

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

February 5-6, 2004

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Executive Summary	1
Welcome and Introductions	3
Announcements	3
November Meeting Summary	3
Recap of Board Priorities and How this Meeting’s Agenda Fits	3
Hanford Performance Management Plan (HPMP) Update and Projectization	4
HPMP Strategic Initiatives 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 Workshop	7
HPMP Strategic Initiative #5 – Central Plateau Optimization Strategy	7
U-Plant Zone Prioritization	10
Draft Advice: Public and Regulator Review and Input of Baselines	12
Draft Advice: M-91 Transuranic (TRU) Waste Change Package	14
HAB Annual Report and Self-Evaluation	16
Committee Reports	17
TPA Agency Updates	18
The Bottom of C-106	20
April Board Meeting Topics	20
Public Comments	21
Attendees	22

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Executive Summary

Board Actions

The Hanford Advisory Board (Board) adopted two pieces of advice: one addressing the public and regulator review and input process for the Department of Energy’s (DOE) baselines and one addressing the M-91 Transuranic Waste Change Package. The Board also authorized the Chair of the Board, Todd Martin, to write a response to the *Tri-City Herald* editorial about the Board.

Board Business

The Board leadership retreat will be held in the spring this year, probably in May. It is possible that the retreat time will be extended, giving the leadership group an entire day to work with the agencies.

Hanford Performance Management Plan (HPMP) Update and Projectization

The Board received an overview of the HPMP and the way that the HPMP interacts with more recent documents and directives from DOE. The Board had a workshop where Board members were able to speak with members of the project teams from each of the HPMP initiatives, allowing them to gather information and ask questions about different aspects of Hanford site cleanup.

HPMP Strategic Initiative #5 – Central Plateau Optimization Strategy

The Board took an in-depth look at HPMP Strategic Initiative #5, which addresses many aspects of Central Plateau cleanup. The initiative attempts to prioritize and summarize all of the work that will be necessary to completely clean up the Central Plateau.

U Plant Zone Prioritization

The Board viewed a presentation about the U-Plant closure area. U-Plant is the pilot project for demonstrating the area closure concept in the Central Plateau and the prototype for the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI). The overall concept is the remediation of high-risk waste sites, which are defined as waste sites that have impacted groundwater.

Hanford Advisory Board Annual Report and Self-Evaluation

Board members were given the opportunity to express their thoughts about the Board, its progress, and its actions over the previous year. Board members also completed a self-evaluation form.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Ecology stated that it is currently reviewing the 2005 budget request, which so far looks good.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

There have been a number of changes in responsibility at EPA. Even with the changes, there has been significant progress made in the cleanup of the 300 Area.

U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)

The Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is currently being reviewed by the U.S. Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ).

DOE-ORP considers the first tank, C106, to be empty. DOE-ORP is working with Ecology on preparing a permit for the closure of the tank, which would also have a public comment period. DOE-ORP is currently retrieving waste from tank S112.

U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Office (DOE-RL)

DOE-RL received a 10% budget plus-up this year, receiving \$1.27 billion for cleanup alone plus an additional \$44 million for national programs across the country in support of Department of Energy – Environmental Management (EM) work.

DOE-RL has received a response from DOE-HQ regarding the Risk-Based End States variance document. The document is now being revised based on those comments, with the final draft to be issued at the end of March.

DOE released the Final Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS) on Tuesday, February 3rd. Information and a copy of the document are available on the website. The notice of availability will go into the Federal Register on February 13th and then there is a 30-day waiting period before Records of Decision (RODs) can be issued.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

**Draft Meeting Summary
February 5-6, 2004
Richland, WA**

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), Chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) to order. The meeting was open to the public and offered four public comment periods, two on Thursday and two on Friday.

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are members of the public. Five Board seats were not represented: City of Pasco (Local Government), Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Washington State University (University), the Columbia Basin Audubon Society and Columbia River Conservation League (Local Environmental), and **Washington State Department of Ecology (Ex-Officio)**.

Welcome and Introductions

Todd Martin opened the meeting and welcomed all the participants. He introduced one new Board member: Rick Jansons, alternate for Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force). Todd also announced Shelley Cimon's seat change on the Board: Shelley is now the alternate for Keith Smith, Public-at-Large. And, with the administration of the Board changing to the Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), the Board has a new Designated Deputy Federal Official, Howard Gnann.

Announcements

The Northern New Mexico Citizen Advisory Board visited and observed the Hanford Advisory Board's February meeting. They were interested in learning what the Board does and how it gets things done. They congratulated the Board on 10 extraordinary years.

The 10th Anniversary Party was held in the Red Lion Richland Hanford House the evening of Thursday, February 5th.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), announced that she has recently become engaged.

November Meeting Summary

The Board approved the November meeting summary with an additional comment from Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large.

Recap of Board Priorities and How this Meeting's Agenda Fits

In order to remind the Board where it is and what it needs to accomplish in the next year, Todd reviewed the September 2003 memo, titled *Major Issues for Consideration by the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB)*. The Board has essentially covered everything listed under issue number 1, Central Plateau End States (which includes reviewing the draft End States document and developing an integrated public involvement plan). Todd noted that the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) will continue to follow this issue, considering the Department of Energy – Headquarters (DOE-HQ) feedback on the draft End States document. On issue number 2, Groundwater Decisions, the Board has not seen the Hanford Site Groundwater Strategy Document. Item b (M-24 milestone change package monitoring wells) was addressed with Board Advice #152. And Item c (N-Area groundwater remediation strategy) has been discussed in the RAP committee. The Board has not seen the Decision Logic Road Map, so there has been to action on that bullet. Issue number 3 (Risk Assessments) was addressed in the RAP meetings throughout

the fall. The agencies stated that, while they did not need advice on the B/C Area pilot (beyond what the Board has provided previously), they will want advice when they do the scoping on the 100 N Area within the next month. On issue number 4 (Central Plateau Cleanup Strategy), at the last RAP meeting several regulatory documents that would be produced under the U-plant closure were presented and the agencies stated they would like advice on their proposed plan, which is coming out this week. Issue number 5 (Site-wide Waste Management Strategy) is what the Board will be addressing in this meeting. Regarding issue number 6 (Tank Waste Issues), the Draft Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement has not been released yet. Items b (TRU Waste Issues) and c (supplemental technologies) were addressed with Advice #149 and #150, respectively. Items d (path forward to meet the M-62 TPA milestone) and e (Waste Treatment Plant construction) have been discussed in committee, but have not been addressed by the Board yet. Issue number 7 (River Corridor Issues) has not been addressed head on, but was partially addressed by Advice # 151. The Board is considering advice in this meeting that will address the budget and therefore will cover issue number 8.

Todd stated that the Board has received a response to the letter, written at the November Board meeting, in which the Board requested clarification of the issues list and more information on public involvement. DOE's response details when these decisions will be made as well as the type and timing of public involvement for each item on the list. The Public Involvement Committee (PIC) will be reviewing this response.

Discussion / Questions

Greg deBruler, Columbia River Keeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen), stated he does not think that the Board is done evaluating the proposed Central Plateau end-states. Todd agreed and clarified that the Board must consider the response the agencies received from DOE-HQ. However, the agencies are no longer asking for advice on this issue as detailed in the memo. The individual items listed in the first bullet are all covered under the Risk Based End States (RBES) document and that is how DOE would like the advice issued, too. Greg wanted to be sure that the Board's new administration, DOE-ORP, is clear that the Board has not really begun to address Central Plateau End-States, since they have not been privy to the previous discussions on this issue.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), asked Todd to clarify that the workshop, scheduled to take place during Thursday's Board meeting, was approved by DOE, since it was planned to be interactive and educational and not advice-oriented. Todd affirmed that the workshop and its intents and purposes had been approved by DOE.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local & Regional Public Health), reminded the Board that it can pick its own issues and topics as well, and should not too get caught up in thinking that its work is done just because it has addressed everything on DOE's list. Todd clarified that the Board is the one who developed this list, even though DOE signed off on it, but he also agreed that the Board is obviously addressing other items as well.

Michael Goldstein, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), wanted to clarify that DOE is the agency asking for input on the RBES process. All of the agencies make decisions through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) and create documents through Comprehensive Environmental Response, Conservation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) processes. Those are the decisions that all the agencies need input on.

Hanford Performance Management Plan (HPMP) Update and Projectization

Pam Larsen began the Hanford Performance Management Plan (HPMP) discussion by stating there is a lot of exciting work going on with the clean up and the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) wanted to share these issues and help the Board better understand the issues coming to the committee. The workshop covers HPMP strategic initiatives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6. (Initiative 2 is DOE-ORP's responsibility.) Pam thanked DOE-RL and the workshop contributors and presenters for their pre-planning and assistance, especially in light of the administration change.

Jeff Frey, DOE-RL, presented an overview of the HPMP strategic initiatives to prepare the Board for the workshop. The strategic initiatives were born out of a number of things, including how to achieve accelerated risk reduction, clean up, reduce mortgage costs, etc. The overarching objective of the initiatives was to accelerate clean up and reduce risk. Part of the plan for risk reduction was to move contaminated materials away from the river and contain them on the central plateau. This also helped achieve the objective of shrinking the site, allowing efforts to be focused on the Central Plateau. One of the first steps toward shrinking the site included transferring nearly 267 square miles of lands to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service by 2005 as part of the Hanford Reach National Monument. The second step is to clean up the river corridor by 2012. This will also allow the focus to stay on the clean up and end states of the Central Plateau. The focus on the end states and the development of the Risk-Based End States (RBES) document is one of the major things going on right now. In fall 2003, DOE-RL and DOE-ORP jointly submitted a RBES variance document. They are currently revising this document to address questions from DOE-HQ on some of the variances to the end states. The next draft is due March 31st. Jeff pointed out that the HPMP and its initiatives were just a document designed to capture and represent some of the things DOE wanted to do, including DOE's commitments to and overarching goals for clean up.

While the HPMP has not been updated for some time and planning activities are ongoing, each element of the HPMP is being propagated through other means and mechanisms in place today. The strategy of the HPMP is under DOE-HQ change control and at least one change to the strategy has been processed since its inception: a reflection of the end state vision was incorporated into the plan along with the RBES plan. The initiatives are contained in the project baseline summary and their scope is contained in the contracts. DOE has worked to incentivize the priority and complex elements of the strategy through the contracts. The performance metrics are measured and tracked in the Gold Chart, which is used to monitor clean up progress and evaluate clean up success and performance. The Gold Chart information flows directly into the scorecard for Hanford and is available on the website. The budget scope and schedule are going to be contained in the Integrated Hanford Baseline (IHB), which is to be completed by March 31, 2004. The IHB is part of the evolution from the HPMP strategy to a schedule of definitive actions and activities that DOE is going to take. The IHB will include the schedule for cleanup as well as the high-level cost and the manpower over time requirements. It will also emphasize the interface and interaction points between the various projects and activities at Hanford and will provide an overall summary look at the project. DOE is committed to updating the IHB annually.

Jeff showed the Board the Hanford Site Integrated Master Schedule, which reflects a new strategy for thinking about the cleanup. Rather than thinking in terms of individual projects at the site, the new schedule is organized based on what it will take to close the 100/300 Area, 400/600 Area and the Central Plateau. This means that they are now putting a greater emphasis on the end states vision and the planning necessary to achieve that vision. Jeff reminded the Board and the public to keep in mind that, while it is important to have a defined end state vision in order to make some planning assumptions and plan and budget the work, there is the potential for change between the planning assumptions and vision and the final decisions that are made. The public process can have an affect on the final decisions. Some upcoming decision points include the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) Final Demolition Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), the Hanford Solid Waste EIS, the Tank Closure EIS and further Records of Decision (RODs) on groundwater and the Central Plateau.

A summary of the strategic initiatives, the projects that are implementing those initiatives, and the change from the HPMP that the initiative represents are listed below:

- Strategic Initiative #1: Accelerate Columbia River Corridor Cleanup
 - ▶ Expands the scope of the River Corridor Contract to include remediation of burial grounds 618-10/11, some of the 400 area facilities that are not already part of the contract as well as some of the 300 area Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) facilities. This would accelerate the scope into the 2012/2014 timelines.
- Strategic Initiative #2: Accelerate Tank Waste Treatment Completion
- Strategic Initiative #3: Accelerate Stabilization and De-Inventory of Nuclear Materials
 - ▶ Delay in the decision for the disposition of Cesium/Strontium capsules. New date: 06/30/07.

- ▶ Potential change to K-Basin sludge disposition, looking for opportunities to be smarter about the disposition of the sludge. The initial plan was to store the sludge at T Plant before repackaging it for final disposition. This initiative investigates options to package the material without storing it at T Plant first and looks at more direct shipping removing the need to handle the material twice.
- Strategic Initiative #4: Accelerate Waste Disposal
 - ▶ New Planning based on M-91 negotiations and other activities may allow for acceleration above rates discussed in the HPMP.
- Strategic Initiative #5: Accelerated Central Plateau Cleanup
 - ▶ No changes to the HPMP (U Plant regional closure strategy).
- Strategic Initiative #6: Accelerate Cleanup and Protection of Hanford Groundwater
 - ▶ Enhanced through development of Hanford's Groundwater Management Plan (March, 2003) which was based on strategies in the HPMP, but provided much needed details.

At the time of the HPMP, FFTF was part of DOE's Nuclear Energy responsibility, so it was not included. It is now part of DOE Environmental Management's responsibilities. At this time, DOE is in the initiation stages for the Final Disposition EIS.

Regulator Perspectives

Mike Goldstein, EPA, commented that it is important for the regulators and the Board to realize that the HPMP is the document that is feeding into so many other documents that come out of DOE, including the RODs and CERCLA and RCRA documents. Mike also warned that word choice is important, as a lot of the documents that are driving the work are interim documents that are still being evaluated. He stated that while the strategic initiatives are the goal for how to get to closure, it is presumptuous to assume that the projects will be completed by the dates in the Master Schedule.

Laura Cusak, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), reminded everyone that in conjunction with the initiatives, the Interagency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) workgroups are working on the same topic areas. The workgroups are trying to identify and resolve regulatory and technical issues to reaching the accelerations and trying to make sure that anything that is accelerated is cleaned up to the standards that everyone expects. These workgroups are open to the Board and the public.

Discussion / Questions

Pam Larsen asked how the determination will be made on B Reactor in the River Corridor Contract. Kevin Bazzell, DOE-RL, stated that while the contractors will be bidding based on B Reactor being cocooned, the Request for Proposal (RFP) includes a clause that delays the transfer of B Reactor until 2006 when the decision will be made on B Museum. Bob Larsen, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), asked if they have decided to issue the RFP yet. Jeff confirmed that they are still getting feedback on the draft RFP at this time.

Keith Smith stated that when the HPMP was written the technology for retrieval of waste from burial grounds 618-10/11 was deemed too tenuous. Now there is consideration of adding the burial grounds to the RFP for the river corridor. Keith asked if there is confidence in the technology now. Jeff replied that the RFP is written so that the work scope would not include 618-10/11, but DOE will consider proposals, thoughts and ideas that a contractor might offer. That portion of the RFP might be awarded later. DOE is looking to get the thoughts flowing and get further input on how to solve this problem. Mike Goldstein added that one of the ongoing EM-50 program activities is a three-year technology development program to look at retrieval methods. This program has a group of six contractor teams competing with their ideas on how to tackle those sites. That program is scheduled to wind down in 2006. Laura pointed out that, based on the size of 618-10/11, there is a lot of waste that is not remote-handled where retrieval could be accelerated. Most of the remote-handled waste settled in the pipe units, but there are other burial grounds in those areas.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked what happened to the public comments from the HPMP; he does not recall ever seeing a published response to the public comments. Jeff replied that the comments were organized and categorized by topic and then formatted for distribution. The finished product was made available on the internet. Jeff stated that DOE-RL is looking to incorporate documents like the HPMP and the strategy for the future of the HPMP into the baseline. Currently there is no timeline or process in place to update the HPMP. The agency is using other documents to update the baseline. Gerry also suggested that the Public Involvement Committee (PIC) review the role of the public in reviewing the HPMP and how the HPMP is being revised based on the public comments. Gerry sees this as the start of the disconnect between the TPA, State and public goals for cleanup, and the cleanup goals of the DOE administration in D.C.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), asked if the performance metrics that feed into the Gold Chart include the safety metrics. Jeff answered that safety metrics are not part of the Gold Chart, but that those metrics do exist at the agencies.

Susan Leckband expressed confusion as to how the HPMP implementation could result in the RBES document, since it seems that RBES is how DOE plans to manage cleanup and define the end states. She asked Jeff to clarify the order of things and that, if indeed DOE-HQ doesn't approve of the TPA "business as usual," how does that affect this whole process and how can the baseline be determined. Jeff replied that the baseline is determined from the assumptions that have to be made in order to do the planning for cleanup. He asked everyone to keep in mind that the planning that is in place is independent of the decisions, the process of making the decisions and ultimately the actual end state. Jeff also clarified that the illustration that had confused Susan was actually meant to depict the fact that the concept of RBES was contained in the HPMP, not that the RBES would be a result of HPMP implementation.

Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, asked if the Hanford Site Integrated Master Schedule (Schedule) represents consistency between the TPA goals and requirements and the Integrated Hanford Baseline (IHB). Mike Goldstein replied that, as the HPMP was formalized in August 2002 and has not been formally revised since, the Schedule is a good summary as it gives a comprehensive look at a glance. The problem will be that it is physically impossible for everything to stay integrated as it is on the Schedule. Timelines will begin to move around and the Schedule will need to be updated to reflect that. Mike speculated that DOE may use RBES to modify all the other documents. Laura Cusak, Ecology, stated that she thinks that the Schedule generally supports all TPA milestones.

Todd Martin observed that the HPMP started because DOE-HQ wanted all sites to do a management plan that represented aggressive acceleration and also wanted the regulators to sign off on it. Next, portions of the HPMP began to work their way into the baseline, and DOE-HQ asked DOE-ORP and DOE-RL to do the RBES exercise. When DOE-ORP and DOE-RL sent back their document stating, "here are our baselines and this is why we believe they are risk-based," DOE-HQ stated that, by definition, that was the wrong answer. Todd noted that, since the HPMP was developed at DOE-HQ's direction in the first place, it seems inconsistent to make plans this way. Jeff responded that one product of DOE's Top-to-Bottom Review was the HPMP. Another product was the focused project teams. The project teams were working in parallel when the agencies were working on the HPMP. They realized how important it is to identify the end states, which is where the push for the RBES variance document came from.

HPMP Strategic Initiatives 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 Workshop

Board members were divided into groups to visit each of 5 stations on the Strategic Initiatives. They had 15 minutes at each station. The RAP committee asked that Board members listen to the presenters at the station with "policy ears" and put any policy issues onto flip charts at each of the stations.

HPMP Strategic Initiative #5 – Central Plateau Optimization Strategy

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, stated that the purpose of the strategy for the Central Plateau is to help drive the development and implementation of a comprehensive plan for the remediation of Central Plateau facilities

and waste sites. The strategy will be key to integrating a protective and cost effective approach to waste site remediation and closure, facility decommissioning, waste disposition, tank farm closure, and groundwater protection. The strategy calls for the accelerated closure of over 2400 locations/sites within the Central Plateau while dramatically reducing cost.

There has been a tremendous amount of effort that has been done on-going for the Central Plateau strategy. Several of the IAMIT workgroups have been addressing some of the key areas for the Central Plateau. The draft Optimization Strategy was issued in the fall of 2003 and is being used as a cornerstone to build the strategy. The RBES was submitted to DOE-HQ and will need to be factored into the Optimization Strategy. The U-Plant area closure concept prototype was initiated. DOE has begun to improve the integration with the tank farm closure areas and to incorporate several of the risk assessment opportunities that are happening across the site.

The strategy provides an initial rationale and methodology for risk-based timing and a sequence of decisions/actions for the cost effective closure of the Central Plateau. Secondly, it establishes closure zones that can be prioritized and tackled. This is important because it captures all the work that needs to be addressed and breaks it down into manageable chunks. Lastly, it helps to prioritize the worksite and focus on the zones that are no longer needed, in order to work toward a more unified closure of these areas.

Some gaps that must be considered with this strategy include inclusion of the ancillary facilities in an integrated approach, so that impacts to nearby piping or canyon facilities can be evaluated. The piping/sub-grade issues have yet to be addressed. The final disposition or end state has not been defined yet. The strategy should also describe how to deal with the TRU waste and residual materials and ensure that plans are integrated with the groundwater strategy and the tank farm closures.

Ultimately, this strategy is an iterative process. DOE is working to a baseline today, but there are always issues that come up that need to be prioritized. An action plan must be developed and eventually a baseline change request must be made when the answer to the next step improvement is found. DOE has a big challenge ahead to tackle the remaining issues and to find resolution of the canyon facilities and how to deal with the interaction and integration of the waste sites. DOE would like the Board's input on the general zone approach and zone priorities; help in identifying opportunities for consolidated decision-making and implementation; help in focusing and prioritizing the U-Plant regional closure; and help identifying any better ideas that would lead to better cleanup of the site.

Regulator Perspective

John Price, Ecology, believes that this is a good example of the success of the IAMIT workgroups, as DOE has incorporated some of the workgroups' suggestions into this document. John considers this a good first step as it structures the cleanup in the 200 Area. The good thing is that the strategy identifies high-risk zones and gives some basis for sequencing work. It also captures all the work; many had not realized all the elements that were missing. Some optimization goals include: minimizing the lifecycle costs; having flat line funding; offering stable employment; technology development; and maintaining institutional knowledge. For example, the current cleanup concept for buildings is to take them to slab-on-grade for now and then come back later and do the sub-grade excavations. This may not be the most efficient approach, since future workers will not be as familiar with the area. Prioritization was necessary, since not all of these goals can be achieved.

Mike Goldstein agreed with Ecology that this strategy is a good first step in pulling together all the pieces in the 200 Area. He pointed out that without any TPA, regulatory or legal drivers this work may get lost during the budget discussions. EPA's main concern at this time is making sure that, once a good comprehensive strategy is identified, DOE commits to the appropriate milestones, commits the decisions to the CERCLA documents and then keeps that work going, since it will cost more in the long run to start and stop or just do it piecemeal.

Discussion / Questions

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, expressed concern over the fact that there isn't enough money to do cleanup the way they want to or think is best. This is especially troublesome in light of the RBES discussion. Norma Jean also pointed out that none of the schedules that were handed out include the public involvement piece of the cleanup. She cautioned that DOE will have great difficulty with the citizens of the region if they are not involved in this process. Larry confirmed that DOE does have the CERCLA documentation that goes out for public comment; he will emphasize that point in future presentations. As for the lack of money, it is one of the constraints that must be balanced. The M-91 package was not originally in the budget, but now things must be balanced and shifted to accommodate that expense. Larry is always looking for better methods, new technologies, and ways to deploy those in an effective manner to optimize the public's tax dollars. Norma Jean agreed but admitted concern that the process can be slowed by looking for new technologies. Also, changing direction repeatedly can drag a process rather than optimize it.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked what the projected costs are right now and what are they being reduced to. Larry stated that, over the 24 – 30 year period, this project equates to just over \$6 billion. This is just an estimate, though, as it is impossible to accurately calculate what it will cost to do the work 30 years from now. Paige also wanted to know how it is possible to start planning cleanup for an area where there is still waste in tanks with no way to actually treat the waste once it is out of the tanks. Larry stated that when identifying priority sites, they looked at sites that are high-risk, are no longer needed and could be closed now. This would allow the test site to be closed using a unified process, so that the cleanup could be completed without worry that something adverse will happen in a neighboring site. Paige asked what happens if a leak re-contaminates a clean site. Larry stated that this scenario is taken into consideration when developing the sequence models to help minimize the chances of that happening. It is also part of the reason why U-Plant was selected -- because it is so isolated.

Susan Leckband stated that every time she hears about the zone prioritization she is more in favor of it. It makes good sense to figure out where all the waste sites are and all the work that has to be done. She asked how this strategy fits with DOE-HQ's RBES directive? Larry replied that a new direction or better way of doing something could be identified and then that would go through the baseline change process. There is a disciplined process to go through with change control and analysis of outcomes.

Greg deBruler estimates that it is possible that, in order to make the caps for the 200 Area, you would need 50 million cubic meters of some material. He would like to know where the material would come from and what the impacts will be to the source. Secondly, Greg stated that if you think of the 200 Area as being the most contaminated site in North America, it is unrealistic to expect that it could be cleaned up within 4 years. He stated that Columbia River Keeper thinks that it is unrealistic to try to clean this up in this timeline. Greg urged the HAB to advise DOE to extend the milestones on this issue, rather than saying, "it is a great thing, move forward." There is a lot of work to be done and it would behoove everyone to have it done right the first time.

Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government), stated that, based on the workshop and John's discussion today of the U-Plant closure, he was not under the impression that U-Plant would be taken to slab and then revisited later. He thought the plan for U-Plant was to take it to slab and then cover it and that there was not a comeback. Larry stated that when they did the Fluor contract they had to pick an end state that could reasonably be achieved by 2006, because they didn't want the contractor to get stuck at a critical point in the demolition. It is a matter of keeping the first contractor accountable and still making the transition easy. For U-Plant, it looks like it will be able to be done in one whole package. Ken asked for clarification of what the planning basis is right now. Larry stated that it would be site-specific. John replied that he had not meant to imply a different end state; he had been trying to describe that with the optimization strategy, you cannot have everything. Sometimes it may be necessary to utilize interim stabilization states, such as reducing a building to slab-on-grade and stabilizing it for a period time before returning to it to complete the sub-grade work. John also noted that contracts could also be thought of as constraints. Ken stated that we will always have the budget challenge and it would behoove DOE to track the inefficiencies of a system where work is being delayed due to a contract change. Jeanie Schwier, DOE-RL, clarified that the cost estimates are just macro estimates, which are associated with how DOE plans to

do the work and reach the end states. These estimates can be affected by changes enforced by the regulators as well as contract changes, etc.

Madeleine Brown, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), requested clarification on the items that DOE would like the Board's input on. Specifically, what type of support is DOE requesting in regard to the prototype process? What can the Board do for possibilities for remedial enclosure alternatives? Larry replied that DOE would like to know if the prototype approach is advantageous or if they are overlooking something by taking the prototype approach. DOE would like to factor in all the ideas and thoughts. Madeleine commented on Ken's request to quantify the inefficiency of DOE's contract process, stating that she does not believe that the loss of efficiency can be quantified as you cannot measure the loss of productivity when workers stand around worrying about what will happen to them. She clarified that she is not criticizing the workers, she is criticizing the process. People express their pain and uncertainty by sharing their concerns with their colleagues and when they are sharing their concerns, they are probably not working as hard or as well. Larry responded that he shares that concern as well. DOE does its best to mitigate those types of impacts with the federal processes that they are given to live by.

Norm Dyer, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), stated that he agrees with his fellow Board members that cost needs to be watched very carefully, but he pointed out that monetary cost is not the only cost involved. He commented that the actual hazardous cost to the workers and the environment during removal is also important. Larry replied that everything DOE does takes into account the worker safety as well as monetary costs.

U-Plant Zone Prioritization

Kevin Leary, DOE-RL, described the U-Plant closure area. U-Plant is an accelerated closure project, which was identified from the HPMP and was further defined by the Groundwater Accelerated Cleanup and Protection Document. The overall concept is the remediation of high-risk waste sites, which are defined as waste sites that have impacted groundwater. This is the pilot project for demonstrating the area closure concept in the Central Plateau and the prototype for the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI). There are 4 components to the U-Plant Closure Area: the U-Plant Waste Site Area Closure, which is a separate CERCLA documentation; the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI), which is going through the focused feasibility proposed plan; and two Environmental Evaluations and Cost Analyses (EE/CA) for the pipelines and the ancillary facilities. There has been a lot of planning, but there have also been a lot of unexpected challenges. The lessons learned from the challenges are being captured and passed on to the IAMIT workgroup, in the hope that future projects will proceed more quickly, smoothly and cheaply.

One of the biggest challenges and unknowns on the Central Plateau is the pipelines. The construction and contents of the pipes runs the gamut, from clay pipes carrying High Level Waste (HLW) to PVC pipes carrying water. It is also unknown how many of these pipes are leaking and to what extent. DOE is also looking at the waterlines running through the closure area, as leaking waterlines can play a part in driving vadose zone contamination.

Four recommended remedial actions will be implemented in the U Area waste sites. Fifteen sites will implement remove, treat and dispose; 4 high-risk sites will implement surface barriers; 9 sites will implement maintaining existing soil cover with monitored natural attenuation and institutional controls; 4 sites require no action, dependent upon the results of confirmatory sampling. Starting in December/January they started taking spectral gamma logging measurements to look at the extent of the contamination around the cribs and how far it has migrated.

For the CDI, the current preferred alternative is in situ disposal, which involves size-reducing the canyon waste, putting it into the cellblocks, putting the cellblocks over the waste, grouting everything to prevent subsidence of the cap, and then putting a 15-foot thick evapotranspiration barrier over the top. The evapotranspiration cap has been tested at hundreds of places; EPA has a guidance document on this type of barrier. The concept is that you build the barrier thick enough to hold water and then vegetate it, so it will hold water during the winter; during the rest of the year, the water is lost back to the atmosphere through

evaporation and transpiration. There is one sewer pipeline that runs under the canyon. If this alternative is selected, that pipeline would be grouted.

One of the biggest assumptions is that resources, funding and staff will be available. Other assumptions include: that outstanding issues will be resolved in a timely and effective manner; that technical evaluations will show that the CDI barrier will be an effective remedy for all waste sites underlying the barrier; and that the innovative barrier design will be accepted by regulators and stakeholders.

Discussion / Questions

Greg deBruler asked what the 4 high-risk sites are and what the rationale is for not doing remove, treat and dispose for those sites. Kevin replied that it is the depth and contents of those sites that justify the implementation of surface barriers at those sites.

Pam Larsen observed that the year is one-third over, and the project doesn't know what money it has. The planning is great and the projects are queued up well, but it is problematic because there is no money to implement the planning.

Gerry Pollet expressed his concern that, for several years the Board has been promised a CDI EIS. Now DOE seems to be taking a piecemeal approach. He would like to know what the effect of having multiple mounds near each other will be. CERCLA will not answer this question. He is dissatisfied with the response that the public will be able to comment, since the public will not have the chance to see the whole picture. He thinks that the regional approach and CDI should be separated. The U-Plant issue and all the canyons need to be addressed in a single EIS document with a major public policy debate about the end state of the Central Plateau, so that the effects can be understood of all the canyons being collapsed with big mounds versus all the canyons being taken down to slab. Gerry suggested that the Board advise that no action should proceed until a CDI EIS has been issued.

Paige Knight stated that she is looking at the overall big picture, seeing the push to accelerate cleanup and the drive to decrease costs. It is clear that workers will be put into extremely dangerous situations to do dangerous work and yet she has heard a rumor that, in order to save money, the workers will be losing their pensions. Jeanie replied that this is more than a rumor: a change to the pension program is one of the options DOE is evaluating. Hanford workers have significantly higher benefits than the national average. Right now the idea under discussion is that new workers will not get the same pension benefits as those who are vested. Also, the cost of healthcare is rising and the budget must be able to transition through closure of the site. Nothing has been finalized yet, but DOE has approached the unions. Paige responded that she does not think that DOE values the Hanford workforce enough.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), stated that the workforce is a fragile thing. It is fragile because it is made up of people and people are more fragile than we think. Some of the work being done is dangerous and if you don't pay the people doing the dangerous work then you will not attract the quality of person you want. Jeff advised DOE to think about all the possible implications of cutting money from the work force. Jeff also stated that one of the tenets of RBES is streamlining the regulatory process. If DOE is considering changing the regulatory process he would like to see the Board brought into those discussions.

Greg deBruler pointed out that a long time ago there was a commitment that an EIS would be done any time there was going to be a project as major as the CDI. The value of an EIS is that it does allow you to go through the entire process by looking at the impacts and potential impacts and potential variables. Doing the EIS is just the right way to get the job done. Greg disagrees with the statement that bringing in small firms increases the economic diversification. In the TPA, the point was to create jobs and work that would last beyond cleanup. And as for U-Plant closure, he suggested that if DOE and the regulators want the Board's input on issues they should clearly, and in detail, inform the Board of the issues and ask for the input they are seeking.

Keith Smith stated that one way to reduce the costs at U-Plant would be to get rid of the operable units and have the workers plan their work on a large scale. The workers on the floor have a better idea of what and how to do their work than the suits who have not worked on the floor.

Todd asked if and how the Central Plateau Terrestrial Ecological Data Quality Objective (DQO) is related to the U-Plant Proposed Plan and the CDI Proposed Plan. Larry responded that the Ecological Risk Assessment will be one of the key documents that supports all of the operable unit work on the plateau. It deals with the bugs, plants, and animals from a terrestrial/ground view. Gariann Gelston, Non-Union Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), stated that there will be a two hour session in the next RAP meeting talking about the coordination between the DQOs, the River Corridor, the Tank Farm assessments and all the other risk assessments and identifying how they fit together both in timing and scope.

Todd observed that this plan reminds him of the original plan from 1989, which was called the Aggregate Area Management Strategy. John noted that Todd's statement is so accurate that, in the U-Plant area, Ecology has thought about going back to the original operable unit designation that was used in that aggregate area study.

Leon Swenson expressed concern over the RBES. He wants the Board to be aware of the fact that the RBES discussions are aimed at a higher level. He is not sure how these documents and plans will eventually come together.

Susan Leckband encouraged the Board to get more involved with the large amount of work that the RAP committee is looking at over the next couple of months. The more people who are involved, the smaller the pieces each person has to deal with.

Draft Advice: Public and Regulator Review and Input of Baselines

Gerry Pollet introduced draft advice about the adoption of baselines and the move away from annual budget prioritizations. The adoption of long-term baselines is a relatively new process. As the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) reviewed the adoption of baselines by DOE-RL and DOE-ORP, they found that there is no established process for regulator or public input and that the baselines were being adopted without any opportunity for that input. A major concern of the committee is that the TPA is very explicit about regulator and public involvement, but it does not mention baselines. BCC believes that the adoption of baselines without a regulator and public review process places DOE out of compliance with the TPA. Another concern of the committee is that the contracts are revised to reflect the baseline and are then locked in without public and regulator review.

The advice states the following regarding the adoption of or changes to the baseline:

- The TPA should be updated to include an annual review process.
- DOE should use the spring public meetings to receive input on the baselines. Changes to the baseline should be reviewed with the regulators, then brought to the State of the Site meetings in the spring. This would give the public a chance to comment and give alternative viewpoints about what the baseline major priorities should be.
- Changes to the TPA regarding modernization of language and the inclusion of this annual process, should be brought to the public meetings scheduled for spring 2004.
- Targets and baseline information should be presented to the Board and the public in a clear and easily understood format.

Another concern is that Hanford cleanup funds will crash after this election year's budget submittal. From 2004 to 2007, there is a loss of \$400 million. If the local governments are selling bonds without knowing this information, there is a problem. This illustrates the heart of the advice, which is that it is vital that this information be presented and updated on a regular basis.

One other important thing learned during the baseline briefings was that DOE-RL said it is changing the baseline in response to the M-91 agreement. In order to fund that change, they are considering dropping the removal of the strontium and cesium capsules from the D plant pools. Gerry pointed out leaving the capsules in wet storage has previously been called high risk, and a high worker safety exposure priority. This is a perfect example of why there should be regulator and public input to the baseline. It would be too late to comment on this after the milestone is already changed if the funds have already been spent elsewhere.

Discussion / Questions

Norm Dyer stated that he supports DOE's move towards a long-term view of the budget and would like to see the advice reflect that.

Ken Bracken pointed out that, while Gerry used the words "major changes to the baseline" in his presentation, these words are not included in the advice. He asked who would be defining what changes would be considered major. Ken suggested that usually "significant" or "major" changes revolve around policy changes or changes to the end point of the baseline. Gerry stated that it would be possible to put a parenthetical in the advice, but that BCC didn't want to get too caught up in the definition. Ultimately, the advice is asking the agencies to define "significant" and bring that definition forward for review and comment. Ken also pointed out that significant changes can happen at any time and a once yearly update may not be enough. Gerry explained that this is partly to encourage DOE to look at these changes as part of the bigger picture, rather than piecemeal. It would be impossible to take this type of information to the public several times during the year and expect them to understand the overall importance. Todd Martin pointed out that there is an infrastructure in place for the agencies to use to check in with the Board on gray area changes. The advice implies that the Board trusts that the agencies will use the structure that is in place, in the event that there are emergent issues that require fast action. Howard Gnann stated that, while it will take time to build that trust, much of DOE's activities are driven by the TPA. Any change to the baseline will likely affect a TPA process, which will automatically initiate the dialog between DOE and the public. Howard stated that it is probable that the Board will find it has more input with the baseline management concept than it did in the funds control process.

Betty Tabbutt, WA League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked for clarification on the difference between the second and third bullets which both pertain to the timing of the budget meetings. Gerry explained that the third bullet is specific to this year's combined Budget and State of the Site meetings. It is a request for changes to the TPA. The second bullet is stating that, if in the future the Budget and State of the Site meetings are not combined, then the spring meetings, whatever they are called, are where this process would belong. Betty expressed reticence as to whether it would be realistic to expect the public to turn out quickly for these budget/baseline meetings. Gerry pointed out that BCC is aware that they cannot expect the public to turn out quickly and that is why the advice calls for only one meeting a year, with the budget portion of the meeting focused on an overall big picture view.

Tim Takaro expressed concern that this is the first he has heard of the strontium and cesium capsules having extended life span within the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF). Todd commented that DOE-RL had mentioned this trade-off during the baseline discussions. He also confirmed that the RAP will be taking up this issue in its March meeting.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), expressed his concern over the fact that DOE-HQ seems to be leaving the local governments out of the communications. He stated that communication is vital. One of the duties of the local governments is to be on the look out for the types of economic impacts that baseline changes could have to the local communities.

Agency Perspective

Max Power, Ecology, agrees that it is important to keep the bigger picture in mind. Some of the old language in the TPA was geared specifically at ensuring that DOE did not shirk its responsibility to ask for what it needs on a year-to-year basis. The regulators are looking at how to best revise some of this

language while keeping a good balance between both the big picture and making sure DOE is asking for what it needs.

Mike Goldstein stated that the EPA also agrees that the big picture view is important. While some details must be left out at that level, most of those details can be worked out at the committee level. He gave the example of current disconnects in the 300 Area, where a lot of the work scheduled in the baseline is not consistent with the RODs or TPA milestones for years in the more distant future. EPA is working on changes to the TPA language that would help EPA insert into this process.

The advice was adopted.

Draft Advice: M-91 Transuranic (TRU) Waste Change Package

Change Package Overview

Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, described the M-91 change package, which is currently in the public comment period until February 13th. DOE has implemented the requirements and met the draft milestones of the change package, even though it is still in the public review process. To date, the contractor has retrieved about 500 drums from the TRU retrieval burial grounds and is in the process of moving those to the Central Waste Complex (CWC) for storage until they are shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). The other milestones are on schedule for completion. DOE-RL looks forward to finalizing the package so clean up can proceed.

Laura Cusak described the dispute that resulted in the M-91 change package. It started in June 2000. DOE gave Ecology the Project Management Plan (PMP) for TRU and TRU mixed waste in fulfillment of a milestone. Ecology did not like the PMP, in particular because the plan was not consistent with the existing milestones in the TPA. Ecology disapproved the plan and started the dispute. In 2002, DOE wanted to start shipping TRU onsite, so they decided to develop a change package that agreed to milestones for retrieving the TRU and shipping it off-site. That change package was to be ready by the end of March 2003. That change package was not ready at that time and, as a result, Ecology issued the following: a lawsuit to stop the importation of TRU, a final determination that set dates for some existing milestones that were part of the dispute, and an administrative order to cover the rest of the work that wasn't tied to the original milestones that were in dispute. DOE appealed the final determination and sued against the administrative order. DOE and Ecology agreed on a good portion of the work that needed to get done and the schedules by which it should be done. The disagreement revolved mainly around jurisdictional issues with regard to TRU mixed waste and how much authority Ecology has to make DOE ship the waste to WIPP. Ultimately, it was decided that the items that everyone agreed on in the administrative order would be carved out and the remaining disputed milestones would be left until the litigation was complete. The M-91 change package is the resulting carved out pieces.

The first section of the change package outline definitions, which are found elsewhere with the exception of the definition of retrieval of contact-handled or remote-handled waste. It was important to establish definitions because DOE wanted to use the word "retrieval" to describe moving dirt away from boxes and leaving it in the ground. Ecology stated that it isn't retrieval unless some action is taken with that waste.

M-91-01 is another Project Management Plan (PMP). The vision is that these PMPs will grow and evolve as new technologies develop and as new information is learned to help with remote handled waste. As time passes, the plan will have to be revised to reflect changes in baselines. There is a milestone that requires revision in 2008 when all the CERCLA RODs come in and again in 2012 when the ability to handle remote handled waste will be available because of milestone M-91-03.

New milestones include M-91-40, M-91-41, and M-91-42. M-91-40 deals with the retrieval of contact-handled, retrievably stored waste. It describes the retrieval rate. It also has a sequence for which burial grounds should be retrieved first, beginning with the highest risk area and then moving on to the oldest burial ground where waste was disposed of in direct contact with the soil. It also defines that DOE cannot get credit for retrieval from the next burial ground until the previous one is completed. There is a Sampling

and Analysis Plan for each burial ground to help determine if any contaminants have been released into the environment and, if so, the nature and extent of the contamination. There is some flexibility within the milestones for dealing with large boxes that will be difficult or impossible to move.

M-91-41 addresses the retrieval of remote-handled retrievably stored waste. It says that DOE should be started in the burial grounds by 2011 and that all the remote-handled waste, except that which is in the caissons, is to be retrieved by 2014. The waste in the caissons must be retrieved by 2018. Both M-91-40 and 41 say that once the waste is retrieved it must be designated as TRU or Low Level Waste (LLW), mixed or not, and then treated appropriately. There are also contingent milestones in the package regarding storage and disposition of mixed TRU. Those milestones will become active in the event that Ecology wins the lawsuit.

M-91-42 deals with the handling of newly generated contact-handled waste and treatment of mixed LLW. The goal of this is to treat and dispose of all the waste that is in the CWC by 2009.

Mike Goldstein pointed out that some fraction of the material generated from the CERCLA projects was getting hung up in this same type of process (not having a disposition plan), so this change package also has an M-16 milestone that requests a work plan for dispositioning the waste being generated from the CERCLA projects.

Introduction of Advice

Susan Leckband stated that one of the things that the advice drafting team determined would help the Board reach consensus was to tie it to advice #143, which clearly stated some principles that the Board has already agreed on for M-91. This advice is subject to and designed around those principles. The committee tried to keep the advice focused on the policy issues and away from the legal issues.

Discussion / Questions

Gerry Pollet wanted to hear more about how it is possible that waste that is retrieved might get stuck back into an unlined trench. Laura responded that when DOE retrieves the retrievably stored waste they will make a determination if the waste is TRU or LLW. In either case DOE will determine if it is mixed or un-mixed. If it is LLW or TRU non-mixed waste it will probably be disposed of in an unlined trench, since those waste forms are not covered by RCRA. Matt stated that DOE is working on a change to CERCLA that would allow this type of waste to be moved into the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), rather than the unlined trenches. Gerry stated that presenting the M-91 package as an agreement is not entirely accurate, since one of the parties that claims to be in agreement continues to sue the other party in an attempt to void the so-called agreement. He feels that it is important to inform DOE that they are committing public relations suicide by continuing this litigation.

Tim Takaro asked what is going to happen with the mixed TRU for which there are no clearly defined shipment criteria. Matt replied that the WIPP acceptance plan does cover all contact-handled TRU. Each site has to go through a certification process for each waste stream. DOE has been working to get as many waste streams as possible certified in the last year and shipments to WIPP have been accelerated. Laura clarified that it is the remote-handled waste for which there are no shipment criteria. Tim asked for clarification on the politics and likelihood that remote-handled TRU would be accepted at WIPP in the future. Matt explained that draft acceptance criteria exist and DOE is waiting for the criteria to be finalized, so they will know how to package the waste. He admitted it is hard to say what the likelihood is that the criteria will be finalized and accepted by the State of New Mexico.

Norm Dyer noted that the last bullet seems to say that the change package will delay remote-handled TRU activities at Hanford until WIPP has the acceptance criteria to take it. He does not think that should be the case. Laura stated that Norm's observation is accurate: there is a large volume of waste to be dealt with and, since the avenue is open to WIPP for the contact-handled TRU, it was decided that it would be best to concentrate on that for the early years and save the remote-handled for later years, when WIPP may change its acceptance criteria.

Pam Larsen asked Matt if it is true that there is a fair amount of LLW being retrieved. Legally, DOE can put that waste into an unlined trench. Pam asked if it is accurate to say that DOE is moving away from the use of unlined trenches. Matt replied that DOE is trying to phase out the use of unlined trenches, especially with the construction of the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF). In other words, if the LLW is reburied it will most likely go into a lined trench.

The advice was adopted.

HAB Annual Report and Self-Evaluation

Agency Perspectives

Max Power stated that he believes that the Board has been very disciplined in tackling the high priority issues that come up. The committees have worked very hard to get things done and ready to come to the Board. He has always thought that the wordsmithing process had a function and he has been impressed by the Board's discipline in the process over the last year. He stated that the Board gets much more done than what "wordsmithing" implies and Ecology is very pleased with the quality and level of advice that the Board has been giving.

Discussion / Questions

Todd Martin asked how other Board members feel about the efficiency measures that the Board has taken over the last two years. He thinks that last year's five meetings may have almost been too few.

Susan Leckband stated that, as self-appointed archivist for the 10-year anniversary party, she found that in 1995 there was a concerted effort to become more efficient, so this efficiency push is not new. She thinks that while the Executive Committee's retreat helped the group focus, the Board has too few meetings during the year. The Board is expected to give good, thoughtful advice, but the Board is not given the time or opportunity to discuss the issues in depth. Susan did acknowledge that she believes the Board has focused more this year than ever, but she is worried that the Board is losing its visibility and credibility.

Jim Trombold stated that he is very impressed with the intelligence and commitment level of the members of the Board. He does not believe that an additional meeting would solve the Board's problems. He believes that the Board produces good products, but that all the hard work on the advice is for naught if no one reads them with focus and attention. He would like to see the Board step up its efforts at being recognizable and do a better job of selling itself.

Greg deBruler stated that as long as there is cleanup, there will be a need for the Board. He thinks that the Board has matured now and Board members have started to realize that they all want the site cleaned up. One of the things that Greg would like to see on the site is the deceleration of accelerated cleanup. He would like to see the Board having more meetings, but more focused meetings where the agencies and regulators bring their difficult issues to the Board for input and assistance. He encouraged DOE-ORP to look at the Board as an under-utilized asset base and to more fully use the assets of the Board. He challenged the Board to create a vision together to drive the cleanup.

Pam Larsen stated that she thinks that the Board has made a lot of headway in the last two years. The challenge that the Board and the RAP committee face is a heavy and somewhat unpredictable workload. Many of the documents that are coming out are being delayed for various reasons. With the limited HAB meetings and comment periods, it makes timing critical. She thinks the committee schedule is working, but she would like to see the Board schedule take into account what and when documents are expected from DOE, so they can be discussed in a timely fashion.

Norm Dyer agreed that the concept of limiting the Board to five meetings a year has increased the efficiency of the Board, but that is with the caveat of the ancillary meetings, including the Executive

Committee retreat, the hard work of the committees, and the topic-specific workshops for the Board as a whole.

Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland (Local Government), agrees that it seems the Board doesn't have enough meetings mostly because he recalls several times when DOE-RL or DOE-ORP had to respond to urgent requests from DOE-HQ and the deadline fell between Board meetings. If there were more frequent meetings, this would be less of a problem.

Paige Knight thinks that the leadership of the Board has been pretty incredible. Along with that, the smooth flow between the facilitators and the leadership has really driven the Board to utilizing its time well. She did note that having fewer meetings gives her more energy to use the time well. Paige likes the creativity of the workshops and the fact that it creates energy and the opportunity to interact with the agencies. She did note that the diminishing resources, in the form of staff and Board member turnover, may be hurting the Board. She also stated that she thinks many members are feeling discouraged by some of the recent policy changes, which do not seem to be benefiting cleanup. However, the biggest difference in the Board is that Board members have gained a better understanding and respect for one another, which makes the Board powerful.

Tim Takaro pointed out that the past year has been pretty difficult for the Board in terms of the amount of stress DOE has put on the Board. He thinks that the Board has responded well to that stress and would like to see some appreciation from the agencies. One of his main concerns is the erosion of the Board's ability to have access to information. An example of this is the loss of access to budget information. He believes that this loss of transparency could really impede progress, especially if it becomes an ingrained loss. He urged the Board to be vigilant about accessibility to information.

Keith Smith reminded the Board that when the meetings were reduced to five per year, there was a caveat that the Board could ask for a 6th meeting if workload deemed it necessary. Keith noted that the Board does more than just issue advice and put things on record. The scrutiny that the Board provides sharpens the way DOE works and reacts. One example is the simple question of "What goes up the stacks?" When they investigated they found iodine. These little things make a difference and he feels the Board should congratulate itself.

Ken Bracken pointed out strong leadership by the chairs of the committees. He noted that fewer Board meetings means harder work for the chairs of the committees. He also praised the workshops put together by the committee chairs and co-chairs. He is hopeful that, as the Board looks ahead, the members are becoming more involved on a more consistent basis.

Amber Waldref noted that there is a continuing need to build new audiences and support for the importance of the work of the Board and the cleanup. Amber commends the Board on the work it has done in the last year as far as reaching out into the community. She challenges the Board to reach out to new groups and communities in the coming year.

Committee Reports

Tank Waste Committee (TWC): Doug Huston stated that TWC is currently in the process of reviewing its work plan, which has become outdated with all the changes on the site. He also pointed out that the C-Farm Risk Assessment Merit Review Panel is still meeting and looking for public input. He reminded the Board that, if it would like to have any input into the C-Farm risk assessment, then it should be sure to comment to the review panel soon, as they are due to turn their report in to DOE at the end of March.

Gariann Gelston stated that the committee is looking for integration and how the whole site goes together. She stated that it would be good to see the overlap between the tanks and the non-tanks as a risk assessment, and C-Farm is a good example where there is some overlap.

River and Plateau Committee (RAP): Pam Larsen stated that RAP will have a workshop on Monitored Natural Attenuation and an overview on risk assessment during its next committee meeting. Pam would

like to have a public meeting on these issues in Richland in the evening. RAP will also be talking about RBES to see what can be learned and what opportunities are being considered for the next draft. The next draft will be submitted without public or regulator input. There will also be updates on the K Basin sludge and the river corridor contract.

Public Involvement Committee (PIC): Amber Waldref stated that PIC will be ramping back up with a call on February 19th. With the need for public input on the RBES and the HSW-EIS there will be more to keep tabs on and be involved with. PIC has a few follow-up items, including the related issues from the dialog that was held in September and the possibility of advice suggesting DOE translate materials into Spanish in order to reach a greater percentage of the affected audience. PIC anticipates receiving a request from DOE for assistance with the upcoming State of the Site meetings, as well.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection (HSEP): Keith Smith stated that HSEP has had an update on the tank vapor issue and things seem to be progressing well. While the vapor levels aren't high enough to be an issue for Ecology, DOE has taken a number of steps to increase worker safety and to regain worker and family confidence. HSEP is also considering advice on the discontinuance of the former worker monitoring program. The committee will also be following a change to the medical contract for health surveillance. The contractor has been changed and there has been a protest.

Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC): Gerry Pollet stated that there would be a half day RL/ORP Baseline Workshop on March 2nd. Ongoing work includes working with the agencies on defining significant baseline changes and the TPA revisions. BCC will continue to look at the River Corridor Contract RFP and will try to schedule discussion on what type impact of removing the pension portability and current site-wide pension provisions would have on maintaining skilled workers onsite and what type of precedent this would set.

TPA Agency Updates

Ecology

Max Power stated that Ecology is still looking at the 2005 budget, but at this time, overall it looks very good.

EPA

Mike Goldstein said EPA has had a number of retirements recently and the Hanford office will also be handling some of the work of the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory (INEEL). There was some press exposure earlier in the morning in which EPA acknowledged the completion of the first phase of the 300 Area cleanup work. This is the portion of the 300 Area outside of the fence where the process ponds were located. About half a million tons of material were removed to ERDF, resulting in about 15% of the contents of ERDF.

DOE-ORP

Howard Gnann stated that DOE-HQ is reviewing the Tank Closure EIS. On February 16th a team will work through DOE-HQ's comments. Under the current schedule, the draft will be put out to the public as early as April 1st, but that may slip slightly.

DOE-ORP believes tank C-106 is empty. DOE is working with Ecology to have the tanks permitted as empty. The resulting permit would also have a public comment period. DOE-ORP is currently retrieving waste from tank S-112; there are probably another couple months before it is empty. There are four other tanks behind S-112, which will make six total tanks retrieved this year. The interim stabilization work should be done within the next month. They will still be doing the paper work to close it out, but that will still make it closed six months ahead of schedule.

Regarding the 2005 Budget Request, there is about \$1.39 billion in the ORP account. Over \$60 million is in a second account, which is part of the lawsuit. That money does not affect 2004 budgets in any way.

Questions

Paige Knight stated that page 249 of the budget states that there will be a \$20 million life cycle cost savings due to the supplemental technologies. She wanted to call everyone's attention to this and point out that the \$20 million figure cannot be a viable estimate, since the supplemental technologies are still under review. Howard replied that the estimate is based on scaling up the bulk vitrification, which is indicated in the baseline. There is also some other detail in the baseline that may be helpful, including the details on how DOE figures its liabilities and long term life-cycle costs. This particular figure also used estimates based on assumptions of how the tank farm will be closed in 2032. Paige also stated that she feels that a statement on page 291 sounds like DOE is going to withhold closure if pending litigation does not go their way. Howard explained that the funds are tied directly to the lawsuit, which is all about classifying residuals in the tanks. Howard said that, in his opinion, the only thing keeping him from tank farm closure is the EIS.

DOE-RL

Jeanie Schwier stated that, relative to the budget, DOE-RL had a 10% plus-up this year, receiving \$1.27 billion for cleanup alone plus an additional \$44 million for national programs that they work on across the country to support DOE's Environmental Management work.

In regard to the RBES document, comments have been received from DOE-HQ and it is being revised with a final draft to be issued at the end of March. There has been a lot of emphasis placed on this document, so a senior RL manager, Shirley Olinger, will be focusing on this effort now. Jeanie would like the Board to take a lot of time reviewing the variance portion of the document, which will serve as the basis for the beginning of discussions throughout the complex.

Questions

Greg deBruler asked Jeanie if comments on the RBES document that were sent to Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, were transferred to the new manager. Jeanie said that Mike is still working on the project along with Shirley Olinger. Greg asked Jeanie to clarify if there will be a public process for the final document at the end of March. Jeanie stated that the document must go to the regulators first; however, she is unsure of the process after that. Greg would like to see that vision described clearly. He thinks that this information is probably contained in the RBES document but it is not clearly stated. Greg was under the impression that the document was supposed to describe the process to get to the end state vision. Howard clarified that there is an end states vision, which is currently reflected in the baselines. There is also the RBES document, whose premise was that, based purely on the risks, DOE thinks that they can do less cleanup. However, saying that and doing that are two different things. Greg urged the Board to focus wholeheartedly on the RBES document when it is released in order to make sure things are done right. He stated that if the Board does not take advantage of the public review process it will not get done right.

Jim Trombold stated that, up to this time, the gold standard for dealing with tank waste has been vitrification. Now using a technology other than vitrification is described as supplemental. He pointed out that it isn't supplemental; it is a substitution. He warned the Board to not get caught up in DOE's words and to acknowledge that the supplemental technologies are really substitution technologies. Both "supplemental" and "accelerated" mean "less".

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), stated that he keeps hearing about how expensive and troublesome it would be to build a second Waste Treatment Plant (WTP), so it seems appropriate for DOE to provide a set of analyses showing the cost for the original WTP and the cost for building another. Howard stated that, as part of the M-62 milestone, DOE has agreed to bring forth a comparison of the performance and cost of the vitrification plant. This information will be presented in a refined report.

Board Business

The Bottom of C-106

Doug Houston, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), informed the Board that C-106 is the first tank to go through the interim tank closure demonstration process. At the last TWC meeting, the committee got to see a video of the inside of C-106, which is essentially now empty. The committee would like to send a letter to DOE-ORP congratulating them on emptying the first tank at Hanford. This wouldn't be advice and would not require consensus.

Discussion / Questions

Tim Takaro asked if the committee had defined "empty." Committee members clarified that the impressive and commendable aspect was that you could see the actual bottom of the tank.

Leon Swenson suggested that it is vital to include the workers in this congratulatory letter.

Several Board members supported the idea of a congratulatory letter, while expressing concern over the accuracy and message conveyed by wording in the letter. These concerns centered on not actually stating that the tank is "empty" or "closed."

Howard Gnann stated that preliminary calculations indicate that C-106 is at less than 360 cubic feet (2700 gallons of waste), which is the TPA goal. DOE has taken solid and liquid samples to find out what is still left in the tank and they are still working through the process with Ecology.

The letter will go to DOE-ORP and will be cc'd to the usual list as well as to the tank farm contractors and the workers.

April Board Meeting Topics

- Tank Closure EIS
- Final HSW-EIS
- Annual Groundwater Strategy Update
- 2005 budget request and out-years
- Risk-Based End States
- K-basins Sludge
- Risk Assessments

Tri-City Herald Editorial

Todd Martin informed the Board that there was an editorial in the *Tri-City Herald* stating that the Board is in a good position to provide educational opportunities and information on Initiative 297. Todd stated that he thinks the Board would never reach consensus on this issue and it would be close to a conflict of interest for the Board to provide this type of dialog, as many of the organizations involved with the Board have direct interest in the initiative. The topic was opened to the Board for comments regarding the level of participation and the necessity and format of a response to the editorial.

Leon Swenson noted that it would be difficult to separate recommendations from an objective discussion of the possible impacts. He recommended that the Board not participate in any sort of educational dialog and suggested that the Board leadership attempt to set up a meeting with the *Herald's* editorial staff, in order to clarify the role of the Board at the Hanford site. Several Board members agreed with Leon's recommendation.

Maynard Plahuta expressed some hesitancy about speaking with the editorial staff directly, as he has worked with editors of public papers in the past and, more often than not, what is reported in the paper is not what was said in the meeting.

Amber Waldref stated that she thinks it would be beneficial and advisable for the Board to make applicable pieces of advice easily accessible for the public.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), pointed out that this is a legislative issue that will go to the public for a vote if a decision isn't made during this legislative session. He does not think there is enough time left in this legislative session for the Board to do anything meaningful and he agrees that it will be difficult for the Board to reach consensus on the issue enough to come up with a meaningful interpretation of the facts. Harold recommended that the Board try to more fully understand what the editorial board was looking for.

Ken Bracken stated that he is against the Board or the Chair making any type of response to the article. He stated that he is certain the *Herald* did not understand what they were talking about or asking for.

Paige Knight pointed out that the fact that the editors at the *Herald* think enough of the Board to want its opinion and respect the Board so much as to count on the Board for an independent review is quite flattering. She suggested making a short, clear and concise response in order to keep the respect and reputation the Board has earned up to this point.

Madeleine Brown stated that the Board has been flattered by this request to help the legislators and public understand Hanford issues. However, she thinks it is vital that the Board reply quickly and make it explicitly clear that the Board is not chartered to do lobbying. She also suggested that the Board revisit the public education idea after this legislative session is over.

Jim Trombold stated that the Board should always be available to explain its role with the Tri-Party Agencies. He suggested that Todd write a response letter or visit the editors in person to describe the Board's roles and responsibilities. The meeting or letter would not necessarily address the initiative at all, but instead could be used as a public relations opportunity.

Many Board members agreed that it would be a bad idea to go before the editorial board due to lack of control over the questions asked and over what gets printed in the paper after the interview.

Max Power stated that Ecology staff, as state employees, are restricted from commenting on initiatives like this. He noted that Ecology's responses to questions about this issue would be constrained.

Todd will be drafting an editorial response relating to the Board's roles and responsibilities with Hanford and Hanford-related issues. He will circulate the draft to Board members via email to ensure no one objects to what he plans to say.

Public Comments

Marilyn Reeves, former Board Chair, challenged the Board for the coming year. An article in the Hanford Reach, dated February 7th, 1994, called the Board a new model of government and a new board of directors. Seeing how America does not need another greedy corporate government, she is glad to see that the Board is not a stereotypical corporate government. The Board is not stereotypical because it has moral principles and values that have been put in place and demonstrated. She congratulated the Board on a job well done.

As part of the public comment portion of the meeting, Gerry Pollet updated the Board as to the content of Initiative-297. I-297 was drafted based on Board advice regarding off-site waste acceptance. The initiative requires an advisory board for all mixed waste sites have. The advisory board would look incredibly similar to the existing Hanford Advisory Board and would exist as a condition of mixed waste permits. I-

297 also requires the discontinuation of unlined trenches, which is the same advice the Board has issued repeatedly. The initiative also addresses waste import, stating permits should be limited to waste generated onsite if the landfills are releasing to the environment or if groundwater standards are going to be exceeded. This is essentially taking the principle that there should be a cumulative impact analysis of adding more waste. The purpose of the analysis would be to say that if such facilities or additions will exceed standards, then off-site waste should not be brought in. The initiative does exempt the importation of Naval nuclear reactors and the low level commercial disposal site, it also states that mixed waste can be imported for treatment at the site, in order to utilize excess treatment capacity. Another item addressed by the initiative is the reclassification of high level waste in the tanks. The initiative would prevent the tank farms from being declared a landfill and would make sure that the tanks are cleaned up to meet hazardous waste law standards by requiring that the tank be closed as a system and releases and risk assessment be characterized before a tank can be declared closed.

The initiative does not change the TPA, but it essentially calls for a RCRA closure of the tanks. The initiative sets up a significant funding stream for local government participation in cleanup decisions. This is in addition to continuing public participation grants. The funding would come from a mixed waste surcharge, which currently funds Ecology's RCRA portion of their oversight program. The surcharge would include the local government and advisory board funding as part of a permit condition.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Ken Bracken, Member	Gerry Pollet, Member	Rick Jansons, Alternate
Patrick Conley, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Leon Swenson, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond	Margery Swint, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Betty Tabbutt, Member	Richard Smith, Alternate
Doug Huston, Member	Tim Takaro, Member	John Stanfill, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Art Tackett, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Allyn Boldt, Alternate	Amber Waldref, Alternate
Robert Larson, Member	Madeleine Brown, Alternate	Charles Weems, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-officio
Jeff Luke, Member	Norm Dyer, Alternate	Michael Gearheard, Ex-officio
Todd Martin, Member	Gariann Gelston, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-officio
Bob Parks, Member	Rebecca Holland, Alternate	Jeff VanPelt, Ex-Officio

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Jeff Frey, DOE-RL	Michael Goldstein, EPA	John Britton, BNI
Mary Goldie, DOE-RL		Suzanne Heaston, BNI
Kevin Leary, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Dru Butler, CH2MHill
Matt McCormick, DOE-RL	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Chuck Hedel, CH2MHill
John Morse, DOE-RL	Brittney Drollinger, Ecology	Rico Cruz, CTUIR DOSE
Larry Romine, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Jeanie Schwier, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Stacey Howery, EnviroIssues
Yvonne Sherman, DOE-RL	Max Power, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
Ted Taylor, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Howard Gnann, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Andrea Hopkins, Fluor Hanford
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Ron Jackson, Fluor Hanford

		Janice Williams, Fluor Hanford
		Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
		Kelly Brazil, Innovations - ORP
		Kim Ballinger, Nuvotec - ORP
		Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec - ORP
		Janice Parthree, PNNL
		Terri Traub, PNNL/DOE Reading Room
		Michael Priddy, WDOH

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Fran Berting, NNM CAB	Mark Freshley, PNNL	Gai Oglesbee, National Nuclear Victims for Justice – Manager
Jim Brannon, NNM CAB	Lori Gamache, Nuvotec	Merilyn Reeves
Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Katherine Guidy, NNM CAB	Doug Sherwood, Rivers Edge Environmental
Rico Cruz, CTUIR DOSE	Liz Hirsch, MACTEC	Skip Wood, MACTEC
Tim DeLong, NNM CAB	Jim Knight, RCA/CDA	