

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

June 16-17, 2005

Richland, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

| | |
|---|----|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Welcome and Introductions | 3 |
| Approval of April Meeting Summary | 3 |
| Integrated Disposal Facility | 3 |
| Washington State Department of Ecology and Attorney General’s Offices Introductions | 5 |
| 200-UW-1 Operable Unit Waste Sites..... | 5 |
| Budgets and Contracts Committee Budget Briefing..... | 6 |
| Capping Considerations..... | 7 |
| Contracting – Small Contractors..... | 8 |
| Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Update | 9 |
| Leadership Retreat | 9 |
| Tri-Party Agency Updates | 11 |
| Committee Reports and Issue Manager Updates | 13 |
| Board Business..... | 13 |
| Public Comment..... | 14 |
| Attendees..... | 14 |

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.

Executive Summary

Board Action

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or the Board) adopted four pieces of advice: one regarding Considerations for Barrier Application; one regarding the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) Permit; one regarding Safety Issues in Contracting with Small Business; and one regarding 200-UW-1 Waste Sites Proposed Plan.

Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF)

Delmar Noyes, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), presented background information regarding IDF construction. Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) informed the Board about the IDF permit process and updated the Board on the permit status.

Washington State Department of Ecology and Attorney General’s Offices Introductions

Rob McKenna, Washington State Attorney General, his staff, and Jay Manning, Director, Director of Ecology, were introduced to the Board. Rob McKenna and Jay Manning briefly thanked the Board for their efforts and encouraged Board members to keep up the good work.

200-UW-1 Operable Unit Waste Sites

The 200-UW-1 Operable Unit Waste Sites Proposed Plan was out for public comment. John Price, Ecology, reviewed highlights of the Proposed Plan. The Proposed Plan outlines cleanup alternatives for some of the first soil waste sites on the Central Plateau to be remediated at Hanford.

Budgets and Contracts Committee Budget Briefing

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), briefed the Board on the 2006 and 2007 budget requests. The funding requests are significantly lower than in the previous years.

Capping Considerations

The Board reviewed and approved the second part of their values piece regarding Central Plateau cleanup and the use of caps and barriers at Hanford. This product is a companion piece to the Hanford Advisory Board – Central Plateau Remedial Action Values Flow.

Contracting – Small Contractors

New contractors and other changes at the Hanford site have raised concerns about small contractor hiring practices and on-site safety programs. The Board approved advice to aid the Department of Energy (DOE) in the selection of small contractors.

Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Update

Todd Martin and Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, updated the Board on the most recent SSAB chairs meeting. The chairs have requested a National Forum on cross-complex waste disposition challenges. DOE is currently working on this forum.

Leadership Retreat

Board leadership participated in a retreat in May. Several things came out of this retreat, including the removal of the second vice-chair position, the creation of a new National Liaison position, Board priorities for 2006, and more conscientious adherence to charter requirements for seat participation.

Board Business

Tim Takaro is leaving the University of Washington and the Board. The selection process for the open Public-at-Large seat has been initiated. Interviews will take place the end of June. New members were assigned mentors to help them transition onto the Board. Topics for the September Board meeting were discussed.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

July 16 – 17, 2005

Richland, WA

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Environmental/Citizen Organizations) Chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) to order. The meeting was open to the public and offered ongoing opportunities for public comment.

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are members of the public. Five seats were not represented: Benton County (Local Government), Hanford Watch (Regional Environmental/Citizen Organizations), University of Washington (University), Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) (Ex-Officio) and one Public-at-Large seat.

Welcome and Introductions

Todd announced a new Public Comment process. Those wishing to make public comment at the Board meeting were directed to sign in and notify the Board's administrator of their desire. The Board Chair would then be notified and would ask for public comment at the conclusion of the following agenda item. The new process is designed to be more accessible and flexible for those who would like to comment.

Lynda Horst was introduced. She is the new alternate representing the Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon) seat.

The open Local Environmental seat has been filled by the Richland Rod and Gun Club. Eugene Van Liew, the new member, and Paul Kison, the new alternate, were introduced.

Dan Opalski, Director, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 10, thanked the Board for their services, stating that, from EPA's perspective, the work the Board does plays a vital role to cleanup. He also commended the Board's work on the Capping Considerations flowchart.

Approval of April Meeting Summary

The Board approved the April meeting summary with changes submitted by Dennis Faulk, EPA.

Integrated Disposal Facility

Delmar Noyes, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), presented an overview of the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF). IDF is composed of two cells. Cell one will be used for disposal of Mixed Low Level Waste (MLLW) containing Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) components, as defined in the draft Part B Permit. Cell two will be used for disposal of low-level waste (LLW) with no RCRA regulated components, resulting from cleanup activities.

The facility will be one construction with a rise in the middle that will separate the leachate collection systems. It will be a double lined landfill with secondary containment and leak detection systems. In addition to the regulatory required barriers, the enhanced IDF design includes two additional Geosynthetic Clay Liners (GCL) and a third high-density polyethylene (HDPE) geomembrane liner beneath the liquid collection area, to provide a secondary leak detection system.

Operations at IDF will be similar to operations at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), with the main difference being ERDF is a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) regulated facility and IDF will be RCRA regulated. Leachate will be monitored and waste placement will be recorded to facilitate retrieval, should retrieval become necessary. The Action Leak Rate (ALR) will be used to monitor performance of the Leachate Collection and Removal System. Groundwater monitoring will be performed in accordance with regulations.

Site preparation activities were completed in November 2004 under a state-authorized temporary action permit. The new temporary authorization to allow construction to proceed is anticipated to be effective by August 2005. Liner system construction would be complete in December 2005 and the remaining ancillary support systems would be complete by January 2006.

Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), commented on the IDF permitting process. She stated the purpose of IDF is to provide a facility that combines new technology and utilizes the efficiencies learned from ERDF and the LLW trenches. DOE has implemented the commitment to discontinue the use of unlined LLW trenches. The existing MLLW trenches are filling up with both LLW and MLLW and will be full by the end of 2006. The IDF MLLW cell will take the pressure off the MLLW trenches that already exist. Suzanne noted there is also a Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestone regarding construction of a LLW glass trench. Having the combined facility will allow the LLW side to be built to the same standards.

The permit is currently out for public comment. For both the Bulk Vitrification (BV) and Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) permits Ecology received a significant amount of public comment which they used to modify the permits. These comments are incorporated into the permit and then the public is notified of how the comments were used. The current permit covers the first third of IDF's MLLW cell for disposal of Immobilized Low Activity Waste (ILAW) glass and fifty BV test boxes from the Research, Demonstration and Development (RD&D) permit. The below waste forms are not currently covered under the permit and would require a permit modification prior to acceptance and disposal at IDF:

- Offsite MLLW
- Onsite MLLW
- Secondary waste from WTP
- Spent and failed melters
- Full scale Supplemental Treatment waste forms

The draft permit requires that waste not in compliance with state and federal requirements not be disposed of at IDF. The draft permit specifies requirements for glass formulation and performance assessment as well as requiring DOE to provide Ecology with a description of WTP production processes. It also requires DOE to create and maintain a cumulative modeling-risk budget tool which models future impacts of the planned IDF waste forms; and that modeling results be compared to performance standards. Suzanne pointed out waste forms and glass formulations that are not included in the draft permit will be required to meet the waste acceptance criteria and will undergo rigorous testing and evaluation. And as with many disposal facilities in dry arid regions where the water table is so far below ground, vadose zone monitoring is required as well as a secondary leak detection system.

Advice Introduction

Gerry Pollet noted that about six to twelve months ago it was proposed to permit the entire facility and all waste streams without an adequate Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The state of Washington is in court challenging the Hanford Solid Waste EIS (HSW-EIS) regarding offsite and secondary waste streams. The risk budget for the site is likely to be exceeded due to these and there is still no cumulative impact analysis. Gerry stated the committee endorses the permit requirements and conditions Suzanne reviewed, but they do not endorse the lack of cumulative impact analysis to this point. The proposed advice advises subsequent IDF permit modifications include cumulative risk analysis of all wastes previously disposed in IDF in addition to all wastes proposed for disposal in IDF in the permit modification. Gerry also noted the entire capacity of IDF is 900,000 cubic meters (m³). The HSW-EIS only analyzed 350,000 m³. The additional 190,000 m³ is for disposal of offsite LLW and secondary waste streams. The impact of disposing of this amount of waste cannot be accurately modeled without a cumulative impact assessment.

Susan Leckband, "Non-Union, Non-Management" Employees (Hanford Work Force) summarized the advice by stating that the committee does not want to obstruct cleanup with the advice, they are just saying

the information provided is good; and requesting that, when subsequent models are made, they should include the capacity. The advice is asking for more rigorous analysis.

Board Discussion and Questions

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government) clarified that the eventual build-out for IDF is 900,000 m³ but the current permit is for 160,000 m³.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government) clarified the source of the additional 190,000 m³ of waste. Gerry pointed out that no off site MLLW will be allowed in the MLLW cell of IDF. On the LLW side of IDF, there are no waste acceptance criteria specified in the permit. He stated DOE wants to import and dispose of 480,000 m³ of waste in the LLW side by 2007.

The advice was adopted.

Washington State Department of Ecology and Attorney General's Offices Introductions

Rob McKenna, Washington State Attorney General, thanked the Board and commended them for being part of the public involvement process. He and several members of his staff will be joining the state Ecology team for a site tour, viewing the cleanup efforts firsthand.

Jay Manning, Director, Washington State Department of Ecology, stated the Board's work is very important and difficult. He noted that he was part of the team that originally negotiated the TPA in the 1980's. At the time, they were worried that Hanford was too big a task to tackle, but in light of the progress to date, it is exciting to be a part of. He noted there are challenges, the budget being the most pressing. There are also tank waste reclassification issues to work through and problems with the WTP. There will be pressure to slow down or stop construction on WTP, due to delays and cost overruns, but this is not an option. Without WTP, cleanup will stop. Jay stated even with these issues, Hanford is managing a large share of the nation's waste.

Todd thanked Rob and Jay and noted the Board's appreciation for having continued support from the regulators, as that is a critical element to keeping the Board operating well.

200-UW-1 Operable Unit Waste Sites

John Price, Ecology, stated Ecology is responsible for writing the Record of Decision (ROD) and responses to the public comments. He gave the Board an overview of the CERCLA Proposed Plan (Plan), concentrating on issues received during the public comment period. There are 31 soil waste sites in the vicinity of the 221-U Plant Facility (U Plant). Many of these sites have soil contamination all the way to the water table. Preferred remediation alternatives were selected by site. Nine sites were selected for monitored natural attenuation (MNA). The contamination will decay within 150 years. Five sites will be covered by three barriers and fifteen sites have been selected for retrieve, treat and disposal (RTD) at ERDF. The public involvement process brought up many ideas and suggestions, which will be incorporated into a remedial design work plan.

John noted that the Board would be discussing Considerations for Capping during the Board meeting. He stated this goes along well with what is being considered now. DOE originally proposed six sites for RTD. They eventually agreed to RTD fifteen sites. In instances where barriers will be used, DOE will be required to do a treatability study to identify what could be done at those sites. In the River and Plateau (RAP) committee discussions, a hybrid alternative involving partial excavation was discussed. This will be modeled and evaluated further, but will not be studied as a separate alternative.

Characterization is always a concern in the 200-Area. A phased or analogous approach has been used to determine the site approaches. There have been problems with this approach and Ecology has asked DOE to analyze at least 61 sites further. DOE has gone ahead and started this further analysis. Modeling is used to predict the effects of remediation on groundwater and the environment. Based on the characterization

and modeling, DOE will be required to do a number of things to ensure protection of groundwater and the environment. They will need to perform post-ROD sampling; submit a detailed barrier design, beyond the conceptual design; perform additional modeling; and monitor the groundwater at those sites.

Advice Introduction

Shelley Cimon stated the challenge with developing this advice was elevating the technical issues to a policy level. She asked Board members who are not part of RAP to trust that the committee did the leg work necessary to understand the issues. The advice addresses several aspects of the Plan, including the fact that none of the RTD alternatives evaluated partial retrieval. All alternatives excavated to 200 feet or not at all. The committee would like to see an alternative with partial excavation and smaller barriers. The Plan presupposes the application of barriers at 221-U and surrounding waste sites. The Plan also uses undiscounted life-cycle costs when comparing the financial viability of alternatives. It should take into account the long-term costs and weigh those against immediate cost benefits. The committee found a discrepancy in the models used in vadose zone excavation and contaminant distribution models. Those models should be standardized, to assist in quantifying the validity of the models.

Board Discussion and Questions

Vince Panesko, City of Richland (Local Government), stressed the importance of cleanup efforts at operable unit 221-U. He stated this is the first cleanup operation of its kind and the lessons and methods used now will be used later in other operable unit cleanup efforts. John Price concurred that this will be the first soil waste sites to be cleaned up and the first barriers to be built on the site. Vince asked if the Plan is the most efficient way to do this. Nick Ceto responded the goal is to take the spirit of the TPA and overlap as little as possible. Vince suggested having a table that outlines the different regulations (CERCLA, SEPA, RCRA) to help with trackability and understanding. Nolan suggested a table illustrating why certain cleanup decisions were made, by site, would be more helpful.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, noted that placing waste under multiple different barriers will be more difficult to track in the out years than if they were all consolidated in one area, under one regulation.

Gerry Pollet stressed the committee is not endorsing RCRA closure. He noted that DOE had applied for RCRA status for crib U-12, stating that it didn't receive waste after 1987. There are other cribs that would also qualify, but DOE has not applied for a permit for those. He wanted to be sure that the advice does not comment on what the status is under RCRA and does not say it is ok to use one blanket permit. John agreed the advice is clear and consistent with TPA values.

Nick stated the agencies were required to use discounted life cycle costs. He suggested the advice say to use both discounted and undiscounted. Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government) would like to see the comparison between the two.

The advice was adopted.

Budgets and Contracts Committee Budget Briefing

Gerry reviewed the status of the cleanup budget for 2006 and 2007. The analysis of the budget request for 2006 is down \$267 million from the 2005 request. He noted that amount is even greater when the amount for safeguards and securities is deducted. For the 2007 request, the above target dollars include the assumption that a great deal of money will be freed up if plutonium is moved off-site, rather than paying for safeguarding on-site. The northwest congressional delegation stated that the 2005 request was the peak funding year for Hanford cleanup. Gerry stated that he was not sure where this peak estimate came from, as it does not seem to be related to the TPA. If congress funds at this lower level, cleanup will be adversely affected. The 2012 milestone for Columbia River Corridor cleanup will be delayed by two years. K-basins don't receive any cleanup dollars. Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) cleanup was funded and groundwater received a slight increase. Gerry stated that Hanford is fighting an uphill battle. If the senate doesn't move

money from other projects to Hanford, there will not be an increase in 2006. Gerry did note that the budget request included a number of changes based on the Board and regulator's comments.

Board Discussion and Questions

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government) stated that a couple years ago, the budget request was based on the assumption that money would be freed up by sites that were closing or transferring to Legacy Management (LM). When those sites closed, Hanford would get those funds. That does not appear to be happening. Gerry concurred stating there was a commitment in the 2006 Closure Act that Hanford would be funded in 2006 due to the closure of other smaller sites. Susan Leckband stated that she had read several quotes from Department of Energy-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) they are not planning on doing that. Gerry stressed the importance of letting Congressman Hastings know this and communicating the fact that Hanford's peak funding year has not yet arrived.

Madeleine Brown, Washington League of Women Voters (Region Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest) asked if what is happening in the Senate has to do with party politics. Gerry stated there isn't much of a partisan element. They are all in agreement not to go outside the account, but to simply move funds around within accounts. Gerry noted that most of the budget talks center around the question, "If we are going to increase funds, where will the money come from?" Gerry noted the 2006 appropriation request is just the beginning. The cleanup funds for Hanford drop between 2006 and 2011. Cleanup laws are clear. If DOE doesn't request the funds, then the state can require them to continue to meet TPA milestones, regardless. However, if DOE requests the funds and congress doesn't approve it, then DOE can be released from liability for not meeting cleanup milestones.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government) stated that budget constraints are directly harming groundwater, as source term could have been cut off if funds were available to cap the contaminating wells. The contractors and workers are there, but the funds are not.

Jerry stated when the budget for 2006 was cut, DOE testified to the Armed Services Committee there would be no impact to schedule with the reduction of the budget. Immediate milestones may not be affected, but out year milestones will be. And how will delays at WTP affect budget requests? Delaying funding now will cost more in the long run.

Capping Considerations

Gary Petersen, Tri-City Industrial Development Council (Local Business) stated this is the second Board product relating to the Central Plateau decision making process. This came from RAP with consensus. The product is meant to strengthen the Board's position on characterization, and then RTD for cleanup in the Central Plateau. When a barrier is applied, RAP hopes that characterization and technology are utilized (as on the flowchart product). Following monitoring, it is imperative that there be a public involvement process in place and that long-term stewardship includes funding for public involvement.

Todd suggested standardizing the terminology regarding what constitutes a cap, barrier, cover, etc.

Dick suggested text to highlight the concern that undiscounted life cycle costs be shown for all alternatives for accurate comparison.

Paul Kison, Richland Rod & Gun Club (Local Environmental) expressed concerns about the use of barriers at the Hanford site. He thinks that monitoring a capped site is a waste of time and money, as the cap is sure to fail at some point. He also stated that putting money in a fund for future work will not happen. He cited Yucca Mountain as an example. Gerry responded that there are some instances where caps are the only practical cleanup alternative. It is true that caps and institutional controls fail, but the proper characterization can aid effective monitoring. Dick agreed that DOE and other federal agencies don't work well when putting money into trusts, but he does know of a private industry example where that strategy

worked. Tax payers are putting money in while a plant is operating and when it shut down, the money was there for cleanup.

Rod suggested the advice cover monitoring all capped sites, rather than simply monitoring representative sites. Dick agreed stating each site should be monitored for the specific array of contaminants contained within the barrier.

The advice was adopted.

Contracting – Small Contractors

Keith Smith stated the Health Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) had concerns regarding recent happenings on the site concerning small contractors. The advice is specifically designed to assist DOE in the selection of small contractors. Recent contract awards seem to suggest that the appropriate standards for safety and environmental protection may not have been adhered to during the selection process. Concerns also exist regarding the specification of DOE Contracting Officer authority in small contractor requests for proposal (RFP).

Board Discussion and Questions

Madeleine asked for clarification of the meaning of one of the points of advice. Keith explained they were trying to capture the idea that, if there is an existing safety program that has proven to be effective, DOE would expect a new contractor to keep that program and possibly try to build on that program, rather than implementing a new program. Tax payers paid for the program, if it is working and paid for, then there is no reason to drop it.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local & Regional Public Health) asked if the advice to look at the history of a person or contractor implies an action. Does this advise DOE to attempt to rehabilitate or exclude the applicant? Keith replied the idea is that the history of the applicant matters and needs to be considered. HSEP is advising that past performance be ascribed more weight which could lead to possible exclusion.

Margery Swint, Benton Franklin Public Health (Local & Regional Public Health) suggested DOE have a pre-proposal meeting with prospective bidders, so they can see what safety and work planning on a DOE contract entails. That way they can ensure their ability to meet the requirements before winning the bid. Paul Kison concurred, stating it is difficult to impose regulations that were not previously detailed, once a contract has been awarded.

Jerry asked if there was an external safety manual that DOE gives new contractors to follow. Joe Voice stated that the requirements are there, but they are not imposed through a specific document. The requirements are imposed and identified upfront and enforced through the contracts.

Mike Keizer, Central Washington Building Trades Council (Hanford Work Force) asked for clarification of “small contractor”. Keith responded there are very specific definitions in place as to who qualifies as a small contractor. The advice uses that same definition.

Dick noted that, if DOE is trying to implement a consistent program across the site, they should make sure it is plainly stated in the RFP. It is possible the rigor may discourage some small contractors, but that is better than waiting until they are awarded the contract and then realizing they cannot meet the requirements.

Rob Davis suggested having a section relating to continuity of worker health and incident records. Vince suggested having HSEP look at this separately, as it is a very important and separate issue.

The advice was adopted.

Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Update

Todd stated, in November 2004, the SSAB chairs signed a letter to the Assistant Secretary at that time, asking for a national forum on waste disposition, mostly due to the looming concern of gridlock. In April 2005, the chairs received a letter from Paul Golan, stating that such a forum would not be a good use of resources. At the end of April, the chairs suggested nearly the same concept, but with more detail. On June 6th, they received a response stating that such a forum would be a good idea. Agency staff were present on the recent chairs' call. They are working on an integrated schedule for disposal of all waste in the DOE complex. The staff were very forthcoming and helpful and answered the chairs' questions. They emailed the chairs the first conceptual draft of the document they had been working on later the same day. Todd stated he left the call feeling very positive and assured that they are thinking about and working on this topic.

Shelley attended the SSAB Chairs meeting which was held concurrently with the April Board Meeting. At the Chairs meetings, advisory board chairs from sites all over the DOE complex meet to talk about issues of interest. Some of the Boards in attendance are collapsing or closing, due to site closure or transition to Legacy Management. How those boards are impacted and how public involvement will continue are the primary concerns for these boards at this time. Other issues covered included potential budget shortfalls, 370 buried waste sites under consideration for capping, and the national forum. Shelley noted that Oak Ridge has tremendous outreach materials. She would like to see the Board develop something that could be taken into classrooms. Shelley would also like to see the Board more involved with national events, like the conference that took place in St. Louis.

Todd noted that, with the number of advisory boards closing, there is a letter all the chairs are signing. He asked Board members to read it and then give consent for him to sign it. Because this is not a Board product, Board members were not allowed to wordsmith or alter the letter.

Dick asked how much involvement boards that are closing should have with the letter and forum. Shelley responded that there are too many variables. Legacy Management is still in its infancy and there is no standard set for how it will work within the complex. Including them acknowledges the knowledge and experience they have is important. Ideally, the chairs would like to see the transitioning boards transition with their sites into another type of public involvement entity. Todd noted that some of the boards will be regulated by legislation that limits participation to elected officials only. Board members who have participated for years feel they are being cut out and this forces elected officials to participate, whether they are interested or not.

The Board agreed to have Todd sign the SSAB Chairs' letter.

Leadership Retreat

Todd stated initially he did not think there would be a need for a leadership retreat, then it became clear that the chair of the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) and vice-chair would be leaving the Board and the RAP and PIC committee chairs would be significantly reducing their commitment to leadership. When quantified, seven of thirteen leadership positions would either be empty or operating with reduced commitment. The Executive Committee also noticed in the Board's charter the requirement for seats to participate in at least 25% of the meetings in a year. And the facilitation contract with EnviroIssues expires at the end of September. There was plenty to cover at the leadership retreat.

The leadership team began by addressing the leadership challenges. They started by looking at where there is energy on the Board and who is doing the work. They realized that many new members have been instilled with issue manager energy and have built up good strength. The issue manager energy is great, but the pool of ready, willing and available leaders is smaller than the need. The leadership team will be instituting a mentorship program. They don't want to just bring in new members, but also bring up new leaders. Also, due to the small pool of candidates, they would like to eliminate the co-vice-chair position when Shelley's term is up.

When Shelley's term is up, the leadership group would like to create a National Liaison position. There is great value in Shelley and the knowledge she possesses. The National Liaison position will be a part of the leadership group. The position will be a great way to maintain Shelley's knowledge and will help the Board put forward a positive image on the national scene.

In the past, the Board and the Agencies have played partnering roles in the contractual process for facilitation selection. The agencies have committed to continue with this approach. The leadership group will be working with the agencies to issue an RFP statement of work and evaluation criteria.

The Board discussed the seat participation requirement last year. Now the leadership group will institute an excused absence policy. If the seat member and alternate cannot be at a meeting, they must contact the agency to let them know they will not make it. This absence will then be excused and not count towards the 25% missed meetings. If a seat misses two meetings in a row, then Todd will contact the member to assess the organization's interest for remaining on the Board. Todd will then take this information back to the leadership group and then ultimately to the Board to decide the fate of the offending seat. In order to support this proposal, a letter detailing the new policy will go out to all seats.

In the coming year the Board will need to come up with a set of cleanup priorities. This is something the Board has never done before. This needs to be done in response to the fact that Hanford cleanup may not be fully funded in the coming years and because there are priorities that are not covered in the TPA or the baseline. Primarily the priorities will probably focus on the Tank Closure EIS and the maturation of the composite site analysis. Also, with the release of the technical guidance document, the leadership team is hoping to implement the technical assistance work the Board requested a year and a half ago.

The leadership team would like to see the Board more involved with public education and involvement efforts. They would also like to see the Board cooperating with other sites on DOE complex-wide interdependencies. The Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) has started work on guidelines for the procurement of major contracts. And groundwater is still a major issue for the Board.

Todd also revealed a proposed plan for the upcoming year's Board meeting schedule. Portland and Seattle were not included, but new locations include Lewiston and a return to Hood River. The schedule will go back to the first Thursday and Friday of the month.

Board Discussion and Questions

Jim Trombold expressed concern that the letter regarding seat participation requirements might cause stakeholders to think the Board has attendance problems. He suggested the letter be worded such that it is simply outlining the policy, not stating that it is in response to a problem. Todd agreed, stating the Board hasn't necessarily had a problem so much as there is a charter requirement that has not been enforced. Susan Leckband noted that there has been a problem, but the letter should focus on why it is going out to everyone. It isn't just attendance issues, it is also participation. Signing on with the Board is a commitment to help with the work of the Board. Todd stated that last year, the Board decided to encourage participation by detailing what it means to be a Board member. This strategy failed, so the fall back has been to go back to the charter.

Rob suggested quantifying the requirement. Attending and participating in 25% would mean attending more than five to six meetings per year. The Board's expectation is that members will become active participants, not just place holders. Todd said yes, 25% is a minimum requirement. Members are expected to participate.

Harold Heacock, Tri-Cities Industrial Development Council (Local Business) asked if the requirement defines what constitutes a year. Todd noted that the charter does not give a definition, but the Board can define it if that will help. The purpose is to look for a way to enforce a reasonable way to enforce the charter. Board members agreed to make it a calendar year.

Jim Curdy, Grant & Franklin Counties (Local Government) would like to see the second vice-chair position maintained. He stated that it seems contradictory to say you want to expand the leadership team and then remove one of the leadership positions. Todd replied that removing the second vice-chair position reduces the number of positions to be filled (from 13 to 12). The goal of expanding the leadership team is to expand the number of people who are qualified, willing and able to participate in leadership roles.

Gariann Gelston, "Non-Union, Non-Management" Employees (Hanford Work Force) stated she does not travel when the Board is not in Richland, but she tries to attend by phone. The process for conference calling is very difficult and inadequate. She would like to see this made more inclusive, so that traveling to be with the Board is not an issue. She suggested teleconference calls or some other way to tell who is speaking when and ensuring that speakers are using their microphones. Rob suggested making this part of the new facilitation contract.

Howard Gnann, DOE-ORP, noted that if an organization is serious about being involved in the Board and there is an alternate appointed, there is no reason for that organization to not be represented at meetings. He finds the excused absence policy odd. Keith stated that, when meetings are not at set times and dates it is harder for some members to attend, so he agrees with the excused absence policy.

Rick Jansons, "Non-Union, Non-Management" Employees (Hanford Work Force) asked if there were any organizations that the seat participation policy letter is aimed at. Todd responded there are currently no egregious offenders. There are organizations who would respond that they are interested in the Board, but their members are under undue circumstances right now. The letters will go out as a reminder and to let the new members and organizations know what the requirements are.

Gariann pointed out that the seat participation policy is directed mainly at Board meetings and more time is spent in committee meetings and outside work. She does not think the letter will get at the heart of the problem, which is a commitment to committee meetings and issue manager work. She suggested looking back at work that occurred in the restructuring workshop.

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, stated that it is important for the Board to ensure it is operating under its charter. He asked if the second vice-chair position and the national liaison position are connected. Todd stated they are not connected directly, but Shelley cannot remain as vice-chair. Nolan suggested that, if the national liaison position can be set up within the Board's structure, it seems like a good idea. It could help to be more interactive with other sites.

The Board agreed to the creation of the National Liaison position and to having Shelley appointed to this role. Board members decided to send the letter to all seats regarding the seat participation policy and encouraging actively participating seats.

Tri-Party Agency Updates

DOE-RL

Joe Voice stated that the big news at DOE-RL is that the transition work under the River Corridor contract has begun. Joe introduced John Fulton of the Hanford Team for Washington Closure. John stated the transition should be complete by August 26th. Washington Closure is made up of three companies. Washington Group International (WGI), Bechtel and CH2MHill. They are hoping to bring in some new faces, but many of their employees are familiar with Hanford, too. They are planning to take on the incumbent workforce and add new resources, too. The details of the contract will be shared with BCC. Joe noted BCC may be interested in an update on the transition plan and planning efforts.

Washington State Department of Ecology

Nolan Curtis reminded the Board that the IDF comment period ends soon. He also noted there are several comment periods coming up in the next couple of weeks. Ecology is reviewing the bulk vitrification

permit. There is not a formal comment period, but if Board members would like to, they can submit their comments to Kathy Conaway (kcon461@ecy.wa.gov). They are also looking at the site wide RCRA ten year permit renewal and the 216-U-12 RCRA permit modification.

Dick asked for clarification of the significance of the 1987 date for buried waste at 216-U-12. Gerry stated that this is the date when the state of Washington was recognized as having RCRA authority at the Hanford site. Gerry would like to know why comment periods are not being held for all the U site. He noted that they are not doing full characterization at the sites, but rather are using analogous modeling. RCRA requires real characterization. He would like to know why other U sites are not undergoing RCRA closure. He thinks the state is rewarding DOE for evading RCRA requirements. Nolan offered to have John Price attend a RAP meeting to respond to Gerry's concerns. Nick stated the main concern is getting the cleanup done right. It doesn't matter which cleanup regulation is used. Todd noted that this issue would be flagged for RAP.

EPA

Nick stated that EPA has done a lot of hiring recently and they are just about done. Nick stated he has been to the 300-Area and seen the decontamination and decommissioning (D&D). They are making great progress and are taking aggressive measures to ensure that nothing leaves the site. They are doing different kinds of air monitoring that have not been done before.

Nick stated they will be meeting with the new contractor in Idaho soon. One of the concerns is that the contracts are incentivized differently from contracts in the past. Basically, there is a fee estimate and the contractor gets a \$.30 fee break for every dollar he saves and for every over run they are charged a \$.30 higher fee. The concern is that the incentive should make sure the job is done quickly and safely. The EPA will be making sure things are working well.

The 183-H solar evaporation waste that was in storage is now in ERDF. Also, EPA had previously reported that there may have been K-basin debris that was shipped to ERDF improperly. EPA has received a report that DOE is confident that this did not happen. EPA is doing an analysis to confirm this report. They continue to be frustrated by the K-basin sludge cleanup delays.

Dennis Faulk is the EPA lead in looking at the U Area soils the Board discussed during this Board meeting. They are looking at a partial cut and cap analysis. There are some shorter lived contaminants that are more shallow, so they are looking at a spread of alternatives. They are using the Capping Considerations flowchart in making this determination.

Jim Trombold commented that the new contract incentives seem backward and would really put a lot of responsibility on the regulators to make sure things are done correctly. Nick agreed, stating that is his main concern. For example, if there is a soil waste site and it is being retrieved, then there is a strong incentive for the person on the backhoe to not look for the last little bit. The idea is that the \$.70 that is saved could go back into cleanup. Joe stated DOE does have some concerns about this, too. This is a new approach for cleanup and the River Corridor contract is an example of this for DOE-RL. He asked the Board to help review the contract vehicles and mechanisms. Dick stated one of the problems with the new incentivization is that it drives the contractor to find the cheapest way out of cleanup, not the most effective. Susan Leckband suggested having BCC look at what the total savings for this type of contract could be. Nick pointed out that the regulating agencies are not regulating cleanup based on these contracts and they will not base cleanup decisions on these contracts. Gerry suggested offering incentives based on RODs might help.

Gerry asked what would happen if the spent nuclear fuel budget is only funded at the requested level. Nick noted this work is currently being done by Fluor. Some of the later basin work will be covered under the River Corridor contract, but that happens after the basins are removed. Currently they say they have enough funding to get the basins out. Gerry stated he was glad to hear about the 300-Area D&D. He asked if the same controls are in place for beryllium at the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) D&D. He noted he had heard of several workers becoming beryllium sensitized in the past year. He is concerned that there

seems to be different safety controls in place for different contractors. Joe stated that DOE will send a response to HSEP on this.

Committee Reports and Issue Manager Updates

Rick Jansons was introduced as the new chair for the Tank Waste Committee (TWC). Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest) will be vice-chair. As new chair, Rick did not have any updates for the Board.

Pam Larsen reported that Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland (Local Government) will be the new Chair for the River and Plateau Committee (RAP). The TWC and RAP have been looking at a draft of the technical guidance document. There are inconsistencies in the document. The issue managers are meeting with DOE-ORP staff to get a better understanding of the inconsistencies. RAP is planning to do a field day workshop on new groundwater technologies that are being examined and hope to bring this information back to the full Board. RAP has not received an update on PFP, but they are aware that work is being done. The River Corridor has been awarded and the protest has been repealed. The 300-Area workshop was a success with more outside participation than either the 100 or 200-Areas. RAP has been given the opportunity to read the outcome reports before they are published. Pam commended Shirley Olinger for her commitment to see the Area workshops through.

Susan Leckband added the end states workshops are being considered the benchmark for end state discussions across the DOE complex. The Board was promised that the ideas brought up in these workshops would be communicated to DOE-HQ and they have been. These workshops have gotten a lot of visibility and credibility. Shelley noted Hanford is the only site that is doing this work and doing it well.

Keith Smith will remain the Health Safety and Environmental Committee's (HSEP) Chair. Jim Trombold will be vice-chair. Vince Panesko has volunteered to join this committee. The committee will be discussing some of the issues that came up during the State of the Site meeting.

Gerry Pollet stated the Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC) will have about five years of contract work to look at over the next year. There will also be discussions on how to allocate far fewer funds than are needed in the out years. This will be new work, as up to this point Hanford has had sufficient funding to complete cleanup goals. BCC will be joining with TWC to look at the delays and cost overruns at WTP.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest) announced Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, will be the new chair and Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest) will be the new vice-chair for the Public Involvement Committee (PIC). Amber added she is proud to work with the Board and she will continue to participate on the Board as an alternate. She will also be available to help and advise the new PIC leadership. She noted PIC is always looking for new members. PIC met on Wednesday before the Board meeting and discussed the follow up from the Yakima Open House. The public turnout at the meeting was light, but the outreach that surrounded the event was great for increasing awareness of Hanford. The committee also talked about the website and what is currently available and what should be available or updated. There will also be a table with information on the Board at the upcoming site tours. The committee would like to have a similar table available at the Stat Of the Site meetings.

Board Business

Committee Talk

Due to the number of new Board members at the meeting, Penny reviewed the structure and function of Board Committees. One of the pillars of committee structure is the Issue Manager. Issue Managers are people with interest or expertise on a particular topic, so they head up research and/or advice on that topic. They bring the results of their efforts back to the committee. This is one of the ways issues get to the Board. Issues can also come by agency request. After the committee reviews the topic, it will usually come to the Board either as advice or a workshop or letter. The committees do not speak for the Board.

Agency representatives do attend and may make decisions based on committee dialog, but that is not the official Board speaking.

Board members can be members of as many committees as they like, but DOE will only pay for travel for two committees. The exception is the Public Involvement Committee, which meets in conjunction with Board meetings.

Announcements

Todd announced new member buddies and mentors. Mentors were encouraged to share any questions their buddies have with other mentors.

- Harold Heacock with Paul Kison and Gene Van Liew.
- Keith Smith with Gwen Luper
- Susan Leckband with Jane Twaddle
- Shelley Cimon with Lynda Horst and Maxine Hines
- Norma Jean Germond with Helen Wheatley
- Pam Larsen with Vince Panesko

Tim Takaro is leaving the University of Washington (UW) leaving his seat open. The UW will be nominating someone soon.

The deadline for public-at-large seat applications has closed. Ten applications were received and are currently being reviewed. Interviews will be conducted the week of June 27th.

Sharon Braswell reminded Board members to get their travel notices in early. She also noted Board members will be receiving travel guidelines. These are the guidelines the government requires the Board to follow. DOE has a contract with Carlson Wagonlit who must make all plane reservations. If a Board member does not get the government rate they will have to pay the difference. Board members were reminded that Board meetings in Seattle and Portland are different, as costs vary by city. Sharon reminded members to be sure they get the negotiated room rates and if they book their own hotel, they should make sure the rate they get is within the per diem limits. Carlson Wagonlit does have a new booking system so all reimbursements should be received within a couple of weeks.

September Board Topics

Todd noted the following as possible topics for September’s Board meeting:

- Closing on Board priorities
- WTP cost and schedule delays
- HSEP and BCC on contracts
- Waste Disposition across the complex
- Annual TPA update

Public Comment

Gai Oglesbee offered public comment. (See Appendix A for transcript.)

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

| | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Madeleine Brown, Member | Margery Swint, Member | Vince Panesko, Alternate |
| Jim Curdy, Member | Jim Trombold, Member | Gary Petersen, Alternate |

| | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Rob Davis, Member | Jane Twaddle, Member | Dave Rowland, Alternate |
| Harold Heacock, Member | Gene Van Liew, Member | Dick Smith, Alternate |
| Rebecca Holland, Member | | John Stanfill, Alternate |
| Mike Keizer, Member | Al Boldt, Alternate | Amber Waldref, Alternate |
| Pam Larsen, Member | Shelley Cimon, Alternate | Charles Weems, Alternate |
| Susan Leckband, Member | Gariann Gelston, Alternate | Helen Wheatley, Alternate |
| Jeff Luke, Member | Maxine Hines, Alternate | Steve White, Alternate |
| Gwen Luper, Member | Linda Horst, Alternate | |
| Todd Martin, Member | Rick Jansons, Alternate | |
| Bob Parks, Member | Paul Kison, Alternate | Earl Fordham, Ex-Officio |
| Jerry Peltier, Member | Wayne Lei | Debra McBaugh, Ex-Officio |
| Gerald Pollet, Member | Wanda Munn, Alternate | |
| Keith Smith, Member | Nancy Murray, Alternate | |

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Steve Chalk DOE-RL | Rick Bond, Ecology | Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues |
| Joe Voice DOE-RL | Nolan Cutis, Ecology | Stacey Howery, EnviroIssues |
| Larry Romine DOE-RL | Suzanne Dahl, Ecology | Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues |
| Kevin Leary DOE-RL | Dib Goswami, Ecology | Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues |
| Greg Jones DOE-RL | Jane Hedges, Ecology | |
| | Tim Hill, Ecology | Ken Allison, Fluor Hanford |
| Howard Gnann DOE-ORP | Jay Manning, Ecology | Lanny Dusek, Fluor Hanford |
| Eric Olds DOE-ORP | Ron Skinnerland, Ecology | John Lang, Fluor Hanford |
| Delmar Noyes DOE-ORP | Mike Wilson, Ecology | Jan Williams, Fluor Hanford |
| | | Barbara Wise, Fluor Hanford |
| | Craig Cameron, EPA | Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec-ORP |
| | Nick Ceto, EPA | |
| | Dennis Faulk, EPA | Mike Priddy, WDOH |
| | Rod Lobos, EPA | John Furton Washington Closure |
| | | John Kristofski CH2MHill |

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald | Gai Oglesbee, National Nuclear Victims for Justice Manager | Ted Repasky, CTUIR |
| Mary Sue Wilson WA Attorney Generals Office | Rob Costeun WA Attorney Generals Office | Andy Fritz, WA Attorney Generals Office |
| Rob McKenna, WA Attorney Generals Office | Joe Shorin, WA Attorney Generals Office | Craig Wright, WA Attorney Generals Office |