

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

April 6 - 7, 2006

Pendleton, OR

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary 1
Welcome and Introductions 2
Approval of February Meeting Summary 2
Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS)
– Draft Advice..... 2
DOE-ORP Integration/Status of Activities – Draft Advice 5
Hanford Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 and FY 2008 Budgets – Draft Advice 6
DOE Contracting Strategy – Draft Advice 8
Committee Reports 11
Board Business..... 11
Public Comment..... 11
Attendees..... 12

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 five pieces of advice: the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) TC&WM EIS scoping; the integration of Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) activities and the interrelatedness of tank storage, retrieval, treatment, disposal, and closure with other projects and issues on the Hanford site; the Fiscal Year 2007 and 2008 budgets; and the new DOE contracting strategy involving the creation of a third Hanford cleanup contract.

Board Business

A Hanford Site tour is scheduled for April 11 and there is a national Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs meeting in Knoxville in two weeks. There is a Public-at-Large seat currently open on the Board.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

April 5 - 7, 2006

Pendleton, OR

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. Four seats were not represented: the City of Pasco, Franklin & Grant Counties, and two Public-at-Large seats.

Welcome and Introductions

Armand Minthorn, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) (Ex-Officio), welcomed the Board to the Umatilla homeland and thanked them for being there.

Steve Wiegman, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), had copies of the National Academy of Sciences review on tank waste available for Board member viewing.

Steve Hudson is the new Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen) alternate. Susan Kreid is the new Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen) alternate. Mark Panther is the new City of West Richland (Local Government) alternate. All new members were invited to the Thursday orientation lunch.

As part of the Chair's overview of the meeting, Todd noted the meeting's advice drafts all dealt in some way with Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones. He asked the Board to consider these questions while considering the advice: Should milestones be rewritten? Would pushing ahead to meet milestones potentially affect cleanup quality? The Board considers itself the keeper and conscience of the TPA, and current circumstances present the problem of not meeting TPA milestones. The Board should identify how to integrate priorities established at the last Board meeting into this meeting's advice. The priorities and advice will guide where Hanford will be in September, and cleanup for the next ten years.

Approval of February Meeting Summary

The summary was approved.

Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) – Draft Advice

Vince Panesko, City of Richland (Local Government), introduced the draft TC&WM EIS advice. The purpose of the advice was to offer scoping comments on the EIS. DOE is required to produce a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) EIS that evaluates actions, alternatives, and impacts, and make a decision based on the EIS evaluations. The EIS covers those facilities not covered by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Vince said it is important to distinguish what is required by CERCLA from what is required by NEPA. He said some alternatives are not yet identified, and potential impacts cannot be evaluated when alternatives are unknown. In the TC&WM EIS, the impacts of the older burial grounds on groundwater are being analyzed without knowing the alternatives. Vince said it is difficult to come up with additional scoping if the existing scope is unclear.

Vince said this TC&WM EIS presents an opportunity for a Central Plateau cumulative analysis, something the Board has repeatedly requested.

Vince presented a chart describing various waste streams and whether they would or would not be included in the EIS.

Steve Weigman thought the Committee of the Whole and the Board is addressing all relevant issues. He thanked the Board for its effort in ensuring the scoping meetings were thorough; comments received are currently being evaluated.

Regulator Perspectives

Jane Hedges, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), noted some key comments Ecology received at the scoping meetings:

- Don't consider offsite waste as an option.
- Include all waste sites for cumulative analysis.
- Characterization is a limiting factor in TC&WM EIS.
- Don't include the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF).
- Include the burial grounds in the TC&WM EIS.
- The timing for the TC&WM EIS is too aggressive.

Ecology would like TPA compliance addressed. Jane emphasized they want the TC&WM EIS "done right," and feel they have good information to progress.

Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), suggested the Board include a statement in the advice about having tools to add and implement new information as it is developed, and to have the ability to refine risk assessments.

Board Discussion and Questions

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), thought the issues should be separated and "binned" into process and scope. Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), thought it would be difficult to separate them, and he wanted specificity – if the TC&WM EIS doesn't include state-required risk assessments, the whole thing may be a waste of money. Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said the State would object if their requirements weren't met, but that is already covered in the Memorandum of Agreement. The Board decided that, at this point within the TC&WM EIS process, the process and scope could not be completely separated.

In response to a questions about pre-1970s waste, Mike Weis, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said that pre-1970s waste is part of the overall CERCLA cleanup process that will be followed with the TPA Agencies. He said they can't publish an EIS until there is a quantitative cumulative analysis of groundwater impact. Dennis Faulk said the first pre-1970s Record of Decision (ROD) is due in September 2007 and the agencies can't reach resolution until they get the proposed plans. Todd noted the legal description: transuranic (TRU) waste was not defined as TRU prior to 1970.

Laura Cusack, Ecology, said when people speak of pre-1970s waste, they are usually talking about the 200 Area burial grounds. She wanted to point out that there are TPA requirements for remedial investigations and feasibility studies with regard to all 200 Area non-tank farm operable units. By 2008 the remedial investigations and feasibility studies are supposed to be completed with decisions about how to remediate particular operable units. Another milestone requires those remedial actions be completed by 2024. These requirements show how pre-1970s waste will be handled.

Armand asked if there will be tribal consultation on the EIS. Steve Weigman said there is intent to discuss the matter with the tribes, but he acknowledged it probably would not be as much as Armand would like. Laura Cusack said the Memorandum of Agreement between Ecology and DOE requires consultation with the tribes during the EIS development and the tribes should expect to be consulted. Armand also said there is no mention of long-term stewardship in the advice; it was added to the general comments.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said natural resource damage should be assessed in the EIS. Steve Weigman said that terminology falls within CERCLA compliance; "natural resource damage assessment" is a CERCLA term, not a NEPA term. NEPA analysis is not necessary if the issue is already assessed by CERCLA. Susan Hughes, Oregon

Department of Energy (State of Oregon), suggested using the term “injury” instead of damage, which would avoid CERCLA/NEPA confusion.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), said the major concern with the discarded Solid Waste EIS was that it wasn’t cumulative, and issues were not addressed because they were said to be included in other analytical documents. She asked if this new process is going to be cumulative? Steve Weigman confirmed that the intent is to do a complete cumulative impact analysis, particularly in groundwater. Dennis said EPA is bringing in national groundwater experts in as consultants for the groundwater portion of the EIS.

Pam asked if the TC&WM EIS would address the risk to human health if Hanford accepts offsite waste. Steve said the Board might want to specifically make that comment, differentiating between the risk from current waste and the risk from added offsite waste. Gerry noted it is important to clarify that onsite waste should be characterized prior to the importation of offsite waste.

Dennis Faulk asked if the 500 sites along the river were part of the risk assessment scope; Steve believed they were.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), stated that the TC&WM EIS is too complicated and he questioned the fundamental premise of combining the Solid Waste EIS and the Tank Closure EIS. Jane Hedges clarified that there is a settlement agreement requiring the combination of the two EISes.

Jeff pointed out it may be contradictory to mix the issues of tank retrieval and tank closure, and Todd said the 99% retrieval requirement needs to be included because previously nothing was said about possible leaks and releases. It was decided the advice should include statements that the scope should include alternatives for the treatment of tank wastes separately from alternatives for tank closure, and should include alternates that are fully TPA- and regulator- compliant. Todd confirmed the Board would advise against a 90% retrieval option.

Many Board members felt FFTF should not be included in the TC&WM EIS. Dennis Faulk said EPA didn’t want an EIS that was at odds with CERCLA decisions; it is fine to do a cumulative risk analysis, but if the Board really wants a cumulative risk assessment, FFTF needs to be included.

Steve Weigman said everything included in a cumulative analysis is based on alternatives analyzed in the TC&WM EIS or on a presumed outcome of a separate decision-making process. The alternatives for FFTF as currently scoped would be included in the EIS; the other reactors would be a presumed conclusion in the EIS. They analyze alternatives for any scoping that is included in a ROD, and have to be clear up front about what components of the EIS will result in a ROD versus what components are strictly for a cumulative impact assessment. DOE doesn’t feel like they are doing their job if they analyze alternatives without analyzing the cumulative impact at the site. Todd said the advice language needed to be clear about each of the reactor facilities and where alternative analysis should be considered, and where the cumulative impacts of an assumed case should be considered.

The Board discussed infrastructure issues related to the delayed startup of the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) to beyond 2017. The advice includes discussion that the life of important infrastructure may be exceeded and equipment may need to be updated or replaced due to the delay.

Todd thought the Board should request a process whereby stakeholders can come and talk to the risk assessment agents; it is not time critical, but something the Tank Waste Committee or Public Involvement and Communication Committee should consider.

Vince suggested a review from the National Academy of Sciences. Steve advised considering the timing to ensure a review would prove useful.

The advice was adopted. It was decided to keep relevant previous comments as an attachment to the advice. The Board also decided to ask DOE to respond to each of the new comments.

DOE-ORP Integration/Status of Activities – Draft Advice

Steve Weigman presented a DOE-ORP update including tank farm and Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) status. He said they are making retrieval progress: four tanks are empty and three are in progress. They have exceeded their 99% retrieval target in most cases. The time between now and the startup of WTP is critical for pacing retrievals so they don't run out of double shell tank (DST) space. An independent qualified registered professional engineer has completed an Integrity Assessment of the DST system. The assessment included evaluating the tanks, piping, pits, and other ancillary equipment, and found that tank integrity is compliant with regulations. The tanks were visually inspected, wall thickness was ultrasonically tested, and a structural assessment was performed. They calculated a minimum useful life of more than 100 years. Steve said DOE-ORP is committed to dealing with the tanks and WTP as an integrated system, and also to integrating the TPA negotiation process.

John Eschenberg, DOE-ORP, gave a WTP update. He said two industry expert reviews are complete: one team evaluated if WTP would actually work and the other team looked at the process DOE used for cost estimation. He said the teams were "world class" and comprised of 40 different companies, including Bechtel competitors.

DOE-ORP is still on schedule for final cost and schedule estimates by May 31st. John said DOE-ORP is doing major work to restore confidence and credibility. The Army Corps of Engineers has been onsite since October reviewing the draft cost and schedule estimates. They will have spent nine months reviewing the final cost estimate by the time it is released.

John emphasized that DOE won't do anything to preclude the early startup option of the low-activity waste (LAW) facility. He noted that the LAW facility is not designed to operate without the Pretreatment facility, but it is possible to make some lean glass using only the LAW facility. He also said it is the intent to have an integrated schedule and will have one once it is determined exactly when the WTP will be built.

Regulator Perspective

Laura Cusack said that the estimated 100-year lifespan does not take the emphasis off of WTP completion and startup. She also agreed that an integrated look at the DOE-ORP work scope is important and that Congress and DOE understand the ripple effects of WTP funding cuts. Integration is important, but it doesn't mean slowing everything down because WTP has been delayed. Ecology thinks a commitment to consistent funding is important; having LAW sit idle while WTP is delayed makes it difficult to keep equipment in operational condition.

Board Discussion and Questions

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional/Environmental Citizen), asked if this is part of the infrastructure in the upcoming TC&WM EIS. Steve Wiegman said yes; they won't activate systems until they are actually needed and they're trying to orient the implementation in a manner that's directly connected to the application.

How much high-level waste is still in the single shell tanks (SSTs)? Steve said the data is divided up, but there is a significant amount of material still in the SSTs. John Kristofski, CH2MHill Hanford Group (CHG), estimated about 53 million gallons left in the tanks – 23 million gallons in SSTs and about 30 million gallons in DSTs. Steve said they had completed the delivery system for the DSTs, and they're using a portable delivery system for the SSTs.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), commented that the WTP timeline is critical if the DST lifetime is running out. Steve said they only have a projection of how long the single and double shell tanks will last, but they do not plan on using the DSTs for long-term storage.

Maxine Hines, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), asked if there were any DST components that have a shorter lifespan than the estimated 100 years. Steve said the study looked at entire systems associated with the DSTs, and corrosion factors were evaluated. He also said that would be a good topic for the Tank Waste committee to review.

Al Boldt, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), said the comprehensive review of the cost estimate for WTP completion infers curtailing LAW startup for two years. John Eschenberg said that is the plan, but the industry expert team identified issues with the flow sheet and some seismic uncertainties.

Will the LAW facility be operational in 2011? John said no: a 2013 or 2014 startup is more likely, and the issue comes down to the limiting factor of funding. John repeated that DOE won't do anything to preclude the option of an early LAW facility startup; it's the furthest along with the lowest risk profile, but it is not capable of handling high levels of cesium. The Pretreatment facility was designed to remove cesium. John said there is a small amount of tank waste that can be vitrified without pretreatment.

Laura said treating waste needs to result in good quality glass, and LAW starting up without pretreatment is not in the best interest of the state of Washington. She gave the Savannah River example of poor glass produced due to an interim treatment measure. There was confusion over how much waste, if any, the LAW facility could treat without pretreatment. Steve said WTP is designed to operate as a whole, and there needs to be more detailed work to determine how much waste could be treated without pretreatment. Billie Mauss, DOE-ORP, said the bulk vitrification plant could treat much more waste than LAW could, and it doesn't require a systems approach. Todd said the Board does not want bulk vitrification to prevent an early startup of LAW.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), said meeting milestones is important, but some milestones seem artificial. It is more important to have quality work and meet regulatory requirements than meet arbitrary milestones. Maynard also said in some cases contractors push just to meet a milestone, with the quality of work potentially suffering. Jane Hedges said Ecology feels very strongly that baselines should not drive milestones. Milestones are mutually agreed to and could be changed if there are good technical and engineering reasons, but milestones should not be changed to meet a baseline.

The Board wanted to make sure it is apparent that the Board is against altering TPA milestones. The advice was adopted.

Hanford Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 and FY 2008 Budgets – Draft Advice

Steve Weigman presented DOE-ORP budget information, saying he knew it didn't have the level of detail the Board would have liked to see. DOE-ORP is in the middle of the FY2007 and FY2008 budget submittal. He said the relationships between the various projects haven't changed, but they don't have firm dates and that is frustrating. DOE-ORP wants to get back on track with an integrated schedule and then readjust projects based on WTP's schedule.

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL, presented a dynamic master-planning schedule from which they build their budget request. He said in 2007 the HAMMER training facility will be funded from an overhead budget, and then will go back to being directly funded. K Basins will still be funded, but from different sources. Priorities for FY 2008 included completing containerization of K East and K West sludge, river corridor cleanup, retrieving TRU waste from burial grounds, plutonium shipping, and continued remedial investigations on the Central Plateau.

Regulator Perspective

Dennis Faulk said Hanford is budget-constrained and it is essential that the regulators make known their concerns, including the need for work on the Central Plateau, the disapproval of safeguards and securities taking money from cleanup funds, and groundwater issues.

Jane Hedges said Ecology agrees with EPA; they would also like to see the supplemental treatment project funded.

Advice Introduction

Rick Jansons, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), introduced the FY 2007 and FY 2008 draft advice. He pointed out that in FY 2007, Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) funding is reduced by approximately half from FY 2006, and increases again in FY 2008. It is critical to recognize that the budget is based on the assumption that plutonium will be shipped beginning in 2007. Rick said if plutonium isn't shipped, he assumes safeguards and securities funding would drastically increase to maintain safe and secure storage. In 2008, U-Plant is in the over-target funding category, and FFTF is reduced to \$10 million.

Rick said the Tank Waste committee has stressed that funding for tank retrieval is not adequate to maintain out-year activities, and that the proposed budget suggests that SST retrieval will slow. He said WTP funding in FY 2008 has dropped, which will affect the completion date; the FY 2008 target is \$580 million, down from the previously estimated \$690 million.

Rick also said that the requesting over-target funding does not make the budget TPA-compliant.

FY 2007 Budget Discussion

Dave said he thinks it is good to request over-target funding, and he thinks there has historically been more positive results than negative. Gerry Pollet thought DOE was being sanguine about receiving over-target funding when they should not expect to receive any additional money. He also said they should not plan from the outdated \$690 million WTP baseline; he noted the Committee of the Whole had already requested the chart be corrected. He said the fundamental point of the advice is that there was a commitment made to a restoration of funds once smaller DOE sites were closed, and Hanford hasn't seen that money yet and should push DOE to honor that commitment.

Gerry said the advice should say to fund LAW in 2007 and 2008 while studying how to have a viable direct waste feed. John Kristofski said that LAW couldn't treat any tank waste without some type of pretreatment. Dick Smith said there is no point in LAW starting up early unless there is enough material suitable for a direct feed, and the Board (and DOE) needs that information to make a LAW decision.

The Board decided it was very important to advise DOE to increase the budget request to cover safeguards and securities, or provide additional funding for it.

The Board decided to include in the advice that DOE continue SST retrievals at a pace to meet the 2018 TPA retrieval milestone. Rick said the Tank Waste Committee would look at the issue in more depth. The advice was adopted.

FY 2008 Budget Discussion

Pam Larsen wanted U Plant addressed because it was the first canyon in the complex with a ROD, and while she didn't think it should be the highest priority, she did not want it zeroed out. The Board agreed, and included it as an example when saying there was no funding identified in FY 2008 for Central Plateau cleanup. Dennis agreed that Central Plateau cleanup needs to get started or else it won't be finished by 2024.

There was much debate over the sentence, "The Board supports the identification of Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) as a lower priority activity assuming the reactor is placed in interim safe storage." Gerry Pollet said he could not support the advice if the statement were not deleted; Maynard could not support the advice if the statement was removed. Dennis said FFTF's budget is

already drastically reduced, and that EPA and Ecology sent a letter to DOE some time ago asking them to reduce funding for FFTF once it was in safe configuration.

The discussion concluded that the advice would be adopted with a statement attached that the FFTF sentence did not have consensus. Board members in favor and opposed to the statement and their position on consensus will also be included.

Standing aside or blocking deletion of this paragraph from the advice:

Block - Benton County
Block - Benton-Franklin Council of Governments
Block - Benton-Franklin Public Health
Block - TRIDEC

Standing aside or blocking inclusion of this paragraph in the advice:

Block - Heart of America Northwest
Block - Government Accountability Project
Stand aside, not block – Washington League of Women Voters
Stand aside, not block – Physicians for Social Responsibility

The advice was adopted with the above-noted exceptions.

DOE Contracting Strategy – Draft Advice

Gerry gave a brief introduction to the draft Contracting Strategy advice. DOE is preparing to open competition for three new contracts for Hanford cleanup: 1) Hanford Mission Support Contract for information management, site utilities, etc. (“infrastructure”) to be managed by DOE-RL; 2) Waste Material Storage and Disposition Mission Contract to be managed by DOE-RL; and 3) Tank Farm Operations and Closure Mission Contract to be managed by DOE-ORP. Three independent contractors will be working on the Central Plateau and no rationale has been provided for the partitioning. There are currently two major contracts, one with DOE-RL and one with DOE-ORP. Dave Brockman said he did not know the rationale for the third contract; he will try to get an answer.

Board Discussion and Questions

Jerry Peltier said there is already a site services contractor, Lockheed Martin. Jerry thought it would be best to have a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a scope of work, rather than a period of time, so the contractor would be there until the work was completed. Transitions are expensive, especially in the middle of a project. Gerry said that scenario is prevented by procurement rules.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), asked if the Board was saying that there should only be one DOE office at Hanford. Rick said that wasn't the intention of the advice.

Jerry wanted the advice to include worker protection during contract transitions. Becky Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force) said the union negotiates with every new contractor and there is a two tier system for employees, incumbent and non-incumbent. She said creating different layers is a union-busting tactic, as is the attempt to eliminate site-wide seniority. Jerry thought the addition of the third contract would lead to an additional employee tier.

Maxine asked if the Government Accountability Office (GAO) agreed with the third contract creation; Gerry said there was no GAO review specific to this contract breakdown, but there is a lot about general contracting structures.

The Board advised DOE to consider one contract for Central Plateau work. It also advised DOE to attempt to minimize or eliminate inequities in salaries and benefits when new contracts are implemented and equal work is performed.

The advice was adopted. Todd reminded Board members it is their duty to inform their constituents about Board decisions.

Tri-Party Agency Updates

DOE-ORP

Steve Weigman gave a DOE-ORP update primarily on tank waste retrieval. Tank C-103 is 66% complete, S-102 is 54% complete, and S-112 is 91% complete. The Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) is 98% complete and almost operational. Tank vapors have become a larger issue, especially with SSTs. CH2M Hill has developed a database of materials of concern and also received "Star Status" for their Voluntary Protection Program.

Steve emphasized that before DOE-ORP declares a tank complete (99% retrieval or to the limit of technology), they get consensus from Ecology. They often find they can retrieve more than 99% of waste.

Board Discussion and Questions

Dick Smith asked about the status of the Appendix H process for C106; Steve said that's why they don't say a tank is complete until Ecology agrees. DOE-ORP's next step is to submit the SST Performance Assessment to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). He said it is a good example of how more work up front saves time and money.

Armand asked what the purpose was of the tank liners in IDF, and what their lifespan is. Steve said IDF is a RCRA regulated facility for mixed waste. Liners are designed as backup in case water percolates through the system, for example. The facility is designed to last more than 40 years; he said the liners were about six feet thick, and that he would get a more detailed description to Armand.

DOE-RL

Mike Weis gave a DOE-RL update. He said DOE-RL is focused on protecting the river and moving toward cleanup work in the Central Plateau. He said they just found out that the River Corridor baseline is executable. There has been sufficient debris removed from K Basins and they have vacuumed about 35% of the basin floor. TRU waste packs are shipping and will continue to ship. Ten N Area injection wells are completed and they are injecting a chemical barrier to prevent river contamination.

DOE-RL currently assumes plutonium shipments in 2007, so they are not preparing for long-term storage yet. Their priority is to be ready to ship.

The General Services Administration is in the process of modernizing the working environment.

Mike said DOE-RL is working with the TPA agencies to ensure milestones are correct for Central Plateau remediation. They have completed 31 waste sites in the last quarter in the U-Plant zone. They are drilling under the old tetrachloride pit at the Z9 slant bore hole and will finish in the next week or two. They have taken down 14 more facilities at PFP and are on the verge of taking down 232-Z.

DOE-RL hired an independent reviewer for their workers compensation program and was evaluated as meeting the standards for program execution. However, they need to improve on execution and customer service and satisfaction. Copies of the report were available at the Board meeting, and it is also on the Labor and Industries (L&I) website.

Mike said he thinks over-target funding is worthwhile because it is important to describe everything beyond what can be accomplished in a year. Requesting items in over-target funding puts Hanford work in context and shows a sequence of events and what could be completed given more resources, and potential impacts from not completing certain projects.

A draft of the CERCLA Five-Year Review has been released. DOE has EPA input already and will be having more public meetings in the next month.

Board Discussion and Questions

Pam asked what the impact will be if Pacific Northwest National Laboratory doesn't get out of their buildings in the current timeline; do they not having funding for replacement buildings? Mike said he doesn't know if that's a problem, but the River Corridor contract interface points don't currently align in the out-years. In the River Corridor review they found many interface points on the schedule are an issue, and they are creating risk plans for how to lower the risk of delay. Those out-year risks have yet to be solved, but they are identified and DOE-RL has several years to fix them.

Rick said finishing 232-Z is a good accomplishment. He also noted that he had been hearing about Hanford having to "convince" Congress for more funding; Hanford should not have to convince Congress to invest in DOE projects. Investments are already made and it is an obligation for DOE.

Ecology

Nolan Curtis gave an Ecology update; they have been focused on budget and TC&WM EIS work. He noted the upcoming *60 Minutes* story on WTP, and said it should be interesting to see how they portray the situation. On April 12 and 13, Ecology will be involved in Hanford general and budget process meetings. Ecology will be hosting a public budget meeting in Seattle on May 9.

There is a technical demonstration on treating strontium-90 using an apatite barrier set up for May 17 – anyone interested should contact Tim Hill, Ecology, or Karen Lutz, DOE-RL.

In late May, oral arguments will resume on Initiative 297, but he doesn't anticipate it will be resolved in May.

Ecology issued a temporary authorization for waste storage in the 331C building; it proved to be a necessary interim step for the next year or two.

Nolan added anyone interested in non-Hanford waste management projects should contact Tim Hill for more information. The Ecology Nuclear Waste Program webpage www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/nwp has information on Ecology's statewide management of mixed waste.

Board Discussion and Questions

Armand asked if the strontium-90 technology is new and proven. Dennis confirmed it is a proven technology, but they are seeing if it will be applicable at Hanford. The apatite bonds to the strontium-90 and sequesters it. There will be a one-year treatability test. Dennis said the test plan is available and the River and Plateau Committee can be briefed if so desired.

EPA

Dennis Faulk gave an EPA update. The three agencies are in M-15 milestone negotiations and are hoping to have results for the June Board meeting. EPA would like to talk to the River and Plateau Committee about it.

EPA's preliminary review of the CERCLA Five-Year Review found that the report did not follow EPA guidance. EPA also met with the Nez Perce and CTUIR regarding the protectiveness determination, which resulted in a recommendation to DOE.

Dennis said there are improvements in groundwater work. They are understanding more about the carbon tetrachloride problem and would like that to enter a committee discussion. EPA is also starting to close plume data gaps.

Groundwater experts from Oklahoma are being brought onsite for two to three days, and Dennis said they hope to entice them to become an integral part of the project team. He expects them to return over the next few years through the TC&WM EIS completion. They are being brought out due to modeling concerns in the Solid Waste EIS and will be essentially performing a quality assurance check.

Committee Reports

River and Plateau Committee: A meeting is scheduled for April 12. Groundwater and M-15 discussions will continue, and a short CERCLA Five-Year review discussion is also planned.

Tank Waste Committee: The committee had been focused on the day's advice. Next time they meet they will discuss WTP reports. They are looking forward to seeing the report on DST integrity and will be evaluating SST status – how many are complete, how many are planned for completion, and how many will be treated by LAW.

Budgets and Contracts Committee: Advice presented today is a result of the Budget and Contract Committee's work. They will be following up on the cost assessment for WTP and the GAO reports. They'll be reviewing WTP contracting and budget issues in conjunction with the Tank Waste Committee.

Executive Committee: A leadership retreat is scheduled for May 4-5 in Pendleton, OR. Topics include leadership development, priorities for the upcoming year, policy and procedures for issue managers, and process codification.

Board Business

Announcements

- A Hanford Site tour is scheduled for April 11; members were instructed to contact Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues, or Karen Lutz if they were interested in participating.
- Todd, Shelley, and Susan are going to a Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs meeting in Knoxville in two weeks.
- There is a public-at-large seat open on the Board.
- Nolan said Ecology is trying to get agents out in the community more; contact him if a constituency would like a Board speaker.

June Board Topics

The Board identified the following as possible topics for the June Board meeting:

- Groundwater tutorial
- CERCLA Five-Year Review
- M-15 change package
- Leadership retreat outcomes
- WTP estimate update
- Long-term stewardship
- Workers compensation program report

Public Comment

No public comment was offered during this meeting.

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Norma Jean Germond, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Vince Panesko, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Mark Panther, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	Jane Twaddle, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	John Stanfill, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member		Dick Smith, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Al Boldt, Alternate	Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	Dave Watrous, Alternate
Todd Martin, Member	Maxine Hines, Alternate	Charles Weems, Alternate
Mark Oberle, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate	Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Bob Parazin, Member	Susan Hughs, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Bob Parks, Member	Rick Jansons, Alternate	
Gerald Pollet, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate	Armand Minthorn, Ex-Officio
Maynard Plahuta, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-Officio

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL	Nolan Cutis, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Barbara Wise, Fluor Hanford
Michael Weis, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Kelly Brazil, Innovations-ORP
Steve Wiegman, DOE-RL	Tim Hill, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec-ORP
Billie Mauss, DOE-ORP	Deborah Singleton, Ecology	Mark Gerboth, URS Corp
Eric Olds DOE-ORP		Dru Butler, WCH
	Julie Atwood, BNI	Emily Millikin, WCH
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Karen Caddy, CH2 M Hill	
	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues	
	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues	
	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues	

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Beverly Penney, CTUIR	Ted Repasky, CTUIR
Titto Moses, CTUIR	Ann Parazin	