



## **Minutes**

**Friday, July 15<sup>th</sup> 2016**

**Idaho State University Student Union Ballroom**

### **Members in attendance:**

Co-Chair Admiral John Grossenbacher  
Co-Chair Lt. Governor Brad Little  
Representative Jeff Thompson  
Representative John Rusche-Phone  
Director Megan Ronk  
Dr. Mark Peters  
Dr. Rebecca Casper  
Talia Martin  
Steve Laflin  
Dr. Mark Rudin  
Dr. Van Der Schyf

### **Ad Hoc:**

John Revier  
Brian Whitlock  
Bobbi-Jo Meuleman  
Elli Brown

At 11:15 am *Lt. Governor Brad Little* convened the meeting and welcomed Megan Ronk as an official member of the committee. Bobbi-Jo Meuleman will replace Megan's role on the commission. Dr. Van Der Schyf was asked to give a brief introduction and welcome.

*Dr. Van der Schyf* welcomed the commission members and members of the public in attendance. ISU with Idaho universities have a long and healthy relationship and INL in the area of nuclear energy and engineering and felt it was a privilege to show everyone what they do at ISU collectively with Idaho universities. He believes the strong attendance shows community interest in nuclear energy.

*Lt. Governor Little* noted public testimony will be taken at the end of the meeting – use sign in sheet for those interested.

## LINE Commission Discussion

*Lt. Governor Little* – discussion should be an open and honest conversation about where we are today and where we want to go with the LINE commission.

*John Revier* listed off the current subcommittees: Safety and Environmental Stewardship, Research Education and Pipeline, Infrastructure, Federal Policy and Programs, State Policy Awareness and Outreach.

*Admiral John Grossenbacher* suggested the subcommittees evolve as the commission evolves to stimulate the broad ownership in INL. His view is to create new subcommittees that are more focused and answer the question of what it means for Idaho. Suggested committees are as follows:

1. Risks – associated with being home of the INL. Seismic, transportation, environment protection, radiation exposure, human error/mishaps.
2. National Policy – Consent Based Siting is an example.
3. Programs at INL – nuclear mission as well as other capabilities and what are the Idaho opportunities around that? Workforce development?
4. Special topics that need special attention – SMR's , GAIN
  - a. Public needs to hear more about the proponents and risks and barriers.
  - b. Opportunities for businesses and universities created by these opportunities.
  - c. Big issues of the day as a path to shed more light.

*Dr. Mark Peters* added Education and Infrastructure committees are needed and welcomed to continue the conversation.

*Mayor Rebecca Casper* brought up the question, what is the Role of LINE 2.0 moving forward?

*Dr. Mark Rudin* and *Dr. Van Der Schyf* agreed with the ideas and expressed the need to go back and review LINE 1.0 and reexamine recommendations and work to implement those.

*Lt. Governor Brad Little* - at October meeting we will show recommendations from LINE 1.0 and executive order of 2.0 to review, compare, discuss and determine path forward. *Dr. Mark Peters* agreed as long as we can add a subcommittee that considers SMR/GAIN in a parallel path and timeframe due to urgency and time sensitive nature.

*Dr. Mark Peters* spoke to the need of subcommittees to be nimble and go along with the dynamic process – differing paces on State level versus federal level. SMR's are a good example. Permitting and design is a conversation that will occur soon. Additionally, there is a need to reestablish a supply chain in the US. SMRs are a bridge and committee will evolve into thinking more broadly.

*Mayor Rebecca Casper* moved we create an autonomous ad hoc subcommittee focusing on SMRs. *Dr. Mark Rudin* second. Allow the committee to define itself. What action items does

Idaho/commission need to pursue? Recommendation to INL, Idaho and private sector. What impediments can we resolve at a state and/or local level?

The SMR subcommittee will give an update at the October LINE meeting. **SMR Ad-Hoc Committee: Director Megan Ronk (Chair), Dr. Mark Peters, Mayor Rebecca Casper, Dr. Mark Rudin, Representative Jeff Thompson, Admiral John Grossenbacher, and Steve Laflin.**

*Mayor Rebecca Casper* talked about the need or potential to include other voices on the commission. It was determined the commission should entertain the possibility after next meeting once the commission has prioritized issues of focus – it may necessitate the addition from a potential group.

*Steve Laflin* suggested the past experience of subcommittees creating their own membership with selected experts, as needed, to fully form subcommittees.

SMR Ad-Hoc Committee will give report at the October LINE Commission meeting.

John Revier will assist Lt. Governor Brad Little and provide a list of existing subcommittees that will be generated and distributed to the commission members for review prior to the October meeting to allow action at next meeting. A report will be developed after the October meeting that lines out where the commission is and where they are going.

WIPP Tour: *Steve Laflin* has a tentative trip planned in August. Would be happy to tour and report to save committee members and time. *John Revier* will talk to Senator Bart Davis about attending. The commission members agreed to the importance of getting informed and up to date on the issue.

*Mayor Rebecca Casper* raised the issue of commissioner education. What core bits of knowledge does a commissioner need to know? Do we need to set standard? What should they be touring and studying to learn?

*Admiral John Grossenbacher* - What tours and presentations should commissioners attend and participate in? Review of settlement agreement? *Dr. Mark Peters* will give input on what the commissioners should focus and engage on.

*Dr. Mark Rudin and Mayor Rebecca Casper* requested an in depth review of settlement agreement and associated timelines at October meeting from Jack Zimmerman and DOE.

*Admiral John Grossenbacher* asked for a Department of Energy Consent Based Siting meeting review from last night. Several commissioners and public members attended. *Talia Martin* sat on the panel last night and talked about the experience. Additionally, Department of Energy mentioned Boise's meeting was the biggest turnout so far through the meeting process. Overall she felt like it was a productive meeting – transparency and trust were the biggest takeaways for the process going forward. *Mayor Rebecca Casper* expressed frustration in not getting to the root of the question 'what should a consent based process look like? *Admiral John Grossenbacher* gave the highlights of David Leroy presentation and the history and difficulty of this issue. Breakout groups were productive – no

one person should have the authority – a broad statewide agreement is necessary. Written testimony is still welcome which would be a good window for DOE to see additional Idaho public opinion. Spoke to the need of a new paradigm for information and input – ISP, universities. Engagement has to be in areas that are technically competent to engage DOE to have a constructive partnership of information sharing.

*Dr. Mark Peters* – Yucca at 10 years just as a background. What is the definition of consent? In the repository world it is based on successful model in Europe. Build trust and transparency with organization then build trust around process? Does it make any sense to provide comment to DOE?

*Lt. Governor Brad Little* asked what recommendations and questions should we ask DOE? What is the ultimate resting place for some of the items we have at the DOD and DOE as an example.

*Dr. Van Der Schyf* agreed with the importance of commission members in weighing in of the process. One question: how broad was the representation?

*Mayor Rebecca Casper and Talia Martin* agreed there is a need for diversity of voices. There was a strong grassroots element from the Snake River Alliance.

The commission collectively agreed to submit comments by the July 31<sup>st</sup> deadline. Staff will review comments made by commission members during the meeting and compile draft letter for review and edits in an effort to have consensus on before submission deadline.

*Admiral John Grossenbacher* brought up an issue from the last meeting, AMWTP, and what is the future of that facility? The Admiral expressed the concern of building a new facility given history. Would the best use of taxpayer dollars be to continue utilization of the state of the facility at INL. There is a need for significant advocacy on state level to express the importance.

*Jack Zimmerman with Department of Energy* briefed the public and state, tribes and others on AMWTP review a month or two ago on other viable waste that could come to Idaho for processing. \$600M to \$1B for capital cost to develop new facility. Headquarters initiative – potential waste in Hanford and Los Alamos as potential projects to extend use for a decade. Mixed low level waste opportunities also available however, transportation is the biggest barrier that exists now. Settlement agreement – 6 mo and 6 mo to treat and remove. Current status at WIPP is another barrier that could exist. 2019, 2020 timeframe.

*Doug Sayer with Premier Technology* presented on workforce development and the issues his company currently is facing. Sayer thanked the commission for the opportunity. Nuclear work is half of the book of business at Premier Technology. The focus of the presentation was around workforce today and potential for SMRs in the state.

Government contract perception is not accurate – capital is an issue for small businesses getting into the commercial nuclear segment. At Premier only ½ that is nuclear related the other ½ allows them the monetary capacity to manufacture the products at a level of quality to protect environment. Quality of craftsmanship is driving the cost down. It's an Idaho company that understands Idaho issues - motivation isn't always monetary.

Idaho is behind the ball in some areas, but can be an opportunity. It can be easy to build buildings the hard part is getting the human capital. Currently employees at Premier Technology work a mandatory 60 hour work weeks due to labor shortage.

There is vast difference between teaching and training – nuclear work takes practice. Investing in education is important but it isn't enough. Training is critical to success but it takes time and targeted effort to develop necessary talent. Traditional avenues are not going to solve the issue. Schooling is only half of the equation – technical colleges help but does not solve the issue. Thinking outside the box is necessary – you can't teach it. It has to be trained. Nuclear work takes specific effort and practice. Experiencing the cliff (sliver tsunami) now and it needs to be addressed. Institutions might become inadequate to address it. Takes commitments and sacrifice and the need for continued investment. If we wait too long it will drive business away – jeopardize quality and safety if we don't fill the need for employees. Idaho is the best workforce when it comes to dealing with nuclear components. Doesn't matter if SMRs are built in Idaho – southeast Idaho has an opportunity and obligation to be involved. Takeaway: it is not easy and it is not only linked to SMR issue. Sayer challenged the commission to deal with this issue and create a subcommittee.

*Director Megan Ronk* – To what extent have your apprenticeships been successful?

A: That is the system that has worked for Premier. If they show a willingness to learn they teach them without an official program.

*Steve Laflin* – SMR 2019, not enough time before that timeline. What can Idaho do in the near term to recruit talent?

A: Working with Jan Rogers (REDI) that focuses on recruitment of talent in an effort to backfill pipeline.

*Dr. Van Der Schyf* – Colleges need to listen to industry – partnerships with industry, curriculum needs to be nimble and responsive to community needs. Creating strategy to create a bridge with the framework described.

*Dr. Mark Peters* – State opportunity - Ideas?

A: The issue is solely around human talent. Idaho needs to create an infrastructure for development of talent (nuclear certified) – companies will come to Idaho. Missouri created a supply chain – less focused on talent.

*Mayor Rebecca Casper* – Toured South Carolina education programs – subcommittee was in touch and addressing some of these issues – subcommittee should provide report at October meeting.

A: Despite the nuclear requirements, it still takes 1 year to train once graduating with MBA. Training how to be in the nuclear business is a unique opportunity. We have the ability to generate talented workforce to manufacture in nuclear environment.

*Dr. Mark Rudin* – workforce preparation is a continued issue – BSU goes to great lengths to ask industry what they need to get trained employees. We have good students but it takes time to get them up to speed. What can higher education be doing to move the ball? Anything tangible?

A: Send instructors instead of students. Manufacturing technology changes so quickly – they need like experiences. Until they understand the industry they are not going to make an impact.

*Lt. Governor Brad Little* – How can ISU get some of that nexus? A model that works that SBE can look at? Faculty can get credit?

A: The sum of all things: internships, instructors, and exposure to the nuclear process. Opportunity to train in the nuclear quality program – it is so important to protect our environment and people. High school education and industry accredited is the answer – degree is not necessary. Demand and supply model for nuclear quality is the issue – level 3 can request their own price. Premier Technology produces more nuclear quality certificates than any other university.

*Admiral John Grossenbacher* – ESTEC is closest existing model but it's not the right place to house this idea, not all kids want to go to college. This is the opportunity to capitalize on to get them technically trained. Are the universities willing to address the industry identified issues? Eastern Idaho Technical College (EITC) – what would it look like and what would it take? Urge universities to sit down together to work out what it looks like – potentially framed after ESTEC.

*Dr. Mark Peters* – Right place to focus, STEM education and other initiatives currently going on does not address the identified issues where this gap clearly exists

*Mayor Rebecca Casper* – Final report from community panel – ETC – panel will be giving a report soon. What role can high school play? Community college? Universities – Eastern Idaho Community College is one of the main drivers why this needs to happen.

*Steve Laflin* – Education is the long term solution to the workforce issue – short term that is not an option. We need to take a long term approach, starting with SMR opportunity, business and talent recruitment.

*Dr. Mark Rudin* – STEM has been addressed after conversations, do we need to add these jobs to the conversation in elementary and secondary schools? When you recruit talented people with that particular skillset – how many are women?

A: Quite a few – not as much of an issue as STEM.

*Rep. Jeff Thompson* – How can the commission help with the ISU discussion?

A: 15 years of work with welding program at ISU – training old technology and would not adjust programs because instructors came from that specific program –standing up an additional program

*Director Megan Ronk* – What are the opportunities for instructors to come from industry? Is that a possibility? Are there opportunities to leverage industry sector grants from Dept of Labor to train instructors?

A: *Dr. Van Der Schyf*: Yes. Relationship with INL through joint appointments – could include industry and it would be welcome. Universities need to address and adjust to industry needs

*Lt. Governor Brad Little* moved to establish an **Ad Hoc Education Committee** which will have conversations with the Governor's Office, Department of Labor, etc **lead by Director Megan Ronk** -

to explore the opportunity of flexibility within education priorities – no big budgetary items. Other **members of the committee will include: Dr. Mark Peters, Dr. Mark Rudin, and Dr. Van Der Schyf**

*Jack Zimmerman*, Deputy Manager Idaho Cleanup Project, DOE ID, gave an update on operation of the Integrated Waste Treatment Unit (IWTU) and WIPP. See PowerPoint. Flour took over management of cleanup as of June 1 2016 and he believes they bring new technologies and approaches to address many of the issues.

*Lt. Governor Brad Little* – Do you anticipate a flow rate difference?

A: Anticipate same flow rate of 1.6 – approximate.

*Dr. Peters* – Do you have timeframes and dates and listed phases?

A: Flour will deliver plan in August. Thinking it's a matter of months not years to get it operating

*Admiral John Grossenbacher* - Concerns and delays of possibilities of leaks – tanks are non-complaint is a headliner – please review.

A: The tanks are stainless steel with concrete walls – have never leaked and have all new double wall piping. The analysis is they have 40 year life remaining.

*Steve Laflin* - Continued and future use of AWTP? Considering similar for IWTU?

A: Current setup of AWTP is very specific, however, facility could be repurposed and could house high level waste processing.

WIPP overview. See PowerPoint.

*Admiral John Grossenbacher* - 400 cubic meters to ship. How many cubic meters are still in the condition they were stored in?

A: Unsure on number – approximately 1300 cubic meters needing retrieval. Total number should be an additional 4,000 cubic meters. Can repurpose area – beginning 2016 double crew in order to have facility clear by the end of 2016.

*Mayor Casper* - Where are we in the que that will get to send things once WIPP is accepting?

A: Idaho will be one of the first. Tru Waste corporate board will meet in August to determine priority. WAC impact our timing? Possible but we have robust process, may find some things but unlikely.

*Lt. Governor Brad Little* asked Dr. Peters to give a brief update on spent fuel shipments while waiting for next presenter. The inability to bring in 1<sup>st</sup> shipment resulted in a re-scope of project with South Koreans. Currently utilizing similar fuel already on site to start process of testing but new fuel necessary and critical to finish the project. Must be received by no later than next spring. (100lbs – 25 rods) Do not want to speculate the outcome if Idaho is unable to receive shipments.

*Fred Hughes*, Site Manager, Flour Idaho gave an update on the progress of the cleanup contract as well as the scope of the company (Flour Corporate as the parent company), its abilities and successful track record at other facilities. See PowerPoint.

Predictable and reliable results are critical before starting fully operating IWTU. See 2021 end goals.

*Talia Martin* – experience in fluidization technology in WA, under similar pressure?

A: No legal or regulatory date but had other deadlines in order to avoid losing money. Commercial work: scope of work and make commitments of accomplishing dates that are realistic to deliver on dates.

Admiral John Grossenbacher – 11,000 cubic meters that has to be processed by AMWTP – partly 6,500 storage, some retrieved, and remainder is waste that is in various part of the process. Number identified during transition. What is the final number when negotiating with WIPP?

A: 4,000 ready today. Start shipping Aug-Sept 25 shipments a week was goal. Idea was to continue to backfill to ensure stable shipment rate.

Zimmerman to discuss other factors: August meeting with DOE, Idaho has majority that is ready to ship and go through certification process. Priorities, limited number of shipments to WIPP. Optimize shipping in batches, weather, traffic, etc. Do not need a defined number – more focused on percentages. Timing and other criteria – South Carolina has equipment that could be used for the process once they are done using it.

*Steve Laflin* – Interim contract milestones throughout the 5 years – sodium bearing waste?

A: Owe DOE more detailed plan for phased approach for IWTU – once the review is completed and has strong assurances they can achieve the date.

*Lt. Governor Brad Little* opened the meeting to public testimony and asked they keep remarks to three minutes. No one came forward for public testimony. Lt. Gov. Little thanked those in attendance and their interest in these issues.

*Admiral John Grossenbacher* wanted to throw out something to the commissioners to think about - spoke to the charge of 2.0 but continues to worry about the impasse of shipments and sets a bad precedent. Looming settlement deadline for used fuels out of state in 2035 – current estimate is 2045 - at best. Is it the States goal to hold the labs progress hostage? What can the commission do to ensure this is not a continued hindrance on the labs work? Discussion at next meeting. What is appropriate? What can we do? Other labs are looking to capitalize on these pitfalls.

**3:15 Lt. Gov Little adjourned the meeting.**