



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

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 – Ohkay Owingeh – Pueblo of Jemez

Hernandez Community Center
19418 A US Highway 84/285, Hernandez, NM
November 13, 2015
9:00a-11:12a

Meeting Minutes

Table of Contents

Attendance.....	1
Call to Order	1
Confirmation of Quorum	1
Approval of Agenda.....	1
Approval of Meeting Minutes.....	2
Briefing fom NM Congressional Delegation	2
Presentation by Secretary Ryan Flynn, NMED	2
Presentation by Doug Hintze, EM-LA	4
Meetings at a Glance	10
Public Comment	10

Attendance

Chair, Commissioner Barney Trujillo, Rio Arriba County; Fabian Trujillo, proxy for City of Santa Fe; Secretary/Treasurer, Kristin Henderson, Los Alamos County; Commissioner Henry Roybal, Santa Fe County; Commissioner Mark Gallegos, Taos County.

A. Call to Order – Chair Trujillo

Chair Trujillo called the meeting to order at 9:18 a.m.

B. Confirmation of Quorum – Chair Trujillo

Executive Director Andrea Romero took attendance and Chair Trujillo confirmed there was a quorum.

C. Approval of Agenda – Chair Trujillo

Chair Trujillo asked the Board to review and approve the agenda as presented.
Councilor Kristin Henderson moved to approve the agenda.

1 Commissioner Henry Roybal seconded the motion to approve the agenda.
2 Chair Trujillo called for a vote to approve the agenda.
3 The Board voted unanimously in favor of approving the agenda.
4

5 **D. Approval of Meeting Minutes – Chair Trujillo**

6 Chair Trujillo asked the board to review and approve the meeting minutes as presented for
7 the RCLC Board meeting that was held on October 9, 2015.
8 Fabian Trujillo moved to approve the meeting minutes.
9 Commissioner Henry Roybal seconded the motion to approve the meeting minutes.
10 Chair Trujillo called for a vote to approve the minutes.
11 The Board voted unanimously in favor of approving the meeting minutes.
12

13 **E. Discussion/Action Items**

14 **1. Briefing from NM Congressional Delegation**

15 Michele Jacque-Ortiz from Senator Tom Udall's office stated that Katie Richardson from
16 Senator Martin Heinrich's office was in Washington DC and Patrick Duran from
17 Congressman Ben Ray Lujan was unable to attend. At the end of October Senator Udall
18 invited the Vice-Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee to visit Los Alamos and
19 they made a point to take a tour of the Los Alamos Historical Museum as well as the
20 Manhattan Project Historical Site in order to sensitize her and groom her for any potential
21 funding requests that might be coming down the pipeline. They also took a tour of LANL
22 and the next day there was a Tech Transfer round table where they were joined by Senator
23 Heinrich and Jetta Wong of the DOE Tech Transfer office. That meeting produced some
24 good results in mid-October. Toward the end of October there was a hearing of the Senate
25 Appropriations Energy and Water Committee that Senator Udall presided over, and that
26 hearing specifically discussed the roles of LANL and Sandia and talked about the
27 technology transfer potential as well as the research and development going on at the labs.
28 This was a precursor to what happened in the NDAA that was passed on November 10. In
29 that bill were several priorities that Senator Udall had been pushing for in appropriations.
30 That bill does not appropriate but authorizes operations, construction, and clean up
31 projects at federal facilities in New Mexico such as the bases and the national labs. The
32 good news that came out of the NDAA was the amounts for New Mexico projects and
33 LANL were at the President's requested level. For cleanup, the amount that is written into
34 NDAA is \$188.625M for LANL. They will be shooting for higher numbers in appropriations
35 bill that is coming up prior to December 11. Other good news that came out in the last two
36 months for LANL is the bipartisan budget agreement. The Democrats and Republicans
37 worked out their issues long enough to create a bill that lifts the debt ceiling for two years
38 through March 2017 and essentially puts an end to sequestration. The bill allows for
39 increased discretionary spending by \$80B over two years, and now it's up to Senator Udall
40 and his colleagues in both the Senate and the House to develop an omnibus bill by
41 December 11 and that's when they will determine spending levels for the government.
42

43 **2. Presentation by Secretary Ryan Flynn, New Mexico Environment Department**

44 Secretary Flynn stated that the 2005 Consent Order (CO) governs the investigation and
45 remediation of legacy waste at LANL. The CO, also known as a settlement agreement,
46 resolved a dispute between the state of NM and LANL for the environmental
47 contamination that had occurred up at LANL related to legacy weapons activities. That

1 document spells out the process by which cleanup of that contamination will take place as
2 well as the process for investigating that contamination.

3 DOE recently estimated the cost of cleanup to be about \$1.2B, but Secretary Flynn
4 believes this number is far too low. It is going to cost much more money to complete the
5 work that needs to be done at LANL. That poses challenges as well as opportunities. The
6 big challenge for the state of NM is to get the cleanup funding that it needs for this work of
7 protecting the environment and public health. NM receives a very small fraction of the
8 total budget that is allocated for DOE environmental cleanup work.

9
10 Katie Roberts from the Resources Protection Division stated that there are four high level
11 concepts that she wanted to go over. First, the 2005 CO was very milestone/deliverable
12 driven, meaning that the due dates for documents are what drove work scope rather than
13 factors like human health or risk to the environment. Secondly, it was very focused on the
14 investigation and characterization of the original approximately 2,000 SWMUs. That work
15 was necessary and valuable at the time, and it was needed to inform cleanup decisions
16 going forward, but now they have 10 years of those investigative efforts under their belts
17 and it's time to change that focus to cleanup. Thirdly, the 2005 CO included very detailed
18 deadlines for several types of documents including work plans, corrective measures
19 evaluations, and other reports. That document didn't allow for much flexibility or
20 adjustments in work scope or priorities. Finally, although the current document allows for
21 alternative sampling and analytical methods, the field methods are very restrictive. That
22 doesn't allow for much flexibility in the development of new analytical methods.

23
24 From these high level concepts they have derived four ways that the CO can be improved.
25 The first change is called the campaign approach. In order to change the focus of the 2005
26 CO from a milestone driven document, NMED is going to utilize the campaign approach.
27 This approach is designed to group work into distinct projects based on priorities and other
28 criteria, for example, risk or the geographic area. The campaigns are designed to be
29 completed from start to finish. The campaigns will contain multiple milestones and will
30 likely span multiple years. They will run concurrently, but not with too many campaigns at
31 once.

32
33 Since the period of investigation has been completed, the focus can now be on cleanup.
34 The deadlines that were established in the original CO were fairly unrealistic and didn't
35 allow any room for adjustment or a change in priorities. The new CO will allow for annual
36 meetings to reassess priorities and progress and make adjustments as necessary.

37
38 Katie Roberts stressed that there are several key foci in the new CO that will not change
39 from the original CO. First, any work that was originally planned in the 2005 CO will still
40 be included in the revised CO, in addition to any new planned work. Secondly, the public
41 will still be consulted on the remedy treatments that are agreed upon. It is important to
42 note that whatever LANL proposes in their corrective measures report is not necessarily
43 what NMED will choose. The final decision lies with NMED. Public input will also be
44 sought on all remedy treatments. There will be a public comment period of 60 days in
45 which the public will be allowed to request a public hearing. If a hearing is requested and
46 granted, the 60-day public comment period will be extended through the end of that
47 hearing.

1 There will also continue to be stipulated penalties, or fines applied to activities or
2 deliverables that aren't subject to dispute resolution or judicial actions.

3
4 Finally, the cleanup levels and standards as defined in the 2005 CO will remain the same
5 in the revised CO. NMED has no intention of changing those standards at this time.

6
7 Secretary Flynn stressed that they have only been discussing the CO, and not the actual
8 treatments/remedies that are going to be implemented. This document focuses on laying
9 out a schedule of work and determining the process by which that work will be
10 accomplished. NMED has not yet started renegotiating the revised CO because they are
11 still trying to get the settlement agreements with DOE finalized. Secretary Flynn stated that
12 he believes they are very close to having those settlement agreements finalized at which
13 point the CO negotiations can finally take place. He said that NMED wants input from
14 RCLC board members on what they believe NMED should be focusing on as they prepare
15 to revise the schedule and work process for the revised CO. He stated that NMED would
16 provide as much information to the RCLC as the RCLC wants, and asked board members
17 what information he could give them. Secretary Flynn stated that DOE was in attendance
18 to give board members more detailed information about the scope of work and the
19 proposed remedy treatments, but that NMED would provide them any other information
20 regarding the CO that they requested.

21
22 Finally, Secretary Flynn reminded everyone that the current CO that is in place does not
23 have an expiration date, rather, it will remain in effect until the revised CO is in force. So
24 even when the current schedule is no longer viable, the terms of the document remain in
25 place. The agreement remains in place until it is updated.

26
27 Chair Trujillo requested clarification on how close is close when NMED says they are close
28 to finalizing the settlement agreement with DOE. Secretary Flynn stated that what they are
29 waiting on is for Congress to approve the funding that is related to that settlement
30 agreement. The dollar amount has been agreed on, the work, the supplemental
31 environmental projects that could be funded by the settlement dollars, none of that has
32 changed.

33
34 Secretary Flynn reiterated that once the settlement agreements were finalized, the CO
35 would follow. Once the CO is in place, it will be easier to request the appropriate funding
36 to do the work. He also stated the importance of reopening WIPP.

37 38 **3. Presentation by Doug Hintze, Los Alamos Environmental Management Field Office**

39 Doug Hintze thanked Secretary Flynn for his presentation on the CO negotiations and
40 stated that he would continue the cleanup discussion by giving an overview of the scope of
41 work to be completed at LANL. He reminded RCLC board members that the last time he
42 spoke to them, he stressed that EM-LA's priorities were and continue to be safety,
43 transparency, and efficiency. Hintze stated there was a lifecycle baseline cost of cleanup at
44 LANL currently under review at headquarters. He said that as soon as that baseline
45 completes the review process, he would personally come back before the RCLC and
46 explain that baseline.

47
48 Hintze stated that EM-LA was going to focus on tangible results and basing their cleanup

1 plans on realistic assumptions and expectations. There simply isn't enough funding to work
2 on all of the cleanup campaigns at once. He stressed the importance of flexibility in the
3 execution of the campaign approach. If multiple years pass between the creation of a work
4 plan and the completion of said work plan, all stakeholders involved have to take new
5 developments into consideration.

6
7 The campaign approach presentation is an overview of EM-LA's response to NMED's
8 request of logical groupings of solid waste management units (SWMUs) that would roll up
9 to major scopes of work. The campaign approach will bundle the actions necessary with
10 an end-state in mind. EM-LA has bundled the work to be done into 14 proposed
11 campaigns prioritized by human and environmental risk, taking into consideration
12 geographic location to take advantage of mobilization, access, and similar SWMUs. The
13 costs given by Mr. Hintze are the costs when you look at each campaign as a stand alone
14 activity so that one can be compared to another.

15
16 Campaigns 1 & 2 address the Chromium plume interim measure and final remedy. From
17 1956 to 1972, a non-nuclear power plant at Los Alamos National Laboratory periodically
18 flushed water with chromium out of its cooling towers into Sandia Canyon. Chromium was
19 commonly used in the industry as a corrosion inhibitor in cooling tower systems. Flushed
20 water with chromium flowed down Sandia Canyon as surface water, penetrated the
21 underlying rock layers, and ultimately infiltrated the regional aquifer beneath Sandia
22 Canyon and Mortandad Canyon. Chromium would be approached as two campaigns:
23 Interim Measures and Final Remedy. Interim Measures campaign would include
24 installation and operations for ~2 years to obtain data needed for a final remedy decision.
25 The final remedy campaign would be the installation and initial operations and monitoring
26 (final remedy will have a long-term period). The estimated cost of this campaign is \$200M.

27
28 Campaign 3 focuses on the Royal Demolition Explosive (RDX) interim measures and final
29 remedy. Past lab operations to test explosives in TA-16 and adjacent areas resulted in
30 legacy contamination of RDX. Investigation and cleanup activities were separated into: 1)
31 surface/alluvial groundwater and, 2) intermediate/regional groundwater. Cleanup activities
32 for the surface and alluvial groundwater have been completed. Further characterization of
33 the intermediate/regional groundwater is needed to support completion of the evaluation
34 and implementation of a final remedy. The current approach is to install an additional
35 well, conduct tracer studies, and if data continues as expected, propose Monitored Natural
36 Attenuation as the final remedy (MNA long-term remedy). The estimated cost of this
37 campaign is \$35-40M.

38
39 Campaign 4 is the TA-21 major acceleration campaign. TA-21 is the second generation
40 buildings of the Manhattan Project, and the mesa top is adjacent to the Los Alamos
41 County Airport. This area is approximately 250 acres and a land transfer priority for
42 industrial space for the Los Alamos County. An aggregate of 14 SWMUs remain and will
43 be addressed as a single project along with the remaining structures made up of buildings
44 and floor slabs/footers. The approach to completing the remaining SWMUs and demolition
45 of the remaining facilities is to execute them in parallel optimizing required resources. TA-
46 21 no longer has a DOE/NNSA mission. The remaining cleanup scope is in the eastern end
47 of the mesa. The estimated cost of this campaign is \$25M.

1 Campaign 5 will focus on the General's Tanks, or MDA-A. MDA-A is one of the first
2 landfills constructed for disposal of operational waste during the Manhattan Project. Within
3 the footprint of the landfill two 50,000 gallon tanks were placed underground to collect
4 excess plutonium for future use. These tanks, also known as the General's Tanks, contain a
5 heel of hazardous and radioactive material. The tanks are planned to be exhumed and
6 disposed of. This work will be conducted under strict safety requirements because of the
7 radiological component (MDA-A is considered a nuclear facility). The two 50,000 gallon
8 tanks will be exhumed and dispose of a heel of plutonium contamination from inside the
9 tank. The tanks themselves are expected to be low level waste. The estimated cost of this
10 campaign is \$100M.

11
12 Campaign 6 will cleanup the various historical sites around LANL. The Historical
13 Properties includes middle and upper Los Alamos Canyon, Fenton Hill, and sites located in
14 Los Alamos County. Investigation and cleanup of these sites have a priority focus and in
15 some cases require access agreements to government and private land. Certificate of
16 Completion (CoC) have been received for 57 sites and have been requested for 31 more
17 sites. CoCs will be requested for 8 additional sites for which corrective actions have been
18 completed. Establish a team that understands and works collaborative with land owners to
19 coordinate cleanup activities. These sites will require access agreements from the owners
20 prior to performing the necessary cleanup work. The estimated cost of this campaign is
21 \$10M.

22
23 Campaign 7 will focus on MDAs A and T. These MDAs are the last two landfills that
24 remain at TA-21. MDA-A is approximately 1.25 acres, while MDA-T is approximately 3
25 acres. MDA-A contains radiological waste and hazardous constituents at approximately 25
26 ft. in depth. MDA-T contains predominantly radiological contamination in absorption beds
27 and deep shafts. This campaign will require a Radiological Risk Assessment to ensure the
28 radiological contamination is adequately analyzed. The final remedy is anticipated to be
29 an engineered cover that would take advantage of economy of scales in terms of
30 materials, engineering, and equipment. The MDAs are within 50 yards of each other and
31 the combined acreage is less than 5 acres making the overall construction activities very
32 executable as one integrated project. If an engineered cover is selected as the final remedy,
33 these portions of TA-21 would be maintained by DOE-NNSA under institutional controls.
34 The estimated cost of this campaign is over \$125M.

35
36 Campaign 8 will look at the Pajarito Canyon Watershed. A watershed is an area that
37 contains more than one SWMU within a distinct delineation of the geographical area.
38 These SWMUs can be investigated as an aggregate for overall impacts. This watershed will
39 likely require some hot spot remediation and final risk analysis to close out the cleanup
40 requirements. Bundle the aggregate investigation and remediation (as necessary) of
41 SWMUs and carry out the necessary cleanup from cradle to grave to take advantage of
42 contractor execution efficiencies. Investigating and remediating as a single phase
43 will optimize resources and schedule. The estimated cost of this campaign is \$15M.

44
45 Campaign 9 will move over to the Ancho & Chaquehui Watershed. This watershed
46 contains both hazardous and radiological contamination (types of sites include: firing sites,
47 high explosives production areas, laboratories, etc.) The estimated cost of this campaign is
48 \$15M.

1
2 Campaign 10 will clean up the Water Canyon Watershed. The estimated cost of this
3 campaign is \$15M.

4
5 Campaign 11 will address the remaining SWMUs. The remaining SWMUs are in locations
6 that can be approached as a geographical area. These SWMUs can be investigated as an
7 aggregate for overall impacts. This bundle of SWMUs will likely require some hot spot
8 remediation and final risk analysis to close out the cleanup requirements. Bundle the
9 aggregate of SWMUs and perform the necessary investigation and remediation from start to
10 end to while taking advantage of contractor resources. Investigating and remediating as a
11 single phase will optimize resources and schedule. Hintze clarified that this campaign is to
12 complete actions on sites that were begun under other projects and not included in other
13 campaigns. The estimated cost of this campaign is \$25-30M.

14
15 Campaign 12 will focus on MDA-C, a 12.3 acre site that contains predominantly volatile
16 organic compounds vapors. The site is adjacent to the TA-50 facilities in the heart of the
17 Pajarito corridor. This is a large landfill with VOCs and tritium vapors migrating off MDAC
18 footprint. The TRU Waste Facility was required to drill monitoring wells to monitor for
19 VOC vapors from MDA-C. This will be one of the largest landfills that is anticipated to
20 have an engineered cover. Strict safety requirements and a congested Pajarito corridor
21 present challenges to construct the cover, however the cover itself is not expected to be
22 difficult to construct. The estimated cost of this campaign is \$50M.

23
24 Campaign 13 will clean up MDA-AB located in TA-49, includes test shafts (hydro-nuclear
25 experiments) that contain uranium and plutonium, with lead (hazardous component). This
26 MDA is relatively small at approximately 0.5 acres. However, the contaminants of concern
27 are radiological. Investigations to date have not shown migration outside the shafts. MDA-
28 AB contains shaft fields that may be capped individually (~4 Shaft Fields) to include a
29 buffer area. The anticipated remedy is an engineered cover as contamination has not
30 migrated and excavating radiological contamination would be high risk to the worker. The
31 estimated cost of this campaign is \$50M.

32
33 The 14th and final campaign will see the closure of Area G and MDAs G, H, & L. Upon
34 completion of all TRU waste retrieval, processing and shipment, Area G will be structured
35 as a closure site, and the remaining cleanup and demolition would be bundled as a
36 package. The SWMU corrective actions are presumed to be an engineered cover for the
37 three remaining MDAs, with Long Term Surveillance and Maintenance requirements from
38 the regulator. Establish a closure contract to complete investigations, demolition of
39 remaining facilities, and install the final remedy (anticipated to be engineered covers).
40 MDA-G is the largest MDA at about 65 acres and obtaining and transporting the necessary
41 material will be challenging. The transportation of the material will require road
42 work/repair and traffic flow management through the Pajarito corridor. The final remedy
43 will incorporate the on-going vapor extraction system and the necessary long-term
44 maintenance and surveillance requirements. The estimated cost of this final campaign is
45 \$225M.

46
47 Hintze stated that this is a very preliminary approach that has not yet been finalized by
48 NMED but it was EM-LA's recommendation that the campaign approach be rolled into the

1 revised CO. He also said that, realistically, EM-LA should be operating and creating a
2 revised baseline every year.

3
4 Councilor Kristin Henderson stated that she was unaware that there was still contamination
5 in town at the historical sites, and she asked if property owners were aware of that fact.
6 Manager Hintze said he would get the information on the location of the contaminated
7 sites in town and deliver it to the RCLC.

9 **3. Board Member Action Items**

10 **a. 2016 Meeting Schedule Approval**

11 Chair Trujillo asked the board to review the proposed 2016 meeting location schedule
12 contained in their meeting packets.

13 Commissioner Mark Gallegos moved to approve the 2016 meeting locations.

14 Commissioner Henry Roybal seconded the motion to approve the meeting locations.

15 Chair Trujillo called for a vote to approve the meeting locations.

16 The Board voted unanimously in favor of approving the proposed 2016 meeting locations.

18 **b. Proposed change of Coalition meeting times**

19 Chair Trujillo stated that at the previous RCLC board meeting several board members had
20 inquired about changing the time of the monthly board meetings. Chair Trujillo
21 recommended 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

22 Commissioner Henry Roybal moved to temporarily change the monthly board meeting
23 time to 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

24 Commissioner Mark Gallegos seconded the motion to temporarily change the monthly
25 board meeting time to 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

26 Chair Trujillo called for a vote to change the meeting time.

27 The Board voted unanimously in favor of temporarily changing the monthly board meeting
28 time to 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

30 **c. JLH Media Contract Amendment**

31 Brian Bosshardt presented the board with the drafted amendment to the JLH Media
32 Executive Director Services contract. The amendment changes the duration of the contract
33 to run until May 12, 2016. That six month extension would allow the board time to put the
34 RFP out and select a new contractor.

35 Chair Trujillo asked the board to review the amendment to the JLH Media Executive
36 Director Services contract.

37 Councilor Kristin Henderson moved to approve the amendment.

38 Commissioner Henry Roybal seconded the motion to approve the contract amendment.

39 Chair Trujillo called for a vote to approve the JLH contract amendment.

40 The Board voted unanimously in favor of approving the amendment extending the JLH
41 Media Executive Director Services contract until May 12, 2016.

43 **d. Executive Director Services RFP Review and Approval**

44 Brian Bosshardt presented to the Board a draft RFP requesting Executive Director Services.
45 He stated that the RFP is pretty much identical to the RFP that was issued two years ago.

46 The scope of work and cost sections are the same. The due date for proposals is December
47 11 to Los Alamos County. Received proposals will be distributed to board members for
48 review and then the board will likely conduct formal interviews.

1 Chair Trujillo asked the board to review the drafted RFP for the Executive Director Services
2 contract.

3 Commissioner Mark Gallegos moved to approve the drafted RFP for the Executive Director
4 Services contract.

5 Councilor Kristin Henderson seconded the motion to approve the drafted RFP for the
6 Executive Director Services contract.

7 Chair Trujillo called for a vote to approve the RFP.

8 The Board voted unanimously in favor of approving the drafted RFP for the Executive
9 Director Services contract.

10

11 **5. Updates**

12 **a. Budget Update from Brian Bosshardt**

13 Brian stated that the November budget update reflects the Coalition member communities
14 invoices for FY16 and shows which communities have and have not paid. Brian stated that
15 he would be reaching out to those communities who had not yet paid. The only expense
16 going out was for Executive Director services and the sponsorship of the Regional
17 Development Corporation's REDI State of the Region Summit.

18

19 **b. Executive Director Update**

20 Executive Director Andrea Romero reported on her attendance with Mayor Javier Gonzales
21 and Councilor Kristin Henderson to the Energy Communities Alliance (ECA) meeting
22 representing the Coalition as they spoke with the Energy Facility Contractors Group
23 (EFCOG) about aligned interests in DOE negotiations.

24

25 Director Romero also attended the DOE National Cleanup Workshop in Washington DC
26 that provided insight into the broad work of EM throughout the DOE complexes, including
27 those sites that are decommissioned and are solely functioning as cleanup sites.

28

29 Director Romero presented to the Mora County Commission and invited them to join the
30 RCLC Board. Mora County is included in the counties that LANL has committed to working
31 with through their Community Commitment Plan. She explained to the Mora County
32 Commission what the RCLC does. They were thankful for her presentation, sent their
33 regards to the RCLC board, and Romero will follow up with their interest in joining the
34 RCLC.

35

36 Director Romero gave the board a recap of the Northern New Mexico Regional Economic
37 Development Initiative (REDI) Summit. Town of Taos Councilor and RCLC board member
38 Andrew Gonzales attended and presented on Taos' economic development efforts as they
39 pertain to the Kit Carson Electric co-op. The REDI initiative is the RDC's overall economic
40 development initiative that reflects the various communities of northern New Mexico.
41 There were presentations from these communities as well as a rehashing of the original
42 goals from 2008 and a review of the current state of affairs from various development
43 perspectives to review what new possibilities could be initiated.

44

45 Director Romero directed the board to several news items included in their meeting
46 packets related to the security forces changeover from SOC to Centerra at LANL. That
47 protective forces contract affects all of the security at LANL. An issue brief highlighting the
48 details of this changeover was given to all board members. Director Romero informed the

1 board that a letter was drafted to NNSA’s General Klotz to discuss ensuring that the
2 changeover happens without sacrificing employment levels, benefit levels, or community
3 involvement.
4

5 **F. Meetings at a Glance**

6 Director Romero stated that the December board meeting would take place at the Jemez
7 Pueblo Community Resource Center from 1:30 - 3:30 p.m.
8

9 **G. Public Comment**

10 Scott Kovac from Nuclear Watch New Mexico stated that a question everyone should be
11 asking themselves is “How much money do we actually save by completing the cleanup
12 sooner?” He stated that the ten years of investigation done at LANL was absolutely
13 necessary to the overall cleanup process. Much progress was made under the original CO.
14

15 Joni Arends from Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety stated that she has been working
16 on the issues at hand for about 20 years and remembered the concern of the citizens as
17 nuclear waste from LANL was being transported through Santa Fe down St. Francis Drive.
18 She spoke about the Chromium Plume and stated that NMED and DOE speaking to a
19 board of elected officials is distinctly different from them presenting to the general public.
20 Arends talked about a perchlorate plume on LANL property and how exposure to
21 perchlorate affects prenatal health. She stated that neither NMED or DOE had addressed
22 the issue of the perchlorate plume. She also stated that the Chromium plume is about fifty
23 times greater than the NM acceptable level.
24

25 **G. Adjournment**

26 Chair Trujillo thanked the public commenters and adjourned the meeting at 11:24 a.m.
27

28 Attest:
29
30
31

32 _____
33 Commissioner Barney Trujillo, Chair
34
35
36
37

38 _____
Andrea Romero, Executive Director