

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

*November 4-5, 2004*

*Clackamas, OR*

**Topics in This Meeting Summary**

Approval of September Meeting Summary .....	3
Draft Advice on Stop-Work Procedures.....	3
Report on SSAB Chairs Meeting and National Risk-Based End States Meeting.....	5
Public Comment .....	6
K-Basins Milestone Letter.....	6
Central Plateau Vision Development Workshop.....	6
Central Plateau Vision Development Sounding Board.....	8
Next Steps: Board and Committee Work for the Next Three Months.....	11
Tri-Party Agency Updates.....	12
Committee Reports and Issue Manager Updates.....	13
Board Business.....	14
Attendees.....	14

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

**Executive Summary**

**Board Action**

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) adopted a piece of advice regarding stop-work procedures, particularly for construction workers. The Board also approved a letter of congratulations to the Department of Energy, the US Environmental Protection Agency, the Washington State Department of Ecology, and the Hanford workforce for completing removal of the spent fuel elements from the K Basins.

**Board Business**

The Board opened nominations for the next Chair term, beginning in 2005. Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), was nominated for a third term as Chair.

**Report on Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs Meeting and National Risk-Based End States Meeting**

Todd Martin and other Board members present at the Site-Specific Advisory Board chairs meeting reported on the proceedings. The chairs drafted a letter requesting a national nuclear waste disposition dialogue. Todd signed the letter on behalf of the HAB.

Nick Ceto, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), reported on the Risk-Based End States (RBES) meeting held simultaneously in Chicago, and commented on the prospects for this initiative in the future. The meeting did not result in any decision documents or clear path forward and, like the SSAB chairs meeting, there was a great deal of emphasis on the need for a national dialogue about waste disposition issues.

### **Central Plateau Vision Development Workshop and Sounding Board**

Becky Austin, Fluor, presented initial plans developed for the Central Plateau region, outlining assumptions and information used in the process. Todd Martin presented “The Cap in the Hat,” a cautionary tale about assumptions made in decisions to use caps.

The Board spent Thursday afternoon in a workshop to discuss values and priorities to guide cleanup on the Central Plateau. Each Board seat was given an opportunity to speak on these topics during a Sounding Board on Friday morning.

### **Tri-Party Agency Updates**

Howard Gnann, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), described progress on the Waste Treatment Plant, and responded to questions regarding cost increases for the bulk vitrification contract.

Mike Weis, Department of Energy-Richland Operations (DOE-RL), mentioned successes during the previous year, and noted challenges in the upcoming year with budget levels and plutonium consolidation.

Nolan Curtis, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), discussed outreach efforts to diverse communities and responded to criticism regarding an authorization granted for excavation of the Integrated Disposal Facility.

Nick Ceto, EPA, commented on groundwater issues in the 300 Area, contract incentives, and resolution regarding waste shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico.

## **HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

*November 4-5, 2004*

*Clackamas, OR*

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

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are members of the public. Seven seats were not represented: Washington State University (University); Franklin & Grant Counties (Local Government); Yakama Nation (Tribal Government); Columbia Basin Audubon Society and Columbia River Conservation League (Local Environmental); Non-Union, Non-Management (Hanford Work Force); Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Ex-Officio); and Public-at-Large.

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Joe Voice, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), introduced himself; he is the new DOE-RL liaison to the Board. Greg de Bruler, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest), introduced his alternate, Steve White. Steve mentioned he has been a designated alternate for some time, but his schedule has previously kept him from attending Board meetings. Nick Ceto, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), later introduced Socorro Rodriguez, Director of EPA's Oregon Operations Office, attending a Board meeting for the first time. Susan Hughs, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), also introduced Lynda Horst, administrator for the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board. She has been named as an alternate to the HAB for Oregon.

Susan Hughs also announced the recent publication of a document useful for media outreach, entitled "Hanford Cleanup—the first 15 years."

### **Approval of September Meeting Summary**

The Board accepted the September summary with edits.

### **Draft Advice on Stop-Work Procedures**

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, introduced the advice and assured the Board that his conversations with construction workers led him to conclude the advice would not encroach on labor agreements. He considered it would lead to both improved safety and efficiency. When correctly implemented, Integrated Safety Management Systems (ISMS) would accelerate rather than delay work at Hanford; in addition, workers could be reassigned to other productive tasks during stoppages.

Keith also clarified that the "fear of retaliation" mentioned in the advice referred primarily to peer pressure among workers, rather than between workers and management. When construction workers are sent home as a result of a stop-work call, they do not get paid. Workers are very hesitant to cause pay decreases for other workers. If workers were to be engaged in re-start of work, worksite culture may better allow stop-work actions.

Howard Gnann, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), remarked that the actions recommended in the advice are standard policy. Mike Keizer, Central Washington Building Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), noted that stop-work authority exists, but a recent assessment showed the message of its proper use is not trickling down through all tiers of workers.

Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government), questioned the need for the advice, since few accidents have occurred. Keith Smith responded that the advice aimed to prevent incidents rather than waiting to respond to them.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), agreed the central interest is that workers understand risks beforehand and are ready to use protected stop-work when necessary. He felt there are problems at the business-unit level: firms with experience at Hanford are well-versed in these procedures; however, new contractors often lack familiarity and thus need training when they win a contract. Contractors may also face financial constraints as a result of low bids, which creates pressure to finish quickly. Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), pointed out that ISMS is included in contracts through the Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) clause, and that audits could insure this provision was being followed. Subcontracting, she observed, exacerbates the problem of implementation.

Madeleine Brown, League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest), suggested Keith's clear statement of "safety pays" should be made more directly in the advice. Becky Holland, HAMTC (Hanford Work Force), added stop-work is not just a right, it is also a responsibility.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), questioned whether the advice delved further into management processes and inter-worker relationships than was appropriate for the Board. Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local and Regional Public Health), felt managers could be directed to have their workers trained in ISMS without the advice. Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government) thought the advice might be disruptive to unions, in that reprisal is a two-sided issue and the Board should not be partisan in its language. Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), felt the advice should be short, general policy advice stating stop-work procedures should apply across worker categories. He felt discussing inter-worker relations or implementation failure was not appropriate in advice.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), said, in his experience, stop-work in work areas other than construction is effective and workers are not sent home. Keith Smith confirmed this, stating the issue with construction workers involves being sent home without pay rather than reassigned. Keith singled out the 220 labs as an example where stop-work policy quickly identified what had to be done to resume work.

Howard Gnann mentioned there is renewed focus on safety at Hanford. He mentioned Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI) as an example: workers are penalized if they fail to report unsafe behavior on the part of a coworker. At one point, BNI spent one-half million dollars, taking an entire day of stopped work to reinforce safety procedures. Howard pointed out that construction workers also differ from contractors in that their work is frequently interrupted by weather or other problems not necessarily related to safety.

Jerry Peltier explained that formal stop-work is a last resort for managers, although informal stop-work occurs frequently. The Board should not equate stop-work incidents with safety concern, he said, since there is strong incentive to prevent problems reaching the level of formal stop-work.

Al Boldt, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), discussed a letter to DOE from the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), warning that a contractor was not following safety procedures or learning from mistakes. For Al, this indicated ISMS is also not being properly implemented outside of construction. Al felt the DNFSB should also be included in the advice. Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), mentioned there will be a plethora of small contractors involved in upcoming demolition work, in which case stop-work could result in severe financial stress even if other work is assigned. He wondered whether contracts include supplemental provisions to cover this situation.

Gerald Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest), replied the advice on implementation skirted what he considered the root issue: low-bid contracts and the lack of pay when construction workers were sent home due to stop-work. He thought DOE had promised in March to address this issue.

Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government), and Rick Jansons, Non-union Non-management Employees (Hanford Work Force), questioned the need for the advice, with Rick noting that risks faced by construction workers at Hanford are not specific to a nuclear site. Keith Smith, however, felt the same level of safety should be afforded to and exemplified by all Hanford workers, regardless of the type of work in which they were engaged.

Howard Gnann summarized that more worker education is necessary. He pointed to other contractors who have responded to the issue. Howard felt the advice did not address some of the issues and duplicated existing policy in other regards.

Todd Martin highlighted key points the advice could make: engage construction workers in restart, and issue a Hanford-wide stop-work policy applying to all trades. Implementation and auditing are also key. Workers should not be retaliated against and ISMS should reach to the ground level. Todd also pointed out the value of advice in soliciting agency attention and a formal response.

After revisions, the Board approved the advice.

### **Report on SSAB Chairs Meeting and National Risk-Based End States Meeting**

Todd Martin described the recent Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting, making particular mention of the concern of those present about the issue of waste shipment and disposal. They were acutely aware of the upcoming I-297 ballot initiative in Washington State, as well as recent events involving Yucca Mountain and the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico; these cumulatively posed a threat to waste disposition plans throughout the DOE complex. The chairs drafted a letter requesting a national stakeholder forum on waste disposition and Todd signed the letter on behalf of the HAB. Shelly Cimon, Public-at-Large, Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management (Hanford Work Force), Maynard Plahuta, and Pam Larsen also attended the meeting, and described the SSAB chairs and site representatives as unanimous in their concerns and support for such a dialogue. Todd noted that DOE's response to the request was relatively positive; they felt it was an appropriate message and especially well-timed. Todd and Susan both expressed appreciation for the candor with which Sandra Waisley, the presiding DOE official, had responded during the meeting.

Jim Trombold noted how unfortunate it was that a better discussion of this issue had not taken place long ago.

Nick Ceto reported on the Risk-based End States (RBES) meeting in Chicago, held at the same time as the SSAB chairs meeting. Attendance and participation was good, although the meeting did not result in any decision documents or clear path forward. Concerns remained, and specific conflicts had not been identified or solved during the meeting. The theme he saw emerging from the meeting was that of big-picture questions, such as the balance of aggressive cleanup with long-term stewardship. Nick also mentioned significant desire for a national dialogue on waste disposition; without resolution of this issue, steps forward may be in jeopardy of being based on what could prove to be faulty assumptions. Washington's I-297 could exacerbate this, he added.

Nick was unsure what might happen to the RBES initiative—the process may begin again at some sites, while others plan to finish their documents in December. Stakeholders remain concerned or confused with the term “risk-based,” and the initiative has not appeared clear to the public. DOE has also promoted some confusion, Nick stated: while stating they will comply with all regulations, they simultaneously asked states to consider what regulations should be changed. Nick considered the way in which DOE rolled out the initiative to be unfortunate, leading to a perception that the initiative aimed to undermine cleanup. However, he felt DOE had recognized it faced long timeframes and high costs, and had intended through the initiative to step back and consider ways to operate more effectively and efficiently.

Nick himself introduced the issue of groundwater at the RBES meeting, from the perspective it is a public resource, not DOE property. He felt the sides were not as far apart as some might suppose; if groundwater cannot be cleaned up, leaving it but continuing to examine new technologies seemed reasonable.

### **Discussion/Questions:**

Pam Larsen expressed hope that administrative personnel changes would have positive effects on the RBES program. In her opinion, Jesse Roberson promoted deadlines that had precluded public comment; Pam

hoped the new staff would approach this more reasonably. Howard Gnann mentioned that the recent workshops reinforced public involvement in the process and that DOE had backed away from its previous deadlines. DOE also responded by supporting local visioning documents and shifting from insisting on articulation of variances to outlining alternatives. He felt the process had become more collaborative and expected it would progress without altering existing laws.

### **Public Comment**

When no one presented public comment, Paige Knight raised a concern that the public is not aware of the Board's timing. Additional invitations for public comment were made again later in the meeting.

### **K-Basins Milestone Letter**

Todd Martin proposed the Board congratulate the agencies and workers on accomplishing the milestone of complete removal of the spent fuel elements from the K Basins milestone. Susan Leckband drafted the letter and the Board approved its delivery to the Tri-Party agencies, contractors and labor unions representing the Hanford workforce.

### **Central Plateau Vision Development Workshop**

Todd Martin introduced the principle agenda item for the meeting: developing Board values and principles for guiding decision-making on the Central Plateau. The workshop topics came as a result of the Committee of the Whole meeting in October on this topic.

### **Assumptions and Information Driving Decisions**

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, introduced Becky Austin, the Fluor project manager responsible for development of the Central Plateau (CP) closure plan.

Becky made a presentation to the Board on the Closure Plan, specifying beforehand that the plan is a starting point to understand technical and cost issues. Regulators would make final decisions, she stated, and the plan would be changed to reflect these decisions. She listed the key assumptions on which the current plan was built:

- The Central Plateau will remain under Federal control for the foreseeable future to insure monitoring.
- Barriers will minimize intrusion and groundwater contamination.
- 95 percent of transuranic waste (TRU) will be shipped elsewhere. Plutonium, buried TRU, vitrified wastes, Cesium and Strontium will also be transferred from Hanford.
- Contaminated soils will remain on site, but placed in a secure configuration.

The plan divides the scope of CP closure into 22 geographic zones. An inventory of closure elements had been undertaken, categorizing 4000 items into five headings: canyons, tanks, waste sites, structures, and wells not needed for ongoing monitoring. The plan for canyons is to fill cells and below ground portions of galleries, then cover them. Material would be removed from tanks, which would then be void-filled and covered with a cap. Waste sites are much more complex, and several options are being considered ranging from no action, to complete remediation, to capping. Structures are dealt with more straightforwardly—they would all be demolished, and if contamination were present it would be covered or trucked out. Unused wells would be filled. The B/C cribs would be considered under the waste sites category.

Becky enumerated risks in the plan, both administrative and logistical as well as technical. Planning thirty years in advance requires flexibility to accommodate regulators, worker safety concerns, rule changes, and

technology updates, she noted. She also mentioned opportunities to coordinate efforts and minimize costs, for example through removing unnecessary infrastructure during the process, allowing further funding to be allocated to remediation efforts.

### **Discussion/Questions:**

Pam Larsen expressed dismay that partial demolition was being considered for the Plutonium Finishing Plant facility, having assumed there was consensus for full remediation. She also questioned the key assumption that waste disposal sites were assured to accept 97 percent of Hanford waste.

John Price, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), stated that his preference was Remove-Treat-Dispose (RTD). Health is the first criteria for alternatives; cost is used to determine between alternatives that are equally protective. John noted that shrinking the operational footprint by closing low-risk sites reduces mortgage costs, which releases funds to be used elsewhere; this benefit should be weighed with the preference to treat high-risk sites first. Another issue is whether disruption of the area by taking materials as fill might in some cases be worse than allowing natural attenuation. Costs of institutional control are compared with higher short-term treatment costs. Technology is becoming a controlling factor in tank and groundwater cleanup. He also pointed out that soil and groundwater issues require integration: between geographic areas, between tank farms and groundwater operable units, between facilities and soil sites, and among all the separate contractors.

Craig Cameron, EPA, pointed out that capping, while less expensive than RTD, must be accompanied by institutional controls, the cost and complexity of which must be considered in the decision. He discounted the argument that dispersal of buried waste would be safer than concentrating them in the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), citing the depth of the vadose zone. He expressed a bias toward RTD, and felt uncomfortable leaving buried contamination without adequate characterization. Maynard Plahuta reminded the Board that these decisions have not been made; they are still in the discussion stage. Craig also reminded the Board that the Canyon Disposition Initiative plan public comment period is beginning shortly, as is the comment period for the U-plant ancillary facilities.

Larry Romine clarified that the plan does not address pre-1970 TRU, and assumes Federal presence in the core zone indefinitely. Todd Martin noted that the first advice ever issued by the Board assumes “indefinite” future to refer at least to the first 150 years, but does not presume assurances for longer periods of time.

Keith Smith stated his concern about plans for the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) and the transfer of materials. Trucking had been mentioned, he felt, without proper consideration of other transportation modes such as rail. It seemed apparent to him the road conditions at Hanford would not support the level of truck traffic being proposed. Larry Romine agreed; although the trucks would be distributed over many roads, the risk of accident would be significant. Howard Gnann replied that no rail line was in place at present; there is a road to the BNI operations and a lay-down yard, which is used to manage fluctuations in transported material volumes. Keith expressed his concern that the amount of material (i.e., sand) required for glassification would further overwhelm the transport infrastructure. Howard replied he seemed to recall the amount required to be smaller than what Keith had quoted.

### **Presentation by the Chair**

Todd Martin prefaced his presentation with the observation that, although caps now appear to be undoubtedly part of Hanford’s future, the Board has not issued much advice on the subject. He then presented his adaptation of Dr. Seuss’ “Cat in the Hat,” substituting EPA for the parents, and a Cap for the troublesome Cat, who blithely offered to clean up his mess by covering it with an impermeable barrier. The story’s dénouement was left unresolved.

Following the story, Todd presented four issue areas for the Board’s consideration in developing a statement of shared values for the Central Plateau:

- 1) What do we have and what do we do with it? (Pre-1970 TRU must be dealt with appropriately. Also, DOE has shifted emphasis from treatment and removal to capping.)
- 2) What is our bias in remedial decisions (e.g., remove-treat-dispose)?
- 3) When do we decide to decide? How much uncertainty is acceptable? For example, earlier advice recommended unearthing the B/C Cribs despite an incomplete characterization.
- 4) Are contract incentives lined up with decisions and milestones in the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA)?

Todd remarked that the “first phase” of decisions have generally been completed or are well on their way; the decisions being considered now comprise a distinct “second phase.”

### **Board Workshop – Breakout Groups**

The Board divided into two groups to discuss vision and values for the Central Plateau, guided by the discussion areas identified by the Committee of the Whole. Following the breakout groups’ discussion, Todd Martin created a document synthesizing the workshop comments for use as a starting point in the Sounding Board that followed the workshop.

### **Central Plateau Vision Development Sounding Board**

Al Boldt, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), shared his vision that in the 200 Area, all that would be left for his grandchildren to see would be mounds, not concrete slabs. He also commented that disposal performance should not rely on institutional controls.

Rick Jansons, noted that while the agencies are looking for a short list of values, there is nothing preventing the Board from delivering them more. Values with Board consensus could be forwarded quickly, while values that members might not agree on immediately could be separated into a subsequent document. Rick felt the effort to create a decision tree deserved devoted effort, and should include the public. He raised the question whether the Board should send DOE an information request. Rick also noted that the discussion on incentives the day before had run short of time and deserved attention again in a future meeting.

Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, agreed with Rick regarding efforts to produce a decision tree; he felt the greatest difficulty would come in defining practicability, including the prospect of future technologies. Leon agreed that treating highest-risk waste first was a good basic principle, although remediation of some waste must be deferred until a method is better understood to deal with it. He suggested the Board address and agree to what level institutional controls will be considered.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, characterized institutional controls as a last resort; and seconded treatment of high risk sites first. She felt the Board should be involved earlier in agency decisions.

Maynard Plahuta, cautioned the Board not to rush to statements of principles and values, but rather give time between meetings to allow for further inclusion and prioritization. He felt committees could work on some next steps, and agreed with treating high risk materials first, with caveats. The Board should support the agencies in interim Records of Decision (ROD) if done properly. By considering alternatives in advance, the Board could encourage the agencies to involve them earlier in the decision making process; he viewed the U-Plant closure as a positive example.

Steve White, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest), expressed his commitment as a new member to learning about the Board’s issues.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), said the method of a decision tree was spelled out in Washington state law, WAC-173-343-50. Cost is a consideration; if benefits don’t exceed costs you don’t proceed. This is an important aspect of practicability; technologies may be available without being



affordable or reasonable. Dick remarked that DOE evaluation documents often do not consider an adequate breadth of alternatives.

Madeleine Brown, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest) pointed out that the Board's bias toward cleanup conflicted with the Central Plateau plan and institutional controls described by Becky Austin. The Board should understand capping and institutional controls, in order to be certain of themselves if they formally disagree with the plan. She imagined touring the site with her daughter in the future, and hoped there would be monuments to preserve the memory of the work that took place at Hanford.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government) questioned what precisely is meant by institutional control, which seemed to him a vague fallback option. At least it would entail forever passing on knowledge that will protect the site, but he was not sure how this would be accomplished.

Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local and Regional Public Health) appreciated the concept of a decision tree. She would like to see a list of major waste streams, categorized by volume, risk, and available technology. The decision tree could be used to allocate efficient use of labor and money. Waste streams with no clear treatment or disposition would be set aside or institutional controls would be applied until new technology was developed.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health) considered Todd's document to be valuable internally, but not intended as formal advice. He expressed strong skepticism of capping, noting that there must be good reasons why treatment is not possible before caps are considered. A better characterization of overall waste would be helpful. He pointed out that high risk may be defined differently by various stakeholders, and the Board should guide the tri-party agreement (TPA) agencies in what they consider to be highest risks. He also reaffirmed that the Board should first consider the ideal of as few institutional controls as possible.

Wayne Lei, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), pointed out that institutional controls in a near-surface site like Hanford are very problematic. He expressed the need to understand the conflicts and synergies between risk items.

Susan Hughs, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), approved of Todd's document as a framework within which detailed decisions could be formulated, and felt it should culminate in advice on a HAB position. She felt the Board could clarify it, and pointed to differing opinions expressed the day before as evidence the Board should reach consensus on a vision, between the Plateau as a sacrifice zone or a legacy for the future.

Keith Smith, Public at Large, considered further information on waste sites, types and volumes necessary to move forward. Orphan waste streams, such as 618-10 and -11 must be kept in mind. He felt Hanford should not rely on permanent institutional controls, i.e. caps, citing the aforementioned principle of avoiding irreversible actions. He also made a statement that conflict among Board members can be positive and illuminating.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest), supported advice, noting that it should assert a change in baselines to recognize the State's specified values of remove, treat, and dispose. He pointed out that industrial cleanup standards currently function as institutional controls on the Central Plateau. The Budgets and Contracts Committee and other committees should consider what budgetary effects would result were DOE to shift from caps to more permanent solutions in its plan. Gerry also suggested that contracts should incentivize the remove, treat, dispose paradigm rather than mere closure. This paradigm might require additional technologies and higher costs. The baseline should also include disposition of Cesium and Strontium wastes.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest), supported the development of advice, but with time for elements to be developed further in committee. She hoped the

Board would have a unified vision, such as the tribes presented in the Exposure Scenarios Task Force meetings. Paige noted that the Board had been jarred into an awareness that DOE's support had migrated to a new baseline. She encouraged the Board to include in their consideration the wastes generated as a result of the remediation process itself. Research and development deserved renewed support. Paige expressed excitement that these principles were approachable for the general public.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government) suggested the Board recommend applying successful methods from the 100 Area to the 200 Area. Interim RODs had merit, she said. There is much to do in committee—quickly understand the M91 matrix and comprehend cap technology, among other things. She was “flabbergasted” by the temporary authorization Ecology granted the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) excavation, an example where the Board was not given the time to respond adequately. In light of the weak Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS), permitting was the defense against poor decisions, and the Board now faces a difficult undertaking in addressing the problem.

Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health (Ex-Officio) was captured by the concept of a decision tree and how it might be configured to include contingent decision-making. She felt once it was developed, it should be posted during meetings, as a reminder.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business Interests), felt a holistic view was necessary, including consideration of orphan streams and pre-1970 transuranic (TRU) waste. Since Hanford cleanup is so dependant on shipping wastes elsewhere, he felt it only realistic that some waste would also be accepted, and considered it possible for stakeholders to work through their differences on this issue. Agreeing with a priority on highest risk, he noted that lower-risk opportunities for budget efficiencies should not be neglected; the diversity of waste suggested no one-size-fits-all approach. He urged the Board to consider use of the Central Plateau in the distant future, noting that the Hanford Reach National Monument management plan outline would be available in time for the January Board meeting.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government) supported developing advice from Todd's document. He felt plans should not rush to closure, and a decision tree could be helpful in reasonably postponing cleanup actions until technology became available. He supported a national waste disposition dialogue. In regard to contracts incentives, he stated they should be incremental, and cautioned against those so long as to span elections, budget seasons, or proven poor performance. DOE should identify and inform the public of contractor variances with incentives. Rob also felt each decision whether or not to cap should be made separately, not influenced by the proximity of nearby caps which might be expanded, i.e. “aggregate capping.”

Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government) felt the Board should release a high-level, concise statement of overarching values soon, leaving the document open-ended for later additions. She remarked that if the Board intends to suggest delaying individual actions until new technology is available, it must reemphasize research and development, which, despite expertise at Hanford, was receiving little in the way of funding support. She mentioned the Board must be flexible enough to address situations case-by-case, and recognize it does not have the ability to perform technical evaluations. She mentioned further that of the trio of good, fast, and cheap, it is realistic only to have two of the three.

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, reemphasized that Ecology would fulfill the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) as part of the permit process.

Nick Ceto, EPA, counseled the Board to issue advice in the form of a general statement of values, but also to write a white paper that could better approach the complications inherent in the situation. For example, while the Board might make a point that “all TRU is created equal,” there are gradations by type, such as “soil contaminated with transuranic elements.” There is value in developing understanding of such detail, although at times rapid decisions must also be made. He suggested a working group be formed which EPA could consult more quickly. The plan for the Central Plateau presented by DOE the day before was not the vision EPA held for the area, he asserted; EPA does not approve of aggregate caps, and encourages the Board to speak out on the topic.

Joe Voice, Department of Energy, Richland Operations, encouraged the group not to forget the statements made while developing the final wording of the document and the decision tree. The reasoning behind the choices and values should be explicitly communicated.

Howard Gnann, Department of Energy, Office of River Protection, looked forward to dealing with the detailed issues. He pointed out the need for the Board to reach some consensus on caps. In addition, he promised to answer the mass balance question by the next meeting; this information will be available from a completed sitewide composite analysis.

### **Next Steps: Board and Committee Work for the Next Three Months**

Todd Martin concluded the Board would aim to issue advice based on his document in January, keeping recommendations on a high policy level and presenting value-based statements for an ideal scenario. The Board would temper this with workload and feasibility concerns later. He noted that public comment on the U-plant Closure Plan would be open during January. He asked the Board to choose one additional issue to address in the January meeting.

Jim Trombold suggested the Board address caps. Paige Knight mentioned her preference for the workshop process in approaching the issue. Maynard Plahuta suggested a Committee of the Whole address it in preparation for the January meeting; Pam Larsen responded that the full workshop could be presented to the Board without preliminary committee work. The experts from Nevada and New Mexico who might speak to the Board would not be able to travel twice, she noted. Nick Ceto cautioned the Board not to become overly concerned with the technical details of capping, but rather to focus on under what conditions caps should be applied. This, he felt, was where the Board could advise the agencies.

Rick Jansons suggested the additional item be waste streams, as the discussion could benefit from the additional information Howard Gnann had promised to supply. This information would help the Board toward developing its decision tree and contribute to the values statement. Madeleine Brown noted the decision tree must follow and wrap up the other items. She asked that additional attention be given to Board priorities for research and development (R&D), which she felt were difficult to grasp at present.

Shelly Cimon mentioned the Board must review an indeterminate amount of decision documents before December. She felt TPA milestones are not aligned toward synergies in the timing and staging of operations—for example, demolition rubble may be used as fill rather than transporting both to and from Hanford. She was, like Dick Smith, concerned that documents currently being published do not include an adequate breadth of options.

Pam Larsen asked if the agencies had designated contact persons who could be consulted to find out when documents would be released for public comment. Nick Ceto, Nolan Curtis and Joe Voice replied they did not, as agency and staff responsibility varied with each document. Joe Voice committed to report back to the Board on the topic, stating that he had considered this issue before, but had lost contact with the staff working on it.

Rob Davis noted that mid-year set-asides were approaching, and the HAB should write a letter emphasizing the need for research and development (R&D) dedicated to cleanup. Todd Martin replied the Board's previous R&D advice could be re-sent.

The committee tasks were outlined as follows: the U-Plant closure plan would be discussed in the River and Plateau and the Public Involvement Committees; the River and Plateau Committee would also prepare information on caps for the Board in January. Information on waste streams and mass balance would work through the Tank Waste and River and Plateau Committees.

Todd concluded that the topic of caps would come before the Board in January; work on the waste stream information would be presented if it was developed in time. Todd also asked the agencies if they might communicate—even if informally—their needs and priorities. Nick Ceto answered by reiterating his

request for a small group that might be available to the agencies without extensive scheduling difficulties. Todd replied that being informed beforehand would facilitate internal HAB scheduling.

### **Tri-Party Agency Updates**

#### **DOE-ORP**

Howard Gnann reported that the WTP construction was proceeding according to schedule. Work was also resuming in the tank farms, after a three- to four-month hiatus. The Tank Closure EIS has passed internal review and the contractor is currently modifying the document; a Draft EIS will be available by early summer, and a ROD perhaps in December 2005. Howard said that DOE is not prepared for an independent groundwater review panel, since the documents in question are not adequately developed yet. Todd asked whether the risk analysis portion was ready for scrutiny, but Howard replied the panel will have to wait. It will require some time to determine the effects of each component toward cumulative risk, as the conservatism of the estimates made a summation misleading.

Paige Knight asked about the recent 100 percent increase in the cost of bulk vitrification, which Howard confirmed. Paige felt the credibility of the project was weakened when such a large change was made after presentation to the public. Howard replied that doing so remained the best choice despite the circumstances. DOE is required through the TPA to develop a stronger analysis, he explained, and other projects had been revised similarly in the past, such as a 100 percent increase in 2004 tank waste cleanup costs.

Howard enumerated the milestones reached during the last month, in particular the feed-receipt vessels necessary for further progress on the WTP. The next milestones in the tank farms are retrieval on S-102 and S-105, set for March 2005. Tank farms have recently been preoccupied with training.

Continuing the conversation on cost estimate revisions, Rick Jansons qualified the idea that safety programs and continuous improvement always reduce cleanup costs—in some cases, during the process, new risks are found and costs must be revised, beyond what is granted for contingency cost.

#### **DOE-RL**

Mike Weis, DOE-RL, spoke to the Board by phone, outlining the accomplishments of the previous year. Aside from a single missed commitment involving spent fuel, all other milestones had been reached. Cleanup goals for pipelines, the soil next to the river, and much of the river corridor has been achieved. He mentioned the office is preparing for Fiscal Year 2006 procurements. Mike considers the greatest challenges in the upcoming year to include continuing under 2004 funding levels and completing the mortgage reduction. Major foci at present included plutonium cleanup and working with external groups to define End States. Shirley Olinger is creating the End States document for submittal in December. Responding to a concern voiced by Pam Larsen, Mike clarified that the 200 Area variances would not be completed at that time, but would require work throughout the coming year.

#### **Washington Department of Ecology**

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, explained Larry Goldstein would lead departmental compliance with Initiative 297 provisions within the next 30 days. He also mentioned Ecology is taking steps to address environmental justice in accordance with previous Board advice, creating voluntary opportunities for citizen participation. An example is their work with the Public Involvement Committee on outreach surrounding the April Board meeting in Yakima. Ecology is recommitting themselves to increased transparency and notification. Nolan characterized the issue as a balancing effort to respond with the responsibilities of doing the job. Where decisions do not meet with external agreement, Ecology can at least ensure the process that was used in reaching them was correct.

Al Boldt commented on the apparent scheduling discrepancy between the Tank Closure EIS, which is six months from completion, and the upcoming bulk vitrification test. Would the state's permit of the test be affected? Nolan answered the test permit is in process and he was not aware how dependent it would be on knowledge developed in the EIS, but assured the Board Ecology would not issue the permit without necessary information. Howard Gnann commented that these two projects are separate; Al disagreed.

Rob Davis raised the issue of temporary permits for IDF and asked whether bulk vitrification wastes would be sent to the facility without a permit. Nolan answered that Ecology did not take issue with the necessity, position or size of the facility, and had therefore given temporary authorization for excavation. However, he said, this action did not guarantee a building permit and Ecology still held control through the permitting process. The issues involve the management of the waste rather than their placement. Ecology recognized the urgency for building the facility, in light of weather considerations and other factors.

Gerry Pollet responded that Ecology had mischaracterized the nuances of the authorization. Size and necessity are related, he argued, as the State is currently disputing in court. Nolan defended Ecology's public comment process. He said public involvement was not required for the authorization. Gerry countered that Ecology had not responded to comments the Board submitted the previous December. He felt Ecology should respond before issuing a SEPA Determination of Non-significance. He also pointed out that the IDF size in the application was far greater than the total on-site and maximum off-site volume described in the HSW-EIS. Gerry asserted that the Board must be involved in this decision. Todd Martin interjected that the Board must address the issue, and deferred it first to committee.

Jim Trombold questioned the term "temporary authorization," noting that since taxpayer funding was entailed, all implications suggested the authorization would not be temporary. He had not been aware of this practice and asked whether it was utilized in other permitting decisions. Todd suggested members speak with Nolan after the meeting on this topic.

## **EPA**

Nick Ceto reported on EPA's efforts to develop decision documents for the 300 Area, where they were concerned with possible groundwater contamination. Craig Cameron is the agency lead for the 200 Area and Mike Goldstein for the 300 Area. EPA had spoken with Fluor and Bechtel regarding contract incentives, and was confident the work in the upcoming several months is the right priority for Hanford. The Continuing Resolution has halted the hiring process for another EPA staff person. The issue with WIPP will be resolved soon, he said; he is simply waiting to receive a letter from headquarters. Nick mentioned his colleague Socorro Rodriguez had been impressed with the Board's knowledge and work during the previous day. He expressed the opinion that the Board's workshops were of value—while scientists will make the technical decisions, he said, these rely on leaders making value judgments.

## **Committee Reports and Issue Manager Updates**

Leon Swenson requested new members join the Tank Waste Committee. Once the mass balance/ waste stream information was delivered there would be significant work for the committee to handle.

Pam Larsen outlined the agenda for the River and Plateau Committee meetings in December and January, discussing caps and U-plant. She also felt a need to identify which TPA agency documents were coming out that would require Board review.

Susan Hughs mentioned the efforts of the Public Involvement Committee (PIC) to keep individuals engaged in commenting on the U-Plant /Canyon Disposition Initiative, both people with technical expertise as well as those specializing in public process. This would serve as a model for communication on subsequent initiatives. She announced the committee's production of both a long and an abbreviated version of the Tank Waste Fact Sheet, to be presented at the Board's January meeting.

The PIC aims to focus on outreach to minority groups during the April Board meeting in Yakima. Todd noted that the outreach planned by PIC would set a new level for the Board. Nick Ceto asked whether an evening meeting would be held, to allow greater public attendance. He observed that the rotation of the Board meetings between cities lacked purpose if local communities were not more aggressively encouraged to participate.

Jim Trombold stated his discomfort with the concept of targeting outreach to ethnic groups, which he felt was condescending toward them—particularly as the Board, in his opinion, did not reach out strongly to the general public. Paige Knight commented that targeted outreach was necessary. She also suggested meetings be held in locations more accessible to the public, recalling a meeting held at Lewis and Clark University. Wayne Lei felt the University setting was particularly worthwhile.

Keith Smith, speaking on behalf of the Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP), thanked Board members for their efforts regarding the stop-work advice. He mentioned CH2M Hill Hanford Group had extended hours of their medical aid station, which avoided displacing this responsibility onto community institutions.

Gerry Pollet informed the Board the Budgets and Contracts Committee would be planning a workshop on target budgets and baseline questions.

**Board Business**

Todd Martin mentioned that the Scope of Work for the Board’s independent groundwater panel was completed, although work by the panel would wait in light of the TW-EIS delays Howard Gnann mentioned.

The Board began the selection process for the Chair for the following year. Todd Martin was nominated. Nominations will close in January and the selection will occur during the Board meeting that month.

Susan Leckband suggested a document of consensus Board values be circulated before the January meeting, and Jerry Peltier requested that Todd present his vision for the upcoming year at that meeting as well.

**Attendees**

**HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**

Madeleine Brown, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Jerry Peltier, Alternate
Robert Davis, Member	Leon Swenson, Member	Gary Petersen, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Richard Smith, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Tim Takaro, Member (by phone)	John Stanfill, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Margery Swint, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member		Dave Watrous, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Allyn Boldt, Alternate	Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Susan Hughs, Alternate	Charles Weems, Alternate
Todd Martin, Member	Rick Jansons, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-officio
Bob Parks, Member	Wayne Lei, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-officio
Gerry Pollet, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate	
Maynard Plahuta, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate	

**AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF**

Larry Romine, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Mike Jensen, EnviroIssues
Mike Weis, DOE-RL (by phone)	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
Joe Voice, DOE-RL	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Jason Mulvihill-Kentz, EnviroIssues
Howard Gnann, DOE-ORP	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Tim Hill, Ecology	Becky Austin, Fluor Hanford
Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	J.S Herteel, Fluor
	John Price, Ecology	Barb Wise, Fluor
	Mike Wilson, Ecology	Ron Jackson, Fluor
	Craig Cameron, EPA	Kim Ballinger, Nuvotec - ORP
	Nick Ceto, EPA	Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec - ORP
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Bryan Kidder, CH2MHill
		John Kristofzski, CH2MHill

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Lynda Horst, Oregon Department of Energy	
Les Davenport	Doug Riggs, Hanford Information Network	