon. So sometime this summer, but we do hope we'll be able to mobilize and do some fieldwork before the end of this drilling season.

AG: Okay, thank you.

CG: Thank you.

AL: Okay thank you very much Christine.

CG: Thank you, I wish you a very good meeting.

AL: Okay, next item on the agenda is a presentation by Albert Jirón who is the IT programs manager at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Albert, welcome.

- 3. Albert Jirón:** Mayor, I want to thank you, and members of the Coalition this morning, thank you for having us here. I'm looking forward to giving you a not so typical, for LANL, presentation. We're going to do something a little different from a PowerPoint presentation. What we're going to do is a demo, actually I'm not going to do it because I brought the people that really know this the best and are really excited about the application of 3D animation gaming technology. Some of you who might be gaming enthusiasts will understand when you start to see some of this, but really the application of that technology can be used at the laboratory for real world solutions, and I invite you as you're watching these demonstrations to think about how we can apply to our communities, especially in the area of training, i.e. the potential for first responders, in the area of economic development, community engagement, and education. So with that I'm going to turn it over to my colleague who will provide some information about his group SAE-3, who oversees both our mobile team and our physical team.

Chris McConaughy: Hi, I'm Chris McConaughy. Over the last seven years LANL has been developing a team that is using video game technology in a very innovative way. It is providing a lot of training solution for the lab, and they're also working with the National Park Service in conjunction with the Manhattan Project National Park for a way to sort of take people back in time and letting them see what Los Alamos looked like back in that era. It's all just very interactive, this augmented reality, and I think you'll really enjoy what we have to present today.

Kelly Michelle: My name is Kelly Michelle, and this is Travis Burkett, and we are both from LANL and a group known as SAE-3, Software and Applications Engineering 3. I'm here today, as Mr. McConaughy indicated, to share a new technology for your consideration. This is something that has been developed over the last seven years and my colleague Mr. Burkett, is logging into this computer, and I would ask that as we present to you over the next 30 minutes

that you turn and look at your monitor here behind you. I would recommend that perhaps we darken the room slightly. So, as Mr. McConaughey indicated, what we've done over the last seven years is we've begun to use, implement, and study the technology bases for many of the modern video games. I'm sure that we've all seen the commercials for video games and such. This is the same technology that they use for the special effects in movies, like Jurassic Park, in particular, is coming out today, and some of this technology was used to help create that incredible production.

That being said let me introduce you to the capabilities and functionalities of the software we've been working on for the past seven years. This intro gives you a brief demonstration of some of the technology of the MaRIE facility (Matter-Radiation Interactions in Extremes) being used by LANS, and this is WIPP and I'm showing you how some of the operations go at that facility. This is an information movie that went to Washington D.C. This is a subsection of a movie that we did explaining operations at the DART facility for NASA. Everything that you're seeing in this movie is animated. These are training videos used by our security officers at our storage facilities. You can study lighting conditions day and night. This is something we use for our general employee training. We're teaching people correct entry and exit procedures on site. Now what you're looking at is a piece that ended up on the President of the United States' desk soon after the Fukushima event that took place a few years ago. So I'll just let this play out. [video simulation plays.]

So instead of doing your training by 80 pages of PowerPoint slides, you'll be doing your training through these game play activities. This is an application that we developed to show the laboratory collaborations across the United States. This is a game we developed to promote environmental stewardship and how to manage waste responsibly. This is an application we placed at the Bradbury Science Museum showing how computing was done back in the 1940s.

This next demonstration will show how we are using this technology to train firefighters here in Los Alamos county to respond to emergency events on site. Our firefighters are only allowed to tour these facilities about once every year, so it is understandably very difficult to anticipate how to respond to an emergency in an unfamiliar facility. What we're going to do here is jump right into exploration mode. We have created the ability for these firefighters to drive themselves around the facility so they can more easily navigate around the labs. Travis, let's proceed on into the area. And that's what TA-55 looks like. We have the ability to control the information that the trainees see and need to know about, and more importantly the information they don't need to see or know about. So from there we're going to go into multi-player mode, and Travis is going to play the role of the training officer and set the scenario. We've actually trained in the last month 24 firefighters in how to respond to an event in this facility, and we've done all that training without actually impeding the ongoing activities at this facility. This marries perfectly with how humans most naturally and most commonly learn.

So that's one form of training that we've produced with this technology. We can also show glovebox rooms and how we inform trainees how to safely handle nuclear material. The goal of this training game is to identify hazards. We promote enforcing positive habits, such as following the two-person rule, and as Travis enters this room he is going to try to identify possible hazards. He is looking at gauges, placards, mats, wiring, and right here at this label that is peeling. We have identified this hazard.

So you get the idea of the technology that is Lab worthy, and we're taking this technology and doing things with it that nobody anticipated we would be able to. We've been able to do that by leveraging the broad expertise pool that exists here at Los Alamos. We're always looking to serve the community better and more fully. My team, I'm very proud of my team. We're teaching local children how to look at the world in a much fuller and more comprehensive way, and

develop their creative instincts and creative abilities and we're encouraging them to understand that there is a place in the world, especially here at Los Alamos National Laboratories.

Since we have started this program there has been an increase in higher education programs reaching out to expand their curriculums in these virtual reality technologies. This is a technology that a lot of folks go home and use every day when they plug in their Xboxes and controllers. There are other economic development opportunities that this technology would create. We also envision this technology being able to be used in court cases and recreating scenarios for consideration in a courtroom.

Lastly I would like to call your attention to embracing this with education, and bringing 3D technology and virtual immersion into the classroom to help kids more fully learn their subject matter. And that is it for us.

AL: Well I think this is a great program and it's enlightening, my goodness. And so I don't know how long this took but it went by really fast. But I think we learned a lot as well. Do you have intentions to go out into the different communities to work with youth programs?

KM: We do actually, and I would like for Travis to speak to that further that we've —this has been so popular within Los Alamos that we've already been invited to work with communities and start expanding.

Travis Burkett: Judge Alan Kirk up in Los Alamos he came to us and he wanted to get this started and so this is just our pilot program and we do this class every Friday, as a matter of fact that's where I'm going after this, it's just a pilot so you have to generate interest in the community and from there we can expand it to either high schools or colleges or other community programs just depending on whether or not we can generate the interest. I know we have folks on the team that want to do it.

AL: Okay because we have an Española Valley YMCA teen center and we have a lot of teens that go there daily and this would certainly benefit them, something like this. And we have so, so many talented youth, we got third place this year in RoboRave, the International RoboRave, so those kinds of technical—a lot of them are very technically inclined, so I would like to see something like this there. Thank you. Any questions from the board, or comments?

AG: I'm interested in hearing more about the university approach and how that plans to roll out. Northern New Mexico, I think, needs to rebrand itself as a technological hub. Software developers, that kind of stuff, none of the universities really offer programs like that to our communities. I would really like to get more of that kind of information, and I know that this Coalition would really foster getting those kinds of classes up and running at any level, whatever we need to do. And I know there's a lot of discretion at the local college level campuses with that type of curriculum, because we're finding more and more that they're allowing deviation from the standard curriculum and are now embracing more—a bigger investment in online education or a more technical education. So anything that you guys can do, or get to Andrea, who will get it over to us, we'd be willing to help in any way we can.

Kristin Henderson: When you mentioned some industry uses and that there were entrepreneurs that could take this kind of technology, are the rights already set up where if there was an entrepreneur who wanted to use that and maybe build training videos for other industries? Is that ready to go or would that take a lot of steps for someone to take that on?

KM: That's a really good question, so I'm hoping, and I don't mean to presume to speak for all of the laboratory or tech transfer developers because this is something of new territory to me, but

we've learned a lot of lessons over the last seven to eight years about what works and what does not; where do you acquire the expertise to develop this kind of technology or to formulate a business. So I would hope that we would be allowed to approach any interested parties in this technology on what would work best for the formulation of that business. So this is not a technology that we own, we are leveraging off of commercial products, but some of the innovative and very different things that we've done at the laboratory with this technology has not been licensed, and I'm not exactly sure how that would transfer to someone who wanted to create their own business.

AJ: I'd like to add something, if I may. We are working with our client center on the capital process right now so we are exploring the intellectual property for this. Kelly mentioned that there are some components that don't require that and there is some content that does require that so if there are people interested we would love to work with them to allow us to share this technology.

AL: Thank you very much, you've given us so much beneficial information to consider, thank you for your presentation, thank you Albert. The next item on the agenda is updates for Board Members and now I'll hand it over to the Executive Director to give us her report.

4. **b. Andrea Romero:** Okay, thank you, and thank you to those that presented today, we really appreciate what you have reported. It's been a busy month, and one that I was actually able to travel for to get to the ECA Community meeting, and I want to thank the board for allowing me to participate in the ECA conference. It was extremely valuable, so I will start with that. The next page following my brief are the lessons learned at that meeting and essentially the ECA peer exchange was on 'Advancing Nuclear Priorities.' The focus was particularly on waste, was the focus of the majority of the sessions that were had and it basically really did focus on New Mexico primarily as WIPP being the only waste facility that does exist in the country. We spoke about what we can do here to replicate the best practices and lessons that were learned following the breach at WIPP and how we can accelerate processes to ensure that we have additional facilities that promote national security from each of the waste creating sites around the country. We met several people who are looking to create alternatives spaces as interim plans to store TRU waste and low-level waste. We also spoke about perhaps trying to change the definition of what high-level waste is so that again, we can find alternatives storage facilities. One of the critical pieces, and there are different sites that can respond to waste in New Mexico that are being explored for both commercial purposes and otherwise is that New Mexico could potentially be that leader in waste remediation and storage based on what was learned at WIPP. Nuclear energy was discussed briefly, but without a waste solution so it's hard to see a future in doing that properly without understanding what we can do to secure the waste.

I invite you to read up on some of the other general notes that were taken throughout the week and again the other topic that I think the Coalition might be interested in that was a very national topic in the DOE complex is how hiring will happen in the future at the Lab. The general sentiment from DOE is that at least 50% of DOE employees will be up for retirement in the next seven to ten years. More specifically, LANL has 32% of their employees up for retirement in the next seven years, so what will we be doing to replace those folks that will be retiring very soon? We discussed talent and being able to ensure that the next generation of Lab workers are properly trained and prepared for those situations how are we going to be able to transition that from the NNSA's perspective. Our perspective is to react as communities who will support the next generation of those jobholders, at the Laboratory. There was special interest from the Mayor of Idaho Falls to perhaps build a Coalition to focus on this. She approached me to think about the Coalition and Idaho Falls' perhaps partnering with us to take on the issue the next generation of hiring for DOE and for our communities that happen to be a bit more in isolation to support that.

We've been working very quickly and urgently on our budget planning execution, which is our next item as far as what we plan for keeping the Coalition sustainable. Things look very promising as far as our DOE grant goes. We have submitted our package to DOE. We have a few more tweaks and edits but we do hope that that will be in order by July 1 and our fiscal year to get that approved and I will update the Coalition as soon as things are moving forward in that way.

Of course many of you were able to attend the Manhattan Project National Historic Park dinner to meet the Task Force that was here and to hear about what certain plans are for the Manhattan Park and I do want to continue to dovetail what was said about what each of our communities here in the Coalition have opportunity to really have a true stake in the way things are moving forward, and again thank you Mayor for your letter on the historical significance of the different communities in the region and how we can have each of those stories told in the process of what will come and what develops. Again I encourage every one of our Coalition members to attend the ECA meeting, I've included the link in here and will send it out again and the Coalition will be able to help fund that process. If you want to attend certain meetings or all of the two days to discuss the Manhattan Project Park I would love for everyone to attend as we anticipate visitors from Hanford, Washington, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and the National Park Service and DOE to help facilitate that whole discussion.

So finally, of course we had our Executive Committee meeting, and those notes are in front of you, as far as what it is that we're doing through budget planning, Coalition travel. I will just give a brief sort of update that in September we would like to go to Washington D.C., so we're looking at two dates, or two possible weeks, the 8-11 of September, and the 15-18 of September. I will follow up with each of you on which dates you anticipate will be easier for the majority of the Coalition to attend, but I wanted to give a heads up so you could determine whether or not you would be able to make that trip. This will be specific to the FY16 budget specific to cleanup and funding for the laboratory.

Finally, I did get to attend the Northern New Mexico Citizen's Advisory Board meeting that was very informative and addressed the entire scope of the WIPP investigation and phase two of that process. I have included some of that information here.

Also, Councilor Henderson and the new staff member Lindi Douglass and I were able to travel to the DOE EM sites at LANL. It was a very informative and enlightening trip and I will have a follow-up to come on that since it was just on Wednesday. I would encourage each of the Coalition members to see those sites. We received very technical background information and were able to see how the workers interacted with waste materials both in the past and how it would be done in the future for legacy waste remediation including being able to actually see the chromium plume site and what's being done to get the actual wells in place and et cetera. It was a fascinating and very informative tour and if another opportunity comes up I will certainly inform the Coalition and I encourage that and will have a briefing for you soon.

Finally there are some news articles here as well as a new ECA report on the changing course, the case for sensible DOE acquisition reform. It's a ten page brief on how acquisition will change as those things are actually happening currently in our state. I encourage everyone to read that briefing. And that's it for me.

AL: And the peer exchange?

c. AR: Oh right, so I also included for the peer exchange on the 16th and 17th of July in "Tab F" for Board Members. That is the layout for that two-day session when Hanford and Oak Ridge do come in to talk about the plan for the Manhattan Park. This gives you an overview of what will be included in that discussion. You can see if there are certain sessions that you will be able to

attend.

AL: Thank you Andrea. Okay, the next item, and this is an action item to review, is the fiscal year 16 budget. We will have an update from Brian Bosshardt.

5. **a. & b. Brian Bosshardt:** Good morning, thank you Mayor Lucero and board members. I have provided your financial update as well as the FY16 budget brief. It is sitting behind, I believe, Christine Gelles' presentation.

So let me walk you through this, and I am specifically looking at the budget for FY16, is everyone looking at that? So we're estimating a fund balance of \$255,515 as we enter FY16 on July 1st. That number has only changed by one payment to your executive director last month as well as receiving a couple of the member contributions. Below that you'll see the DOE funding, the grant that we will be getting, for \$100,000 and then below that are the individual contributions by each of the member communities. Now you had tasked Andrea and myself with coming up with some kind of a sliding scale with what each of the individual community members would contribute to the Coalition, and plainly we struggled with that. We struggled to determine, what's the line of demarcation? How do we split up what each individual community contributes? It was one of the reasons when this Coalition was originally formed that the board at the time didn't come up with this kind of split is because it was difficult. In the end we looked at the number of employees residing in the individual communities with Los Alamos having the most, followed by Santa Fe County and the others as well, so that'd kind of what we ended up with with respect to what we're proposing here today. But you know we struggled with, should Santa Fe County, since it has the second largest number of employees, does that mean that Santa Fe County's contribution should be higher than the city of Santa Fe's? Should it be the same? Should one be different than the other? That's what we struggled with, so it's hard to try to come up with some kind of hard and fast breakdown of how each of the communities should contribute.

You will note that in FY16 that the Los Alamos county payment was \$60,000 so that was our high mark with respect to how we broke it down from there. Los Alamos County's contribution has been about as high as \$150,000 for several years; in FY15 we gave \$135,000, and brought our contribution going forward down to \$60,000. So as we're proposing right now the total needed is \$115,500 in revenue from our members, which brings us to a total revenue of \$215,500.

From there we get to our expenditures, and as you will note the lion's share of the expenditures goes to the Executive Director contract, including some money there for legal services, some money for memberships and subscriptions, and the ECA membership comes out of that. The line for travel, there's enough money for travel for each of the board members, all eight, to travel twice in one year. You will note in the column on the left from inception to 6/30/15, so that is historical spending to date. We have spent \$23,700 in that travel line, but that's a little off because as you know you've gotten reimbursed in the past from JLH for some of that travel, so some of that money you see in the Executive Director line, the \$480,000 number, also includes some travel. I'd like to just point that out. So today, what we're proposing for travel is \$30,000.

There's \$15,000 for other professional services should we want to—should the board decide we want to do a community planning process, there's money there to hire a facilitator for us to work with should you choose and want to do that. And we included some other money for some miscellaneous food, some of the giveaways that we've given out to some of our members, et cetera. So you will note our revenues total is \$215,500, and our expenditures total \$222,845. So we're spending about \$7,000 more than we're bringing in.

So let's fast forward for a second to FY17. Everything is the same; we've included the \$100,000 DOE grant. That is not a given. That is not something that we have requested yet. So we'll

assume for a second that we do not get that grant in FY17, and we'll have to subtract \$100,000 from our fund balance for the end of that year, bringing it down to \$140,325 at the end of FY17 without that DOE grant, meaning we'd have enough money moving forward in FY18 with respect to paying our Executive Director. Again, these are all unknowns, into the future just some things I wanted to point out to the board. So at this point I think I'll stop and take some questions.

AL: Okay, let me just ask a question. Andrea, can you tell me what the memberships and subscriptions are, other than ECA?

AR: That's the Weapons Complex Monitor, some other, I guess, news outlets that are specific to DOE that do require subscriptions that are in the thousands of dollars. I mean, Weapons Complex Monitor alone I think is like, \$6,000. It's quite expensive for that particular subscription. And so that's what that would be focused on. And the complete breakdown we do have, unfortunately I don't have that in front of me, but I can send that out.

AL: Do we really need that?

AR: I mean that's—we could basically throw that out as far as the Weapons Complex Monitor, I know that Los Alamos County does have it, so I do get certain alerts as far as being able to do that, but it's usually from another publication so we get a second layer of being able to see that, those news updates.

AL: It just concerns me that our expenditures are greater than our revenues. I think we need to balance it so we have about \$7,000 that we need to consider cutting. I don't know how you all feel, but I don't have a—I have a problem approving a budget that has higher expenditures than revenues. Councilor Gonzales?

AG: Brian, when it comes to the ED services, that \$168,000 number, wouldn't it make more sense, and I'm saying this without seeing the overall contract and what ED services are provided, I'm sure a portion goes to JLH, and a portion goes to paying Andrea, but I mean, there's gotta be some cost savings in there to bringing it in house, I mean, if we hired our own ED as opposed to using a media group, umm, to do so, and managed by a fiscal agency?

BB: Chair Lucero, Councilor Gonzales, that is something the board considered back the last time we chose to go the PR route for the ED services as opposed to hiring an actual employee. So one of the other options was that one of the communities hires an employee to serve as the Executive Director with the contributions of the Coalition going to help pay that person's salary. So that was discussed with the board at the time, and the decision was made to stay the course with the services agreement, and we're in year two and we have two one-year extension possibilities. And we would need to discuss that—right now, I think it's about September-ish, and the contract is up the end of October, so that is a conversation we're going to want to start having now if there's a change that we want to see there.

AG: Mayor, I would ask that we possibly entertain that option, because we—just looking at it, if the member communities contributed—let's just say, for example, \$80,000 for the ED, \$25,000 for expenses, back to, let's just say, Los Alamos County being the fiscal agent, to kind of cover some of the expenses and what not, you're still seeing a savings of almost \$80,000 just dependent on whether or not we get the grants in 17 and 18. But again, I think it was addressed last time, you know, we had some issues with regards to—having to—just like we did with Darian, having to go to JLH take action and get any kind of implementation with regards to going to the Executive Director. I know Andrea works for JLH, and to me it's a two-step process with a lot of excess expenditures. And Andrea, I'm extremely happy with the services that you've provided, so I wouldn't see right now that it would be foreseeable to change that course, but I do

think that—I just think that if we're looking at cost saving measures, I think the subscriptions will help aid that, but I think the long-term fiscal responsibility would be to look at it as if we're not getting grants, and we don't want to serve as a charity board either, if we're constantly relying on some type of grant to keep us funded, I think it's a good idea moving forward to create sustainability for this board, I mean, we're all elected, so that could change from year to year, whether or not we remain in office, but I think that if we set the course for seeing this board remain successful from here on out, I think that's the only way we can operate and remain moving forward.

AL: Thank you councilor. One thing we need to consider is if we would decide on hiring somebody, for our fiscal agent, or whatever, it wouldn't just be paid in salary, it would have to include benefits, which can be very expensive, and the operating costs, in regards to an office and staff—

AG: The other option, Brian, would be to bring in that individual under contract for that specific purpose, and that salary would encompass that entire—so basically their contract, I know we've done this in the past, for example we talked briefly about having the services of a marketing contract for the city of Taos, and that's exactly what they are, they're a contractor, we pay them out a lump sum, and they're responsible for their expenses and everything, so they're not housed and utilized as office staff, and you're just diluting JLH, or a third-party billing entity, so I wouldn't necessarily say that you'd have to provide them with an office or benefits or whatnot, but I think at the end of the day you could say 'Here's your contract, you need to operate within the confines, and this is what we need to make sure that you stay responsible for and execute on behalf of the board. Either you can do it or you can't'. I mean that's what a contractor does.

AL: Okay, I think that's something that we can discuss, but it's a good point. Are there any other places—professional services also came to mind. What do we—who do we hire to do professional services.

AR: So that was for, specifically, perhaps hiring an outside source for retreats, all of our annual review, and strategic planning for the year, whether that was to be in a separate facility, or we had more of a retreat-like feel, or if we had a facilitator that we would bring in from outside to help that entire process of what we were looking at for the broad scope of the year. We just wanted to allocate resources to be able to do that properly in the event that we did decide to have a semi-annual or annual sort of strategic planning or review.

AL: Okay, we've spent \$10,000 to date, correct, and so we're proposing \$15,000? I'd like to hear from someone else, Councilor? Did you have your hand up, commissioner?

AG: I actually agree with your statement you know, you're worried that our expenditures are actually higher than the amount of money we're bringing in, so I think that that is something that we really need to look at before we approve this budget.

AL: Anyone else?

BB: I think it would be easy to cut that subscriptions line down to the number we need to get it balanced. We'll still have enough money to pay our ECA membership. We can cut that down.

AG: So I think Brian, we need to do this in a formal motion. I move that we approve the budget based on your recommendations that we can have some savings through membership to balance, but with the intention that we will review the overall full budget moving forward as soon as possible. So if it takes a special meeting that we implement and do that as soon as possible.

AL: Well in order for this to be in effect by July 1st we should be approving this today.

AG: Yes, that's my recommendation, that we approve it based on Brian's recommendations that we balance it through membership savings—or subscription savings, I'm sorry. Right Brian? So we'll end up with a balanced budget.

AL: And it seems like we'll still be short a little bit, maybe we can just take that out of professional services? Then we'll be fine.

BB: We'll be fine.

AG: I move that we approve.

Unknown: I second.

AL: Okay, it's been moved and seconded that we approve the budget with the change removing \$7,000 from memberships and subscriptions in order to balance the budget having the same amount of revenues and expenditures. All those in favor of the motion signify by saying 'aye'.

ALL: Aye. Motion Passes.

AL: Under discussion, any further discussion? Oh, I'm sorry, we voted on it already, there's no further discussion. We just voted, sorry. I'm sorry about that. Motion carries. All right, let's see, we'll move on. And thank you Brian for the hard work. Thank you, Andrea. I know that it isn't easy, but I think this will make it easier for next year, and perhaps we can have some line item expenditures next year. Okay, next item is Meetings at a Glance, and that's under tab H.

F. AL: Okay, July 10th we are meeting at Jemez Pueblo after all, right? I think there was some confusion with the Governor? Okay, and so that's fine. And we just, Christine mentioned that someone could give us a presentation, I forget the name, the more technical presentation on—

AR: Yes, Dan Katzman.

AL: Yes, do we want him in July or can we confirm for August?

AR: She did recommend later in the fall once the consent order hopefully is agreed upon because once that's close to being set the presentation would be more valuable later on in the fall.

AL: That's fine for September, then, for him, if they're ready, if the consent order has been approved. Is there anything else that you see that needs to be added to already?

AG: When do we need to let you know on--

AR: On September? I'll follow up after this meeting with each of you on which dates are more preferred.

AL: Can you give us those dates again?

AR: Yes, they're in my report. It's, I believe, September 8-11 and September 15-18.

AG: And or or?

AR: Or, I'm sorry. And the variables with that is October 1st is when the FY16 budget is meant to be approved so, just—on timing—it's just what would be most appropriate either one of those.

AL: It would seem like the earlier the better. Because you know—I would think the earlier, the better. Because we had also talked about a July trip, is August out of the question?

AR: They're in recess in August, all of August. July is pre-recess but they're apparently not very close to an actual final budget discussion traditionally, so September tends to be a better time to visit.

AL: All right, thank you. So is the 8-11—can we tentatively set that date since it's earlier?

AG: If you could just check their Congressional schedules—

AR: Right, yes, those were chosen specifically based on their Congressional schedules, yes.

AL: Okay, so check your calendars.

AG: So count me in for anytime we go, I think it makes a better impression to be there, so—

AL: It does. I thought it was important that we be there.

AG: I would encourage the board; there are several of us who tend to be more—

KH: I thought when we went in February it made a big impression on the group when we go around the room and we have the Mayor of Espanola and we had, you know, the town councilor there, and the mayor of Santa Fe—

AL: And it would be nice if we could get some of our Native American pueblos to join us.

KH: That would be great.

AL: Because it really makes for a diverse group, and they tend to pay attention. Okay, September 8-11. In the meantime, I'd like to send a letter from the Coalition asking for at least, well we were asking for more money than that, we were asking for \$255,000, and now it's down to \$188,000 so I'll word the letter carefully, and send it to you all before we send it off but I would like to send it this month. So watch for that email. Okay, Andrea and I can work on that. All right, so anything else on Meetings at a Glance?

G. AL: Okay, do we have any people signed up for public comment?

AR: We do not.

AL: Okay—

AR: Is there anyone here for public comment?

AG: Nobody wants to talk to us? That's a change.

AL: Well then, I guess we'll be on time. Is there anything else to bring before the board? Is there a motion to adjourn?

AG: So moved.

AL: This meeting is adjourned.

H. Adjournment—11:00 a.m.

ATTEST:

Mayor Alice Lucero, Chair

Andrea Romero, Executive Director