

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

November 2-3, 2006

Hood River, OR

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary 1
Welcome and Introductions 3
Risk Assessments..... 3
M-15 Change Package 6
Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Update 7
Pensions and Benefits 8
Double-Shell Tank Integrity 9
Board Chair Selection..... 10
Agency Updates 13
Committee Reports 17
Public Comment..... 18
Board Business..... 18
Attendees..... 19

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 two pieces of advice at this meeting: one regarding pensions and benefits of Hanford employees and the effect of inequity on cleanup progress and performance; and another concerning the Double Shell Tank Integrity Assessment Report, its data gaps and Ecology’s permitting strategy for the tank farms. The Board also submitted a letter to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies commending them on the M-15 change package and agreed to sign on to a Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs letter about public participation in technology development.

Chair Selection

The Board selected Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), to be the next Chair, beginning in February 2007. The consensus recommendation was submitted to the Department of Energy (DOE).

Risk Assessments

The Board discussed a risk assessment guidance document and advice compilation, and how best to direct and educate contractors in the use of past Board advice for risk assessments, specifically the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA).

Board Business

The Board discussed major topics for the February Board meeting and confirmed committee conference calls and meeting schedules.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

November 2 - 3, 2006

Hood River, OR

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interests), Board 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: Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), Hanford Atomic Metal Trades (Hanford Work Force), Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), University of Washington (University), and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Ex-Officio).

Welcome and Introductions

Greg deBruler, Columbia RiverKeeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen), welcomed the Board to Hood River.

Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), announced that the draft Yakama Pre-Assessment Screening Report, completed in preparation for assessing natural resource damages, is available for public comment until November 15.

The Board welcomed new member Robert McFarlane, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), and a not-so-new member representing a new seat, Rick Jansons, Benton County (Local Government). Todd invited new members to an orientation lunch.

Norma Jean Germond, Public at Large and Chair of the Nominating Committee, requested any additional Chair nominations; none were submitted.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), underwent surgery on Tuesday; the Board hopes for his complete recovery and healthy return to Board activities.

Gabe Bohnee, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government) announced that Donna Powaukee, a wise and steady guide during the early years of the Board, recently passed away. The Board sent condolences to the Nez Perce Tribe.

The Board meeting was not audio recorded and there are currently no plans for recording for the rest of Fiscal Year 2007.

Approval of September Meeting Summary

Changes were submitted on the September Board Meeting Summary. The Board approved the summary.

Risk Assessments

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), introduced the risk assessment guidance document under consideration from the River and Plateau Committee (RAP). He said Jill Thompson of Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) recently discussed risk assessments at RAP and how she was incorporating HAB advice into the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA). Jerry said he and Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), attended an interesting risk assessment workshop, but came away with many questions and started thinking about developing a white paper reminding the Department of Energy (DOE) of HAB risk assessment principles.

Gerry Pollet created the risk assessment guidance document. He thought risk assessment advice is difficult to find and often the best risk assessment advice from the Board does not have “risk assessment” in the title. Gerry said the guide is not new advice, but a cited compilation of risk assessment advice designed to be useful and easy to find. Gerry called it “one-stop shopping” for finding HAB advice on Board values for risk assessments.

Gerry is concerned the RCBRA is not the comprehensive assessment the Board and public expected. He said it does not include every area of the river corridor and sometimes runs counter to HAB principles. He said the Board previously stated the risk assessment should be based on complete characterizations, yet many areas are not characterized. Gerry also said the risk assessment lacks opportunities for public comment on reasonable exposure scenarios. He is concerned the contractor is using reasonable and average behavior instead of looking at a maximum exposure level scenario.

Todd clarified the Board should not look for a product out of this discussion. The discussion is to give feedback to RAP on how to revise the document and bring it back to the Board at the February Board meeting.

Agency Perspective

John Price, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), suggested including HAB Advice #132 and #135; he said he found Advice #132 from the Exposure Scenarios Task Force the most useful.

Nick Ceto, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said risk assessment is an informative tool to guide decision-making, but is not the ultimate decision-maker.

Dave Brockman, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), asked that Board expectations be clear regarding the document. How does the Board want the agencies to respond? He reminded everyone the agencies have already responded to prior advice.

Board Discussion

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), acknowledged risk assessment as a tool, but asked what the parameters were for the RCBRA. Regarding appropriate agency response to the draft guidance document, she would like to know if the agencies find it helpful and useful. She viewed it as a living document.

Pam also said that cleanup, driven by risk assessment, needs to result in an end state, and needs to address natural resource damage. In the end, the Natural Resource Trustee Council (NRTC) will evaluate if cleanup was adequate. She said the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFW) is developing a Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP), and DOE needs to ensure the RCBRA addresses the same risk parameters as USFW since they are the future land managers. She did not think DOE fully respects and understands USFW’s role.

Greg deBruler thought the document is a good start. He commented the agencies can use it as a tool to see if they are on target. He agreed with Pam and thought it could serve as a good multiple-use risk assessment document to meet all agency needs, including USFW.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County, thought the document is timely and a good start. He also thought it could be applicable to the Central Plateau and elsewhere. Gerry Pollet agreed and said it is intended as a living document and generic risk assessment guide to be used for future risk assessments.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), agreed that contractors do not seem to be aware of past advice, or where to find it, and he did not know if they are required to use Board advice. Rob noted a contractor’s life span is short. He felt the RCBRA data quality is low, and suggested the help of an independent review. He agreed on the importance of characterization prior to cleanup.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), noted three things about the risk assessment process: 1) assumptions should be transparent; 2) risk assessments should consider all scenarios; and 3) risk assessments should be subject to updates and revisions. Betty viewed risk assessments as ending in specific decisions but with the opportunity for adjustment and change.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked the agencies to commit to using advice early in the decision-making process. She also suggested USFW and NRTC collaboration and perspective on the risk assessment guide. She said the Board should ensure the guide becomes an educational tool for constantly-changing managers and contractors, and the Board should ensure advice is reviewed by every new contractor.

Shelley Cimon, Public at Large, suggested using the risk assessment guide in the Data Quality Objective (DQO) process, especially during scoping.

Susan Hughs, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), thought the Board should look for opportunities to work with the NRTC. She said the risk assessment guideline should say the Board wants land use restoration, and does not support the assumption that institutional controls or caps will work.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, said contractors do not follow HAB advice unless directed to do so by DOE. The advice should be clear that DOE assumes the responsibility of directing contractors to review HAB advice before performing a risk assessment. Jeff said it is timely to request that DOE-RL direct their river corridor contractor to look at all past HAB advice on risk assessment and consider that advice during the scoping process.

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, said she and Erik Olds, DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), are developing a formal process for contractors' use of HAB advice. John Price, Ecology, said the Board should also pay attention to Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agency advice responses on this topic.

Dave Brockman asked the Board to consider the enforceability of a "guideline." Todd said, in the past, public acceptability of a cleanup process is measured by the extent a guideline is followed. For example, the RCBRA would be less acceptable if some guideline points went unaddressed.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), wanted the Board to be clear that the guideline document needs to be followed, not just considered.

Dave Brockman asked if DOE had agreed to all the advice compiled in the guideline document. Gerry Pollet said he looked at the responses and there were places of strong consensus, such as Central Plateau values. He said, however, there is a difference of opinion on groundwater and institutional controls.

Gerry suggested Heart of America Northwest could send the current compilation to DOE, since the committee and Board have not reached consensus on the document. He said the document is timely and usable now, and was concerned about waiting until the February Board meeting. Jeff Luke did not think Heart of America Northwest could sponsor and send Board advice in development. Maynard asked if the Board has ever sent advice in draft form.

Nick Ceto noted there is a difference between risk assessment and risk management. Risk assessment is a tool to evaluate risk, not a decision-making process. Nick suggested Todd email the guideline to Dave Brockman to forward to contractors.

Gerry Pollet reiterated he wanted the agencies to review and use the guideline document now. He would like the agencies to come to the next RAP meeting with risk assumptions. He thought the process lacks transparency and opportunities for meaningful public input. Gerry called for a discussion of the RCBRA's scope; he thought the public and Board have different expectations than the agencies.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick, noted the Board can advise and suggest, but not direct DOE or the other agencies to do anything. He thought the guidelines could clearly state the Board's expectations of what

should be included in an acceptable risk assessment, and DOE can ignore at its own risk. Dick said it is to DOE's advantage to pay attention now. It should be documented in the risk assessment if DOE cannot fulfill a certain guideline.

Todd clarified what he saw as a good path forward: DOE-RL and DOE-ORP can utilize the intent of the draft now, and the final document will be brought to the February Board meeting for more formal consensus. Todd noted it is good to remember Board discussion is "not always about advice." He said the RAP committee should get clarification from DOE on what is rushed and what is not. He also thought, in addition to the guideline document, RAP should try to produce specific RCBRA advice.

M-15 Change Package

Dick Smith presented an overview of the TPA M-15 Change Package. Dick drafted a letter to the TPA agencies commending them on their presentations and discussions of the proposed M-15 changes at the recent RAP meeting. The letter said the Board supports supplemental characterization and identification of new individual milestones for delivery of the Feasibility Studies and the Proposed Plans for remediation for the sites. The letter also said the Board feels collecting and analyzing additional characterization data will greatly assist the process of selecting the appropriate disposition path for the waste sites. Dick said the M-15 Change Package is evidence of Board advice usefulness and DOE advice utilization.

Board Discussion

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy, was concerned the new milestones might get "locked up" under reduced funding. Nick Ceto did not think it would be an issue, and despite being resource-constrained, they intend to push on every operable unit.

Jerry Peltier explained that the several added interim milestones will help monitor performance in smaller increments.

Gerry Pollet asked Ecology to look at the principles leading to the M-15 Change Package and see if they are applicable to other projects, like the burial grounds. He also wanted the letter to be clear that the Board never thought capping was the best choice. John Price said he would look into the applicability of those principles to other projects.

Dick Smith said he found he lacked operable unit knowledge. He thought operable units should be listed by their current titles with a description of how they were named and why they were grouped as a unit. He wanted to know operable unit criteria, and also the methodology of how new operable units were created.

John Price said the agencies analyzed all Central Plateau waste sites (884 sites) and agreed that 350 were small and shallow enough not to need extensive characterization, and could be dug out in less than a month. Dick thought that information should be added to the M-15 Change Package fact sheet.

Susan Leckband thought the US Ecology site should be included in risk assessment discussions. She said it has not been addressed because it is outside of the TPA boundaries, but it is on the Hanford site and has the potential to leak contaminants into Hanford waste sites.

Gerry Pollet also thought the US Ecology site should be included in the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). He urged the agencies to slow down and discuss the investigation and public concerns. He said the US Ecology site cleanup should proceed with the same values as the rest of the Hanford site.

The letter was adopted.

Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Update

Shelley Cimon attended the September SSAB Chairs meeting in Santa Fe and brought back a SSAB Chair's letter for HAB consideration.

There are seven SSABs left in the DOE system, besides the HAB:

- Idaho National Laboratory Site Environmental Management Citizens Advisory Board
- Nevada Test Site Programs Community Advisory Board
- Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board
- Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board
- Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant Citizens Advisory Board
- Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board

Shelley said there was an interesting site tour at Los Alamos, and noted 80% of the site has been intensively surveyed. She briefly described the site as dry like Hanford, but with waste up on plateaus. One site covers 53 acres and low-level waste is stored in unlined waste pits. They have high-level waste in shafts that are not currently retrievable. The transuranic (TRU) waste is stored in drums in facilities similar to Hanford, and they hope their low-level waste will go to commercial disposal.

An EPA Groundwater and Ecosystem Restoration Division representative discussed sampling protocols and the importance of gathering samples representing aquifer chemistry, something Shelley thought RAP should review.

Shelley noted DOE Assistant Secretary Jim Rispoli participated as much as possible over the three-day meeting, and she was impressed with his level of support. He discussed budget cuts and how the SSABs have to be champions for cleanup and stabilization. He admitted assumptions were overly optimistic and wants to make a course correction and focus contracts on optimization. He said SSABs are vital, especially for long-term stewardship and institutional controls.

Larry Bailey, Director, Office of Groundwater & Soil Remediation at DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ), discussed the process of developing a ten-year plan for technology development and deployment. DOE is also looking at monitoring and cleanup investments. Shelley said Larry is keeping track of how the \$10 million allotment toward Hanford groundwater is spent.

The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) was recently permitted for remote-handled TRU waste, and the Board needs to discuss how to get Hanford's remote-handled waste in the queue. DOE is considering using T-Plant for remote-handled TRU and K Basin sludge, and she thought the Board should consider if a new facility is needed for remote-handled TRU.

Shelley introduced the SSAB Chairs' letter, "Recommendation to Include Public Participation in Technology and Deployment at DOE Sites." She was surprised to discover other SSAB chairs were unaware of the Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG). She said it was a reminder of the institutional knowledge loss among the SSABs, and how term limits increase the chances of knowledge loss. The SSAB Chairs meeting used past Board advice on the STCG to craft the letter.

Board Discussion

Susan Leckband agreed that science and technology deployment is critical. She has copies of a recent presentation by Jim Rispoli about the importance of engineering and technology development.

Pam Larsen thought that, although the STCG system was a little convoluted, it kept all sites aware of technology development in the event they needed new technology. Shelly said communication about technology between sites was not discussed, but it is something the Board needs to promote at the next SSAB meeting.

Ken Gaspar, Benton County, emphasized technology coordination and cooperation between sites depends on DOE-HQ support and funding.

Shelley provided a copy of the Los Alamos briefing book and the groundwater workshop presentation. She noted DOE is still working on the waste disposition map. Gerry Pollet asked Board members to look at the Rocky Flats Legacy Report from the Rocky Flats Advisory Board; he thought there were “lessons learned” applicable to the HAB.

The Board agreed Todd should sign the letter.

Pensions and Benefits

Gerry Pollet introduced the pensions and benefits advice. Gerry explained the concern behind the proposed multi-tier pensions and benefits system in upcoming Requests for Proposals (RFPs). The Board anticipates contractor changes will result in unequal benefits among non-federal Hanford employees. Gerry said the committee was concerned about the disruptions and poor morale this system would create. Gerry said DOE committed to review the pensions and benefits policy before issuing the RFPs, but failed to communicate who would do the review and when and have not identified public participation for the review. Gerry said a DOE-HQ official recently said the RFPs would be issued in November.

Jeff Luke and Susan Leckband recused themselves from the discussion. Todd confirmed the Board’s strong policy of self-recusal if there is even a perception of conflict of interest.

Board Discussion

Ken Niles questioned whether the topic is in the Board’s scope and asked how the pension and benefits policy impacts cleanup. Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, said the policy creates inequality among Hanford workers and a bad environment for the integrated safety management and cooperation that is necessary for a successful, efficient, and safe site cleanup.

Rick Jansons said an unequal, multi-tier system creates a barrier for efficient worker movement as work ends and contractors change. He has seen skilled and good employees leave or lose commitment to the cleanup mission because of being forced into a different benefit status. He provided an example of an employee who ended up working on the Hanford Site for 23 years with zero vested years. Rick added the advice should not be too inclusive; for example, 60-day contractors should not be included. Dave Brockman said it was clear the advice was not addressing short-term contracts, since it is directly referring to upcoming RFPs.

Jerry Peltier thought non-union employees should be included in the pensions and benefits policy review.

Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments, (Local Government), said she thinks an aging workforce is the biggest workforce problem at Hanford. She said the exceptional pensions and benefits plan has been the primary way of maintaining a long-term, dedicated, and well-trained workforce. Wanda also noted the issue is not new, and the Board should avoid sounding “whiny.”

Gary Petersen, TRIDEC, questioned the advice’s relevancy to cleanup and asked for the agencies’ perspective. Dave Brockman had no comment. Todd said these decisions are not made at the local level.

Pam Larsen said it was a policy issue, and the Hanford community previously determined such pensions and benefits policy proposals impact health and safety and qualified workforce continuity, and increase retraining costs. She said benefits are an important draw to do hazardous work.

Susan Kreid, Washington League of Women Voters, thought the focus should be on equity. Equal pensions and benefits programs allow greater worker reassignment flexibility and eliminate financial penalization concerns. She said inequity fostered cynicism within enterprise companies.

Gerry Pollet thought the advice needed to better connect pensions and benefits programs with cleanup success.

Todd thought DOE-HQ would think the advice is tenuously linked to cleanup and not within the Board's charter. He said there could be a political cost, and therefore the advice should only be sent to DOE-RL and DOE-ORP. He did think the Board going on record about equitable pension and benefits plans was valuable. Todd confirmed Board members can always distribute final HAB advice as they see fit.

The advice was adopted.

Double-Shell Tank Integrity

Rick Jansons introduced the Double Shell Tank Integrity Assessment Report advice. He said most of the advice is directed toward Ecology. He said the report does not show the condition of each double-shell tank (DST) and does not describe how testing and maintenance will be performed while the tanks contain waste. The advice states that leaks need to be evaluated in addition to structural collapse. The advice also addressed the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit being considered by Ecology.

Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, thought the agencies were already doing much of what the advice recommended and she asked the Board to be specific about what it thinks the agencies are *not* doing. Todd responded the committee thought this could be a useful tool, and, in their responses, the agencies could indicate specific things already accomplished.

Jeff Lyon, Ecology, agreed that specificity is useful, and would like the body text of the advice better linked to the bulleted advice points.

Ken Niles thought the Board should specify how expanded tank testing should be. He asked if Ecology was considering issuing DOE a RCRA permit.

Jeff Lyon said RCRA enforceability is clearer and easier to manage; the TPA is lengthier, more generalized, and has a primary document and comment resolution process. A permit has very specific conditions; Ecology could be clearer about expectations and consequences so they felt a permit gives them the right amount of authority. Consent decrees so far have been specific to certain activities. He said Ecology does not feel regulations are implemented properly when judges and interpretations become involved.

Todd clarified the committee felt issuing a permit jeopardizes political clout and gives the public the idea the tanks are fine and stable.

Betty Tabbutt asked why a RCRA storage permit is being pursued if there is a chance of no integrity. Jeff said the majority of the single-shell tanks are under a corrective action, but the DSTs are not leaking. Ecology does not see a threat of release with the DSTs and they do not think they will fail, which will be addressed in the permit.

Betty asked if the committee had a specific suggestion as to how Ecology could maintain authority without a permit. Gerry Pollet said Ecology could issue an enforcement order rather than a permit. He said a permit confers rights on the permittee, which makes the situation difficult if there is a violation. He is concerned a permit sends a strong signal to the world that the tanks are structurally sound.

Jane Hedges, Ecology, clarified an enforcement order has the ability to be appealed and end up in court with a judicial decision. She said there are potential consequences, such as a judge making a decision Ecology does not like.

Jeff Lyon said the DSTs are compliant with the exception of the 90-day storage component. Shirley Olinger said the DSTs are highly regulated and studied, and DOE has confidence they are not leaking and the inspection program is robust.

Ken Niles wanted to see detailed history and lifespan information on each tank. He said he understands the tanks are compliant now, but how much longer will they function? Todd said DOE-ORP does not have sufficient trending information to predict how long the tanks will last.

Keith Smith asked if there is a leak response plan; Shirley said there are different thresholds of action dependent on the leak.

The Board agreed Ecology should explore an alternative action, such as an enforcement order and schedule, before deciding on a permit.

The advice was adopted.

Board Chair Selection

Norma Jean Germond, Nominating Committee Chair, presided over the selection process. Norma Jean introduced the nominees for chair: Jerry Peltier, Susan Leckband, and Rick Jansons. The new chair will assume duties at the February Board meeting. Pam Larsen discussed the roles and responsibilities of the Board Chair, and read the descriptions from the Board charter. Paige Knight read the Chair and Vice Chair selection criteria from the charter. DOE selects the chair based on Board recommendation. Norma Jean asked again for any nominations from the floor; none were offered. Under the charter, each HAB seat has one vote and a quorum must be present to make the selection. Norma Jean said if there is not immediate consensus on a candidate, there would be an initial vote to narrow the field to two candidates. If consensus is not achieved when there are two candidates, another vote will be held. A nominee needed to get two-thirds of the quorum votes. Tammie Holm and Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, counted the ballots with Nick Ceto and Jane Hedges served as witnesses to the ballot counting.

Gerry Pollet thought independent chair compensation was important, and asked Todd if the DOE had committed to chair compensation. Todd said the Board is working under the assumption that the chair will be compensated.

The Board received statements from Jerry Peltier, Rick Jansons, and Susan Leckband in their HAB packets prior to the Board meeting. The nominees were invited to make additional statements and answer questions from Board members.

Candidate Statements

Jerry Peltier

When I decided to run for chair, there were obligations I took on, like giving you my background information and qualifications. I think my resume, provided in the packet, is more than adequate to tell you about my diverse background that provides me with the skills to be an effective leader. I also prepared a brochure about what I would do as elected. Today, my focus is not on my qualifications, but what I would do if I were elected. About a week ago, something happened that strengthened my dedication – it was an email affirming how important the Board is to the public. I cannot emphasize enough how important public involvement is. If I am selected, I have some principles and guidelines I live by that I would bring to the Board. I am a strong and independent leader that does not bring conflicts or side interests. Before, I was a Hanford manager and elected official. Now I do neither and am free to exercise my opinion. I have the ability to get consensus. I have experience with many boards on a local and state level, and gaining consensus is something I did frequently. As HAB chair, I would be available to meet with HAB members upon request. I am retired. I have time to be chair

and have the ability to be downtown at a moment's notice or in Portland. I think sometimes people have to meet in person rather than over the phone. I have done a lot of public speaking on Hanford issues. I could represent the Board in public speaking forums adequately. I'm located in the Tri-Cities and am accessible at any time. I can travel to all locations. I could work with all members to make sure they are fairly represented. The challenge is not promote my beliefs, but the beliefs of the Board. I would emphasize our Board goals and the goals of the TPA. That should be part of our work scope this coming year. We are at a point where we have to look at ourselves over the next year. What have we been doing right? What has been going wrong? What have the responses been? What are the resulting documents? Being a sort of QA person myself, I think the Board has to do some self-evaluation. If there are corrective actions needed for HAB advice, I would take it. We have to challenge ourselves to improve our product. After 20 years, I understand Hanford issues. I am not as versed on Hanford issues as my opponents, but I am better skilled at facilitation and consensus in group decision-making. Thank you for having me in the contest for chair.

Jeannie Sedgely asked if Jerry had any conflicts of interest. Jerry said his wife works for Lockheed Martin and that could possibly be perceived as a conflict of interest.

Gerry Pollet asked Jerry how he would preserve his independence. Jerry felt strongly that the chair should be compensated. He said being chair is a full-time job that requires compensation to maintain Board success.

Greg deBruler said all the candidates are from the Tri-Cities. He is concerned about other communities not being equally represented and asked how Jerry would enhance the Board's ability to work together. Jerry said the chair facilitates consensus and does not dictate policy. He said the chair should not become influential on any piece of advice.

Susan Leckband

Thank you for asking me to run for chair. Having shadowed Todd for the last six months, I understand the depth of the office. There is a ton of behind-the-scenes work that goes into being chair. I believe in servant leadership. The chair is a servant of the board and a guard of the processes, and a soldier to carry on what we have done in the past to the future. Over the years, regardless of my employment, I have proven time and again to reach consensus and understand all views. Each seat has important contributions to make. The chair needs to be the long-term steward of the processes of the board. Regardless of my employment, I have never felt compromised by my employer. I have gone directly to management and said I expect to devote 50% of my time to this job and I will not "carry your water."

Gerry Pollet was concerned about the independence of the chair and funding perceptions. He asked Susan if she perceived her Fluor employment as a perception problem, and if she is willing for half of her salary to come from an independent source. Susan said she would work for the Board regardless of the funding source, and she is fine with however compensation is resolved.

Rob Davis asked about Susan's SSAB experience, since chair duties include attending national meetings. Susan said she has been a long-term stewardship issue manager and has participated in national workshops. She said the Board's power will diminish as other sites are completed. She said the Board needs to work even more closely with other sites to make sure Hanford is funded. She thought the more the Board works on national issues, the better. She said the national liaison helps ensure the Board's national participation.

Greg deBruler asked Todd how many hours a month he spends on chair work. Todd said about 100 hours when the Board is busy. Greg asked Susan how she would manage 100 hours a month in addition to her full-time employment on site. Susan said she already spends ten hours a week on Vice Chair duties, and fifty percent of her work day is already committed to Board work. She said she would continue to be available on weekends and evenings. She said it has not been a problem and did not anticipate it becoming one.

Rick Jansons

I want to talk about mudslinging. Rather than sling mud, here's my vice – I read rare and used books. I know people, characters, from multiple chapters of a historic Hanford account. They are second and third generation workers. I know Tom Bailie, a down-winder. He is very anti-Hanford and has many conspiracy theories. The reason I'm telling this story is because it is indicative of what the Board does. I am the first "nuke" able to go to a Bailie family reunion because they are part of my family through marriage. The power of the Board is to bring people with different views together and reach consensus. The position of the chair is to bring consensus and not bring my views into the process. When the Board agrees, it is powerful, relevant, and important. We have power from our regions to advise the TPA. As we move forward, we need to further market our consensus. We do not see a lot of public at Board meetings. People tend to show up when things are bad and emotional. We need to get back to the public and say what we do and how we reach consensus. Todd and I asked the Tri-City Herald to write stories on our advice and how we reach consensus. I would like to see us expand our role of talking about what we do. In terms of qualification, it matches my passion. I am good at details; I am a nationally RAD Certified Technician with a good technological background. I have worked at Hanford and in Nevada, at Rocky Flats, Savannah River, and enlisted in the Navy and was on a nuclear submarine. I have skill, but the biggest reason I am anticipating doing this is my passion of bringing people together who disagree. It brings meaning to what I do, to what I give my time to. The missions, people with different views. This is a great environment to work in.

Rick added that he currently works in the housing market and he would reduce the time spent on that for Board and Chair work.

Rick responded to Gerry Pollet's compensation question. He said payment is important because being chair is a full-time job. He also said independent compensation is important because it eliminates conflicting interests. To Rob's question of Board work on a national level, Rick said it is vital to remain involved with national waste site discussion, especially as waste begins to move between sites. He said national discussions are crucial.

Board Discussion and Voting

Bob Parks commented that all the candidates are very important to the Board; all are well-qualified and each would bring something different and good to the Board.

The Board did not have consensus on one candidate, so a first vote was taken to narrow the field to two candidates. The initial vote eliminated Jerry Peltier. Todd thanked Jerry for running for Chair.

The Board continued discussion prior to a second vote.

Susan Kreid asked Todd what he thought it took to be chair. Todd thought the most important chair duties are working toward consensus and guarding the processes of the Board. He said chairing the Board meetings were only about 1-2% of the job. He said the most time consuming work is behind the scenes, strategic work ensuring agency needs are met to the extent possible within the needs of the Board. He said there is constant tension that requires balancing, and much time is spent deciding on timing and problem resolution before issues become "large public bonfires." He said vague problems and issues comprise about 80% of the job.

Todd said maintaining agency support is very important, yet the chair has to ensure the Board maintains its independence in a credible and valid manner that does not violate rules and expectations. He said the limits are constantly pushed but maintaining a positive relationship with the agencies is the job of the chair. He said there are always opportunities to break Board processes, and it is the chair's job to maintain Board processes and to decide (in rare occasions) to break them.

John Stanfill, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), asserted both Susan and Rick are extremely well-qualified. Regardless of who he votes for, the winner has his support and he has no doubt the Board will be well-served.

Greg deBruler said contractors are heavily influenced by DOE, and he asked Susan again how he could be assured that she would stand up for the Board when it could mean difficulty with her employer. Susan said she was unsure how to convince Greg of her independence; she has approached DOE on a number of occasions. She said she is fearless in that regard and does not see it as a problem. She said the Board taught her to understand all divergent opinions need voice.

Rob Davis asked how she would act in a whistler-blower event. Susan said a whistle-blowing event is highly unlikely to ever affect her work role. She said the Board decides how to act and makes the decisions, not the chair.

Gerry Pollet asked both candidates to address how they would act in behind-the-scenes work as chair, and to address the issue of perception of independence. He saw a perception problem if the chair is paid by a contractor.

Rick said many decisions are made outside the public arena, such as at SSAB Chair meetings with DOE-HQ. He thought the chair diffuses issues as much as possible, and considers agency input. He said many things contribute to a particular perception – dress, manner of speaking, where one used to work. He used to work at Hanford, like Susan. He noted perception differences between Seattle and the Tri-Cities, for example, and that he would rely on advice from Seattle seats on how best to interact with the Seattle community.

Susan said she understood the concern over her employment with Fluor. She said she would not act any differently if she were not employed by a contractor. She said she would continue to work with DOE to meet Board needs and ensure the charter is maintained. She said she is counting on Board members' help to ensure public perception of her is positive.

Susan Kreid asked Rick how he would manage and balance his time. Rick said he and his wife make conscious decisions about what he becomes involved in, and he is accustomed to a busy personal and professional lifestyle.

Discussion concluded and ballots were cast. Susan Leckband received a two-thirds majority. Rick then asked the Board for a consensus recommendation of Susan for chair and the Board agreed. Susan thanked the Board for the vote of confidence and looks forward to her work as Chair. Todd thanked all three candidates and the Nominating Committee.

Vice Chair selection to replace Susan will take place at the February meeting.

A letter will be sent to DOE, Ecology, and EPA, announcing the Board's recommendation of Susan Leckband for chair.

Agency Updates

DOE-ORP

Shirley Olinger provided a DOE-ORP update. The Army Corps of Engineers report on the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) was issued and confirmed the seismic evaluation. She said the Low Activity Waste (LAW) Facility has made progress with exhaust stack, siding, and roof installation.

Shirley said five single-shell tank retrievals are complete (C-201, C-202, C-203, C-106, and C-103). S-112 is nearing completion and retrieval will start soon on C-108. Shirley said technology development will help complete S-102 retrieval.

Shirley discussed the TC&WM EIS. Technical work has focused on geology to support the groundwater model and the associated Quality Assurance (QA) related to the boring logs. She said information is being developed to support Waste Management Alternatives for on-site and off-site waste. Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) identified the Technical Review Group (TRG) to support the model, and a kick-off meeting and tour of the site was held in September; tribes and stakeholders were invited to an open house.

Shirley said the schedule for the draft TC&WM EIS slipped due to QA work required for the data efforts. She said the TRG will meet in December 2006, February 2007 and March 2007. Shirley noted the groundwater model will be ready for use in the TC&WM EIS in July 2007. Schedule items of note include:

- Draft TC&WM EIS (DOE-HQ review) – October 2007
- Publish draft TC&WM EIS – February 2008
- Publish final TC&WM EIS – November 2008

Shirley said DOE continues to work with tribes and stakeholders to address areas of interest. Five HAB members have volunteered to work with the TRG and TC&WM EIS team to help coordinate and communicate information: Ken Gaspar, Dirk Dunning, Jerri Main, Dick Smith, and Larry Lockrem.

Shirley mentioned upcoming public involvement activities, including the upcoming State of the Site meeting in Spokane on November 14.

Board Discussion

Paige Knight asked how the State of the Site meetings have been. Shirley thought the Kennewick and Seattle meetings were pretty positive. She thought the Hood River meeting went well, too, but had hoped for a better turn-out. Shirley said there was a large advertising effort, but they would investigate underutilized methods.

Greg deBruler asserted that Columbia RiverKeeper (CRK) had notified people about the meeting, but he thought the low turnout was a response to what he thought of as a meeting format that prevented meaningful public dialogue, discussion, and public interest organization involvement. Pam Larsen disagreed and thought there was ample opportunity for open dialogue. Nick Ceto also thought everyone had a chance to speak and there was no effort to stifle public involvement. Greg continued to disagree with that assessment.

Gerry Pollet was concerned about the November 2008 release date for the final TC&WM EIS, and thought the presidential election would be a distraction. He asked for a DOE-ORP commitment to do everything possible to release the final TC&WM EIS before November 2008. Shirley said DOE-ORP was also troubled by the release date, but the timeline required an extension due to things like a longer public comment period and additional TRG reviews. She said DOE-ORP would try to beat that date, but it is an aggressive schedule already.

Keith Smith asked about tank farm safety; Shirley thought there was much improvement and progress, especially with worker communication.

Rob Davis asked for a WTP timeline. Shirley said start-up is scheduled for 2019 with an estimated cost of \$12.2 billion. She said \$3 billion of that is a two-year contingency to fund anticipated “unknowns.” Shirley said cold start is scheduled for 2017, and the LAW facility is scheduled for a 2012 start-up. She said they are looking at different LAW start-up options with Ecology.

Rob asked about bulk vitrification status. Shirley said they are negotiating the future of bulk vitrification with the regulators. She said DOE-ORP wants to complete the demo, which requires 2008 funding, and prove it works. She said bulk vitrification provides flexibility in retrievals before WTP is operational. Jane Hedges said that schedule is promoted by DOE and not accepted by the regulators or the TPA.

Dick Smith thought more information was needed before money is spent on bulk vitrification.

DOE-RL

Dave Brockman provided a DOE-RL update. He said there was a recent notice of violation and DOE initiated an investigation from worker concerns related to a spill in the 100 D Area. The contractor is making corrective actions, and Dave wanted to assure the Board that safety is paramount.

Dave said the Fluor and CH2MHill contracts were extended and the RFP for the Infrastructure and Support contract will be out in the next several weeks. DOE also recently held public tours that drew approximately 500 people and representatives from eleven different states. Dave thought there were good things about last year's State of the Site meetings, and good things about this year's meetings. He thought different formats for different regions should be investigated.

Cleanup progress highlights include K Basin bulk sludge containerization completion, commencement of hose-in-hose transfer of radioactive sludge, and burial ground cleanup. Dave said they think they have all fuel out of K East Basin.

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five Year Review Final Report will be released in mid-November.

Dave identified upcoming public involvement opportunities:

- State of the Site (Spokane) – November 14, 2006
- Oregon Hanford Forum – November 8, 2006
- Proposed TPA Changes to the 200 Area Non-Tank Farm Waste Site and Groundwater Remediation Milestones (M-15) – Public Comment: October 23 – December 7, 2006
- 100 Area and 300 Area Component of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment – Ongoing workshops
- Groundwater Project Management Plan – Winter 2007

Dave confirmed DOE-RL is working with Todd on the HAB budget and charter.

Board Discussion

Keith Smith thought the safety facility representatives should have known there was an undercurrent of a poor safety culture, resulting in the violation. Dave thought that was a valid point and they are looking into it.

Norma Jean Germond asked if there were many tanker cars dug up in the 100 Area. Dave said he did not know; usually contaminated rail cars are at Purex. Todd suggested adding the topic to the next RAP agenda.

Shelley asked if there was a more specific date than “winter” when a groundwater management plan would be available. Dave said he would find out.

Ecology

Jane Hedges provided an Ecology update. She said most people were aware of a Washington Post article claiming the Tri-Cities wanted cleanup to go on indefinitely because it is an economic boon. The governor immediately responded to the article. Jane emphasized neither the Tri-Cities nor the State nor EPA want cleanup to go on forever.

Jane said the air operating permit is complete and under review by EPA. Ecology has recently hired additional staff. Also, Ecology received an M-91 TRU Retrieval and Certification Change Package. Ecology chose not to respond--equal to a denial--and are in the early conversations with DOE.

Regarding groundwater, Jane said there is progress in the tank farm vadose zone. New technology in the tank farms, including resistance technology, has been very beneficial. She said new technology is saving money by helping identify good well locations in the T, C, and U Areas. Technology development and progress, such as the apatite barrier and chromium electrocoagulation, are benefiting the river corridor as well. Jane said greater science and technology development is possible with additional funding.

Jane said the Areva waste site was recently cleaned up under a consent order from Ecology; groundwater monitoring will continue. The US Ecology Agreed Order recently closed for public comment. The Agreed Order includes characterization, bore holes and sampling. The DQO process included tribes, stakeholders, and the State of Oregon to develop the scope of work for the Agreed Order. Jane committed Ecology's technical staff to present that information at the RAP meeting or to the Board.

Board Discussion

Pam Larsen was glad to hear about Areva remediation completion. She said there is a plume extending onto the Hanford Site and asked if uranium technology would be useful. Jane said Rick Bond is the project manager, and could present information at a RAP meeting.

Gerry Pollet expressed concern about the US Ecology waste site. Gerry thought the site merits Board review and attention even though it is not part of the TPA. He said most Board members were unaware of the contamination and investigation, and asked that the entire scope of the field investigation last for 120 days. He was concerned that the bore holes would be insufficient, and asked for an extension of the comment period and work plan review so the Board can discuss it at the February Board meeting. Jane said she would take that back and discuss it with Ecology's legal counsel.

Pam suggested keeping all 300 Area buildings on the demolition permit. Jane said some buildings had been taken out of the permit and moved to the CERCLA process.

Gary Petersen thanked the governor for the quick response to the Washington Post article. Pam was concerned the article could have serious consequences for Hanford perceptions in D.C.

Shelley Cimon said the Board should advocate for more groundwater funding.

EPA

Nick Ceto provided an EPA update. EPA has a new regional administrator, Elin Miller. Nick hopes she will visit Hanford soon.

EPA reviewed recommendations and assessed a penalty for the 100 D Area spill. DOE has made progress since then and the episode raised issues that DOE and the contractor are working on.

Nick thought the K Basin sludge transfer is a success, and was pleased the hose-to-hose transfer is underway. He said EPA should be getting their CERCLA Five Year Review comments to DOE soon.

Nick talked about TPA agencies' big picture discussions about Hanford's future and how cleanup hinges on the budget. Nick said Keith Klein, DOE-RL, has said DOE cannot maintain TPA compliance if Hanford does not receive over-target budget funding. Budget concerns affect the WTP and all onsite work.

He said Hanford is on track for a good quality cleanup, and it is important that the Board have confidence in the process and the people doing the work, and not give in to divisiveness and rhetoric. Nick said if the agencies and Board are not careful, they will become their own worst enemy. He said the Board must help advertise cleanup successes. He is concerned momentum will slip, and Congress will see Hanford as

ineffective and cut funding. Nick emphasized they need to focus on how best to optimize the path forward, celebrate the successes, and show the public Hanford cleanup support.

Board Discussion

Norma Jean thanked Nick for pushing the Board to promote a positive Hanford cleanup message. She said she is impressed with K Basin cleanup and overcoming the sludge problem, and thought the Board and DOE should assess the tank situation to ensure funding.

Committee Reports

Tank Waste Committee (TWC)

Rick Jansons said John Eschenberg, DOE-ORP, talked with TWC and clarified some misunderstandings. TWC also heard a tank leak characterization presentation. He said DOE-ORP is tentatively scheduled to present more on tank leak characterization at the next meeting. Rick said the TRG is waiting on an early LAW facility start-up report and hopes to have more information in December. He said TWC discussed the bulk vitrification feasibility study. The study said bulk vitrification is feasible and 2011 is the earliest start date; the committee is also asking why the cost has increased from \$30 million.

Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP)

Keith Smith said HSEP discussed the hexavalent chromium spill in the 100 Area and will look at the full report when it is released. Rob Davis made a presentation to the committee on hexavalent chromium and its effect on stainless steel welders. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) recently reduced the exposure limits and the committee wondered how the contractors and DOE responded. The committee also heard that DOE would work with the Government Accountability Project (GAP) to discuss the discrepancies between its survey and the official report DOE commissioned about workers compensation problems. Keith said the committee is considering advice on workers compensation and other concerns.

River and Plateau Committee (RAP)

Pam Larsen said the November 15 RAP meeting will include a river corridor update, specifically N Area groundwater. USFW is invited to discuss future use of the Hanford Site, and how their vision lines up with DOE's vision. Also on the November agenda:

- Groundwater values and the draft integration strategy document, and how it is a roadmap for river corridor Records of Decision (RODs);
- Further refining the risk assessment guidance ;
- Reports on remote-handled TRU waste, 200 Area burial grounds, and DQO objectives

Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC)

Gerry Pollet said there is no BCC meeting in November, but they will have a joint meeting with TWC on December 5. They will discuss the RFPs scheduled for release, and he thought there should be a joint meeting with PIC to discuss the budget process. The committee needs a baseline review discussion with the agencies, and plans on reviewing the Bechtel contract. They are also tracking Government Accountability Office (GAO) and Inspector General (IG) reports on the exclusion of TRU waste treatment and disposition from the burial grounds from the baselines.

Public Involvement Committee (PIC)

Norma Jean Germond said PIC reviewed the TPA quarterly update, discussed advice responses and issue manager duties. The committee discussed budget meeting public outreach and is concerned about the level of outreach, and PIC advocates a day-long budget workshop with the agencies. They are considering a Board budget tutorial in February.

Public Comment

Cyndy deBruler made a statement regarding her appearance at the State of the Site meeting. She felt the agencies should have been clearer it's all just for show and that is why she dressed as a clown. She also defended Columbia RiverKeeper's efforts to turn out the public for the meeting and reiterated that they had not told anyone to boycott the meeting.

Brent Foster, CRK Executive Director, said getting people to public meetings is tough, and he wanted to be clear that there was no attempt to discourage people from attending the State of the Site meeting. He and Greg deBruler discussed how to get a good turnout. They sent many emails and contacted the local Hood River newspapers, who unfortunately did not attend or promote the meeting. Brent said they made over 30 phone calls as part of CRK's effort to encourage public attendance.

Brent said CRK may disagree with DOE and the agencies, but they all share the fundamental desire to involve the public. Funding stops when public interest decreases. Brent said he talked with the agencies and they agreed that a more interesting forum is needed for public hearings to get people to come to future meetings. Brent said there are a lot of first time attendees who never come back. He said he appreciates the effort, but if the agencies rely on public interest groups to turn people out for meetings, they should be included in the meeting formulation process. Brent said together they could come up with a better way to do a meeting. He said congressional representatives should attend – they control the purse strings and the public should have access to them.

Brent thanked everyone who participated and said they could all work together and utilize local resources to better advertise public meetings.

Board Business

Todd updated the Board on the charter status and potential revisions, including term limits. Todd said DOE is working on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and minor charter changes to be compliant with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). He said DOE and the charter revision do not intend to undercut the Board. Todd said local cooperation has been outstanding and the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) could review the modifications in a few months. Todd said he is confident in DOE's cooperation, and DOE is committed to keeping the Board operating as it always has.

Todd discussed the Board's budget, and said the agencies committed to seek an increased budget. Todd said the EIC will take a more active role in monitoring the Board's budget.

Gerry Pollet commented that any significant charter change would have to be discussed with the seats' constituencies.

Cathy McCague briefly reviewed issue managers' responsibility to review advice responses at the committee level, and if necessary, at the Board. Susan Leckband said the committee chairs and vice-chairs should be held responsible for checking in with issue managers, reviewing committee past advice, and keeping response reviews on committee agendas.

February Board meeting topics include:

- Columbia River Toxics Program
- Guideline for risk assessments
- Budget and new RFPs
- Public budget process
- Workers compensation programs
- Early LAW advice

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Gabe Bohnee, Member	Bob Parazin, Member	Laura Mueller, Alternate
Rob Davis, Member	Bob Parks, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Jerry Peltier, Member	Gary Petersen, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Rick Jansons, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Dick Smith, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member	Keith Smith, Member	John Stanfill, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Susan Kreid, Member		Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	
Jeff Luke, Member	Kenneth Gasper, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-Officio
Gwen Luper, Member	Susan Hughs, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-Officio
Todd Martin, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate	
Ken Niles, Member	Robert McFarlane, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Bill Barker, AREVA
Dave Brockman, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Suzanne Heaston, BNI
	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Eric Olds, DOE-ORP		Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Barbara Wise, Fluor Hanford
	John Price, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, Innovations
	Ron Skinnerland, Ecology	Karen Hale, CH2MHill
		Dick Wilde, Energy Solutions
	Nick Ceto, EPA	Lynette Bennett, WCH
		Michael Fox, WCH
		Mike Priddy, WDOH

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Brent Foster, Columbia RiverKeeper	
Cyndy deBruler, Columbia RiverKeeper	Christine Olds	