

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

September 7-8, 2006

Richland, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary 1
Welcome and Introductions 3
Approval of June Meeting Summary 3
Look Back/Look Forward: Perspectives from the Board and Senior Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Managers 3
Waste Treatment Plant 11
Board Budget 13
Chair Nominations 15
Board 2007 Priorities and Meeting Schedule 15
Agency Updates 16
Issue Manager Training 17
Board Meeting Schedule 18
Committee Reports 18
Public Comment 19
Board Business 19
Attendees 20

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 one piece of advice regarding the impact of Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) delays on the Department of Energy's (DOE) path forward for Hanford's tank waste treatment and immobilization program.

Look Back/Look Forward: Perspectives from the Board and Senior Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Managers

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interests), Board Chair, presented his summary of the Board's work from the past year. Roy Schepens, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP); Keith Klein, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL); Polly Zehm, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology); and Nick Ceto, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) each presented their agencies' perspectives on the Board's work from the past year and offered suggestions for possible issues where the Board could have input in the coming year.

Board Budget

The Board discussed the status of its budget for the next fiscal year and considered draft advice developed by Board leadership regarding future Board funding. The Board decided against issuing the draft budget principles as advice, but may choose to send a letter.

Chair Nominations

The Board discussed the process for chair selection and officially opened the nominations. Board Chair selection will take place at the November Board meeting.

Board 2007 Priorities and Meeting Schedule

The Board reviewed its priorities for 2007, and approved the 2007 meeting schedule.

Committee Issue Manager Training

Board leadership and facilitators provided training on the role, policies, and procedures for committee issue managers.

Board Business

The Board discussed major topics for the November Board Meeting and confirmed committee conference call and meeting schedules.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

September 7 - 8, 2006

Richland, WA

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. Two seats were not represented: Yakima Valley Community College (University) and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Ex-Officio).

Welcome and Introductions

New Board members include Laura Mueller, the new alternate for Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Workforce); Barry Beyeler, the new alternate for the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon); and Mike Silverstein, new alternate for the University of Washington (University).

Jane Hedges, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), introduced Cheryl Whalen, a health physicist, as Ecology's new lead on cleanup oversight.

Todd explained that due to the Board's limited budget, audio and visual support for the meeting was significantly reduced; as a result, the meeting was not audio recorded.

Approval of June Meeting Summary

No changes were submitted on the June Board Meeting Summary, and the Board approved the summary.

Look Back/Look Forward: Perspectives from the Board and Senior Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Managers

Board Chair Perspective

Todd presented a video review of his perspective on the Board's accomplishments in 2006. He reviewed each of the Board's priorities and evaluated how well the Board's work addressed it.

- *Priority 1* – Address how cleanup priorities would be decided based on reduced staff, funding resources, and Department of Energy (DOE) programmatic changes.

Board work – Although the Board's committees discussed cleanup priority trade-offs, the Board did not produce any products to help guide the agencies in priority trade-off decisions.

- *Priority 2* – Develop values, principles, and strategies for Central Plateau remedy selection and waste management.

Board work – In addition to the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) being re-scoped, the Board issued five pieces of advice related to this priority.

- *Priority 3* – Public education and public involvement goals including seeking opportunities to provide Board speakers to groups interested in Hanford, increasing outreach to the University of Washington, creating a HAB display board, and increasing leadership visits to editorial boards.

Board work – The Board met all its public education and outreach goals. In addition, the Board issued three pieces of advice regarding public involvement at the State of the Site meetings and for the TC&WM EIS.

- *Priority 4* – Promote cooperation with other sites on DOE complex-wide interdependencies.

Board work – The Board signed three Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs letters, and adopted one piece of advice promoting continued funding for plutonium disposition activities at Hanford and DOE development of a national strategy for plutonium consolidation.

- *Priority 5* – Procurement of major cleanup contracts.

Board work – The Board issued two pieces of advice addressing cleanup contracts.

- *Priority 6* – Review the scope and process for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) 5-Year Review.

Board work – The Board issued one piece of advice suggesting the CERCLA 5-Year Review incorporate new study information and expand the analysis of cleanup actions beyond the failure of institutional controls.

- *Priority 7* – Leadership and membership development.

Board work – The Board placed six new members in the leadership team in 2006.

In addition to work addressing its priorities directly, the Board also issued two pieces of advice on the 2007 and 2008 Hanford budgets; one on Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) funding and another on bulk vitrification. The Board also issued several letters, including one congratulating DOE and Ecology for settling their National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) lawsuit.

DOE responded to nearly all of the Board's current advice, and Todd noted that the responses have been much more substantive and constructive in addressing the Board's concerns than in previous years.

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force) and Board Vice-Chair, discussed the new national SSAB charter, which conflicts with provisions in the Board's charter. She explained that Board leadership discussed the charter conflicts with Jim Rispoli, Assistant Secretary, DOE-Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM). She noted that it was a successful meeting, in which Mr. Rispoli confirmed the value of Board, and indicated that DOE understands the Board was chartered differently than the other SSABs, although he also said that, despite its unique charter, the Board still has to comply with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA). Susan said next steps include working with the TPA agencies to look at what achieving FACA compliance means for the Board. The Board leadership will present a path forward on this issue at the November Board meeting.

TPA Agency Perspectives: DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)

Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP, reviewed the Board's work pertaining to DOE-ORP activities, and said the Board can provide helpful advice for DOE-ORP in Fiscal Year 2007 (FY07) in the following areas:

- Public policy values – Engage in thorough review and consideration of issues involving public policy values.
- Prioritization of cleanup work – Sequencing work according to public values and principles, rather than funding. Develop criteria and guidelines to help in determining work acceleration or re-sequencing trade-off decisions
- Institutional controls – Provide TPA agencies with methods and recommendations to achieve public confidence on the effectiveness and appropriateness of institutional controls.

- Tank closure – Determine what constitutes tank farm closure.
- Groundwater integration – Develop advice on remediation priorities and methods to improve integration across the Central Plateau and the tank farms, which will inform DOE’s revision of the Groundwater Management Plan to better integrate groundwater and vadose zone remedy decision making.
- Public involvement – Advise the TPA agencies on evaluating and enhancing public involvement outreach efforts to increase public participation. Provide guidance to the agencies on products and methods for public education and outreach. The Board should also consider developing guidance for evaluating public involvement products and methods.
- Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) – Continue frequent consultation with the TPA agencies on the status of the EIS. Provide advice as necessary to help the agencies develop a credible and defensible EIS through an open and transparent process.

Roy said safety is DOE-ORP’s highest priority, and discussed current efforts to maximize safety throughout DOE-ORP activities. Current efforts to improve safety include immediate safety risk reduction, vitrifying all tank waste, using a conservative approach to tank vapor issues and facility design, employing highly skilled, trained and experienced workers, and integrating safety into all programs and processes through Integrated Safety Management.

Roy described the Senior Management Integration Team (SMIT), which was established to provide executive oversight and direction to contractors on activities at the tank farms and the WTP. SMIT includes senior managers from ORP as well as the WTP and tank farm contractors. On average, the SMIT meets twice a month.

Roy reviewed DOE-ORP’s River Protection Mission, including WTP construction, tank retrieval and closure activities, design and testing of supplemental low-activity waste treatment (bulk vitrification), and the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF).

- The WTP Estimate at Completion (EAC) is currently \$11.6 billion, with \$3 billion already spent on the project to date. Remaining WTP construction challenges include establishing a credible project cost and schedule baseline, which will address recommendations from reviews of the May 2006 EAC by industry experts and the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE).
- Fifty-three million gallons of waste remain in 173 tanks. DOE-ORP continues to plan on removing waste from single shell tanks (SSTs), storing it in double shell tanks (DSTs), and eventually treating the waste at the WTP. DOE-ORP has a contract with the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) to treat Hanford’s transuranic (TRU) waste. Currently, WIPP is seeking permits allowing TRU waste to be shipped from Hanford. DOE-ORP is developing a variety of new tank waste retrieval technologies to more effectively and completely retrieve tank waste.
- Results indicate bulk vitrified glass is comparable to WTP Immobilized Low-Activity Waste (ILAW). An independent expert review panel of the demonstration bulk vitrification system is currently underway. Results from the review will be factored into a path forward. Bulk vitrification could allow interim low-activity waste (LAW) treatment prior to WTP startup.

Roy noted that meetings were held in June and July between TPA agency senior management and a representative from DOE Headquarters (DOE-HQ) to initiate a collaborative process to address the interaction between cleanup challenges and TPA commitments. This process is designed to help the TPA agencies develop a mutual understanding of cleanup challenges and identify assumptions, logic ties, and end states related to the schedule and cost for key cleanup activities.

TPA Agency Perspectives: DOE- Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)

Keith Klein, DOE-RL, discussed the Board’s work in 2006 from DOE-RL’s perspective. He introduced Joe Franco, Assistant Manager for the River Corridor. DOE-RL appreciates the Board’s advice, especially on the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) and the 200-UW-1 Waste Site Proposed Plan. Regarding the

Board's contracting advice, DOE-RL is unable to share some contracting information. Keith recognized this limits the Board's ability to develop advice on contracting issues; however, DOE-RL is interested in the Board's perspective on some specific contracting issues.

Keith discussed DOE-RL's priorities for FY07. He said safety is DOE-RL's top priority, and maintaining critical safety infrastructure requires significant funding. Other priorities include DOE-RL's effort to maintain TPA compliance, in particular completing containerization and consolidation of K East and K West sludge, cleanup of facilities and waste sites along the Columbia River Corridor, retrieving suspect TRU waste from burial grounds and shipping it to WIPP, continuing the remedial investigation / feasibility study (RI/FS) process, and continuing with offsite plutonium shipments.

Keith described challenges DOE faces managing River Corridor and Central Plateau activities, focusing especially on strategies for dealing with unexpected field conditions. He emphasized DOE-RL's effort to ensure a work environment where workers feel free to speak up to improve work on site. He expressed appreciation for Hanford workers who go into harm's way every day in the face of changing conditions and risks, and showed a video highlighting and celebrating site workers. DOE-RL is also interested in feedback on the video from the Board.

TPA Agency Perspectives: Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Polly Zehm, Ecology Deputy Director, described Ecology's commitment to Hanford cleanup and the Board. She noted Ecology's appreciation of Board members' time, concern, and commitment; both Washington State and Governor Gregoire value the Board's insight and recognize the Board as a credible voice for cleanup and a key repository of cleanup knowledge. Polly reviewed Ecology's mission to promote hazardous material cleanup and support sustainable communities and natural resources. Ecology is focused on making sure cleanup actions taken today do not cause problems in the future. Ecology is concerned about the stymied progress on several cleanup activities and DOE's inability to meet the TPA cleanup schedule. She noted that the Board's advice is very helpful to Ecology, and that Hanford cleanup is stronger and better because of the Board's work. She stated that Ecology requests full support for Board funding to honor its independence and charter to provide advice to all TPA agencies.

Polly described Ecology's priorities for Hanford cleanup:

- Adequate and continued funding – TPA cleanup milestones provide for a thorough cleanup in an appropriate timeframe. Stable funding is essential to meet the TPA cleanup schedule. Recent budget shortfalls mean Hanford cleanup is taking longer and is in jeopardy. Ecology would like to see DOE request funding to accomplish cleanup, and not just meet internal targets. Ecology intends to hold DOE to its legal and moral obligations, and will continue to urge DOE to pursue more adequate funding to meet cleanup milestones.
- WTP construction – Ecology considers the 53 million gallons of radioactive waste in underground tanks to be the biggest cleanup risk at Hanford. Polly emphasized the need to have the WTP operating to treat tank waste, and the need for DOE to provide diligent and adequate oversight. Ecology will not permit any part of the facility until safe operation is assured. The WTP is a daunting challenge, but vitrification is the right treatment technology and needs to be built now. Leaving tank waste in place increases the risk of exposure. Polly said Ecology supports the Board's advice to DOE to meet its TPA obligations and there is a lot of collaborative work to do to ensure this happens. Polly said DOE is behind the curve for selecting supplemental technology, and emphasized the need for Board advice on bulk vitrification. She said selecting supplemental treatment technology must incorporate lessons learned from the WTP.
- Removing risk to the Columbia River – There is no greater risk to the Columbia River and region than waste left in SSTs. Four SSTs have been emptied, which is good, but there are still 53 million gallons of waste remaining. DOE cannot consider delaying tank waste retrieval. Ecology looks forward to Board advice during the TC&WM EIS process.
- Restoring Hanford groundwater – An enormous amount of contamination has leaked into the ground at Hanford, much of which has reached the groundwater and Columbia River. Not enough attention is being paid to protecting groundwater. DOE received \$10 million to further technologies for addressing groundwater contamination at Hanford. Ecology compliments DOE

on this decision-making process, and believes the selected technologies will help resolve groundwater contamination. Polly indicated a need to continue to address emerging and future contamination issues, and more attention and resources need to be focused on groundwater remediation.

- Meeting TPA agreements and commitments – Adhering to the TPA cleanup schedule is an enormous challenge. Board advice has consistently recommended the TPA agencies stick to TPA milestones. Ecology will continue to encourage DOE to meet TPA milestones. Polly noted that Ecology has the option to legally enforce TPA milestones. Although this is not a preferred option, DOE knows it is a tool Ecology is willing to use if necessary. A third option is for the TPA agencies to establish a common understanding of milestone delays and develop a master plan to address delays to Hanford cleanup work. She stressed that such meetings are not TPA negotiations, but are a preliminary effort that could indicate a need to open up negotiations. Ecology wants to have input on overall cleanup priorities and strategies.
- Public involvement – The Board has issued several pieces of advice on public involvement values. Ecology remains committed to public involvement and working with stakeholders in the Hanford cleanup process. The TPA agencies need the Board's help on all public involvement issues.

TPA Agency Perspectives: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Nick Ceto, EPA, acknowledged the work of EPA staff on Hanford cleanup and congratulated the Board on its work and commitment to Hanford cleanup issues. He does not consider the Board to be solely a DOE advisory board, but instead an advisory board for all the TPA agencies. EPA values the Board as a partner.

EPA is committed to an expeditious completion of Hanford cleanup. Nick acknowledged cleanup progress is being made, but the work is taking a long time. Cleanup decisions and actions have to be recommended by responsible action. According to the TPA, if DOE cannot make cleanup decisions, EPA must. Therefore, EPA serves as a backstop for cleanup decisions.

Nick reviewed cleanup progress in several areas, including:

- Demolition and decommissioning (D&D) of contaminated buildings and structures
- Addressing spill/release sites
- Good progress on solid waste burial grounds
- Tank farms
- Legacy nuclear material
- Groundwater contamination
- Releases to the Columbia River

He provided a status update on the 100, 200, and 300 areas from EPA's perspective.

- In the 100 Area, K Basins cleanup is nearly complete and some sludge has already been treated. Groundwater treatment is progressing and the K Area treatment systems are being expanded to capture newly identified plumes.
- Due to the proximity of the Columbia River to the Central Plateau, increased characterization and treatment is needed to address tank waste and other contaminated sites in the 200 Area. The 200 Area Milestone Change Package includes recognition of the need for more information to make decisions. During soil and pipeline excavation, effort is being made to characterize what is in the soil.
- In the 300 Area, cleanup of historic contaminated areas continues, including holding ponds and processing plants. Building demolition allows for characterizing and addressing some of the soil sites beneath. Battelle and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) facilities are expected to operate in the 300 Area into the future, which has implications for how cleanup activities are conducted. Completion of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), which is a linchpin for Hanford cleanup, is moving forward and exemplifies a good coordinated effort.

Nick noted several future cleanup issues.

- CERCLA 5-Year Review

- Risk assessments
- Remedy selection
- Tank farm retrieval and treatment
- Groundwater restoration
- Vadose zone characterization and cleanup
- Long-term stewardship
- Budget and schedule
- Off-site disposal/storage facility availability

Nick stated that funding may be the single biggest issue for Hanford cleanup. Future cleanup is resource constrained, and additional costs and demands for cleanup will likely exceed available resources. EPA will encourage DOE to submit the most appropriate budget requests. EPA would like to see a fully integrated roadmap developed for Hanford cleanup. Nick emphasized the need to develop a baseline for expeditious Hanford cleanup, which the TPA agencies can take to Congress to demonstrate an honest, credible accounting of Hanford cleanup costs. In addition, the TPA agencies need to determine how to develop a long-term institutional control (IC) system, which should involve the local community.

From a technical standpoint, Nick believes technical problems can be solved with adequate financial and political support. He cautioned against making cleanup decisions too quickly, and noted that Board advice prompted the TPA agencies to take a step back and carefully consider cleanup decisions.

Board Discussion and Questions

Greg deBruler, Columbia River Keeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interests), expressed concern about the TPA agencies not providing adequate feedback about how the Board's work is important to Hanford cleanup activities. He believes this is especially critical given the Board's budget issues and the move to restructure the Board's charter. If the Board is of such value and helps inform decisions, what is the rationale for changing how the Board operates? Dave Brockman, DOE-RL, said DOE is not trying to change the Board. The Board is directed to comply with FACA, and DOE is trying to find ways to maintain the Board's charter and FACA compliance. Greg stated that he believes efforts to change how the Board operates have been going on for a long time. The Board's budget should be reflective of the Board's value to cleanup. He stated that the Board should be fully funded, and if DOE cannot provide the funding, the State of Washington should take over managing Board funding. Keith said there is a lot of misattributing DOE's motive to ensure the Board's compliance with FACA. He said discussions of the Board's charter between DOE, Board leadership, and the TPA agencies have been helpful and successful. Todd explained that this is the basis of the budget advice developed by the Board leadership for Board consideration. So far, he said, DOE has positively supported the need to make the budget reflect the Board's value.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), said the WTP facility currently being built is not the same as the original \$5 billion facility, which she does not believe is being made clear in discussions of the WTP cost overruns. She encouraged people, especially DOE, to make this clear when discussing WTP delays and construction. Roy explained that on the high-level waste (HLW) side, the WTP capacity was increased by four times to handle all high-level waste, the pre-treatment facility was increased to handle all tank waste, and the LAW facility will now handle about fifty percent of Hanford's LAW. Additional consideration is being given to increasing the capacity of the LAW side to handle additional waste, which would reduce the amount to be treated by supplemental treatment.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), said it was good for the Board to receive feedback from the TPA agencies about how its work has informed cleanup progress. He asked Nick whether the TPA agencies are at a point where they are expecting new work on groundwater contamination, or just identifying a need to do more. Nick said some new groundwater work has been done, including DOE receiving \$10 million to evaluate and implement new technologies for addressing groundwater contamination. There is clear recognition that some treatment systems along the Columbia River were not installed as aggressively as they could have been. There are additional projects in K West

and K East that increase groundwater protection. The TPA agencies hope to install systems to extract technetium (Tc⁹⁹) from sites in the 200 Area, where Tc⁹⁹ is deeper than previously thought, before it spreads. Nick said DOE has demonstrated a genuine willingness to move forward with groundwater treatment, but money is the limiting factor. Ken asked whether any work is directed at the sources of contamination. Nick said Alicia Boyd, EPA, is working with Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, to install wells to improve characterization of the uranium source plume in the 300 Area. Additionally, new chromium (Cr) source terms have been identified in the 100 Area. Keith acknowledged that DOE's increased focus on groundwater is real in terms of interest and dollars, since DOE is completing work with spent fuel and focusing more on groundwater.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interests), asked whether the TPA agencies agree with Board advice on the CERCLA 5-Year Review, calling for more work to be done on institutional controls. Nick said the CERCLA 5-Year Review has not been released, and EPA and DOE have engaged in significant discussion about the review's content. The TPA agencies would appreciate the Board's help in developing reliable and lasting institutional controls. Paige said the Board has seen what is planned to be included in the review and found it to be lacking. Are the TPA agencies considering the Board's advice to incorporate new information? Nick said the agencies consider any new physical information related to cleanup work. He noted there is a need to identify cleanup end states that can accommodate future land use options.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), said he is pleased to hear Ecology is supportive of the Board's work. He said that at committee meetings contractors are often unaware of the Board's advice and how they could use it. He expressed concern that Board advice is dead-ending at the manager level. Roy said DOE considers Board advice with the understanding that it is passed down to contractors; however, it is possible that some advice has slipped through the cracks. Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, noted one instance where there was an issue with contractors not being aware of Board advice at the last River and Plateau (RAP) committee meeting. DOE-RL is providing this advice to the contractors and will provide an update at the next RAP meeting.

Susan Kreid, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interests), said developing advice is a huge investment of time, thought, and effort, so it is disappointing if the advice does not receive appropriate TPA agency consideration or does not reach contractors. She asked what the Board can do to ensure its advice is useful for DOE and contractors. Keith said having Board dialogue with DOE, such as sessions with Board leadership to clarify and emphasize advice principles, is really useful. He noted that when DOE reads advice on paper it is easy to under-appreciate the effort and thought that went into it. Roy suggested the Board needs to work on things DOE can impact or change and areas where DOE asks for Board input. He said the Board often addresses funding issues, which is good, but all the Hanford DOE offices can do is present the advice to DOE-HQ. He emphasized the need to have good discussion on issues like tank closure. Nick said changes the Board has made to make advice principles clear and succinct, such as the Central Plateau decision flow chart product, have been useful. Pam commented that DOE should hold routine meetings with site managers to discuss the most recent Board advice.

In addition to the TPA agencies needing to ensure appropriate consideration of Board advice, Todd said the Board's committees also expressed a need to consider and review agencies' responses to advice. This will be part of future committee meetings. Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), commented that the Board does a good job issuing advice on pertinent topics, but needs to improve its review of advice responses

Paige requested the TPA agencies update the Board about how management issues are being resolved. This would help the Board recognize agency accountability and allow the TPA agencies to show, specifically, how management is changing.

Jim thanked Polly for her positive comments on Ecology's involvement in Hanford cleanup. He noted that the larger the cleanup project, the more coordination and teamwork is necessary. Cleanup will not be successful without commitment from all the TPA agencies. Nick explained that EPA and Ecology have not

previously participated in budget baseline development, and EPA would like to have all the TPA agencies develop and agree on a baseline to demonstrate to Congress and others what cleanup actually costs.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), asked whether DOE-RL has updated the baselines. Does DOE anticipate adding greater contingency in out-year budgets? Keith said DOE-RL is trying to install more project discipline. He added that contingency ends up being the project schedule. With such a dynamic program, it is difficult to predict what will happen, so being able to change and adapt quickly is key. There is no contingency in the Hanford budget; DOE cannot afford to have money not being spent on cleanup activities. However, he said DOE is trying to develop ways to accurately forecast funding needs and be able to adjust to emerging issues in real time.

In light of recent reviews, Maynard asked whether DOE is increasing assumed out-year costs. Keith said DOE does not have that level of sophistication in its budget forecasting. He noted that much consideration goes into developing out-year budgets. DOE estimates labor hours for out-year budget profiles, but those numbers are considerably uncertain.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, expressed appreciation to the agency managers for discussing how the Board's work is useful in Hanford cleanup challenges and asked who is responsible for all the risk assessments that need to be done (e.g., all agencies, specific agencies, an outsider, etc.). Nick said risk assessments are generally done by contractors, but include information from several sources, such as the Natural Resource Trustees.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), thanked the agency managers for their perspectives. Are the new technologies being developed to retrieve tank waste built into project budget estimates or contingency? Roy said they are part of the project estimate. Jerry said there is a feeling that Congress is determining whether to continue with the WTP project. Given the WTP is 70% designed, how will the remaining 30% be funded and is the project design fluid enough to account for potential increasing future costs? Roy said funding for the Pretreatment facility is fluid and the design includes contingency. Funding for the HLW facility is not as fluid, but design needs to be completed. From a hardware standpoint, construction activities are pretty well-defined. To address Congress' concern about the Pretreatment and HLW facilities, DOE plans to complete the WTP design to 90%.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), said the Board has expressed strong interest in an early startup of the LAW Facility. The TPA Milestone M-62 Report has been postponed until the demonstration bulk vitrification system is complete. The Board was told another report would examine possibilities of an early LAW start. What is the status of this report? Roy said the M-62 report was delayed because of the delay in conducting a hot bulk vitrification test, which will provide vital information enabling Ecology and DOE to make an informed decision. He said the study examining the possibilities of an early LAW start is available and he will share it with the Board's Tank Waste Committee (TWC) in the next several weeks.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interests), commented that the TPA agency managers recognized some potentially massive changes to cleanup activities and asked the Board for input. What are the TPA agencies' goals for responding to public input and providing access to information? He noted that the WTP is at a crossroads, facing a crisis of confidence. The recent Los Angeles Times article on the WTP is symptomatic of the lack of confidence in the project and underscores the need for a united Pacific Northwest consensus for a path forward.

In order to advise the TPA agencies on tank waste removal, Gerry said he would like to know the baseline costs, to the extent practicable, to address tank leaks as well as burial sites. He said there seems to be some barrier to disclosure of baseline costs, and he would like DOE to explain why current contracts would impact disclosure of baseline costs. He encouraged the TPA agencies to make a concerted effort to explain to the public and Board what cleaning up tank leaks would entail. Roy said DOE is in the process of working on the TC&WM EIS. He encouraged the Board to be involved in advising on the development of what tank closure should look like. He said he would share the tank closure baseline, which accounts for WTP delays, with the Board once it has been updated. The TC&WM EIS will have cost estimate

information to compare different cleanup scenarios. The Draft TC&WM EIS is scheduled to be released in September 2007. Gerry said that if DOE is considering holistic changes to baselines and new end states, they need to have a set of public involvement goals. He noted that tank closure is just one example of an issue that conflicts with public values. Is DOE able to provide alternative cost estimates to the Board? Roy said he will look into providing that information to the Board. Polly added that if cleanup activities and decisions change, the TPA agencies need to obtain input from the Board and public to ensure support for the decisions. Todd commented that letting all information needs and requests rest on the TC&WM EIS will not likely be acceptable to Hanford stakeholders.

Susan Leckband expressed concern about how the TPA milestone M-15 change package will interface with the new focus on groundwater. Nick said the TPA agencies are scheduled to complete all feasibility studies by 2008; however, there are still questions about vadose zone contamination. Some work activities have been paused to provide more time to determine how best to address groundwater issues.

Susan thanked the managers for their perspectives on the Board's work. She said she is heartened by the agencies' verbal support for the Board. She is enthusiastic about the commitment to discuss institutional controls and long-term stewardship.

Waste Treatment Plant

Ken Niles introduced draft advice regarding the WTP cost overruns and construction delays. There are some interconnected impacts causing the WTP delays that are not always evident in DOE's approach. He said the draft advice addresses the interconnectedness of the impacts causing the WTP delays and the collaborative effort between Ecology, DOE, and the Board to help the public understand the situation. The advice reflects the need to develop public assurance and confidence that all results and potential impacts have been considered and there is a path forward to address problems.

There were two points of significant discussion among the TWC during advice development: 1) Whether or not the Board can speak for all entities that might be losing confidence in DOE's ability to complete the WTP, and 2) Whether to recommend a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) review of the proposed integrated plan for retrieving, treating, and disposing of all tank wastes.

Agency Perspective

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, said Ecology agrees with the Board's draft advice principles. She indicated the advice highlights things Ecology and DOE are working on, and that the advice does not cause any new questions. She recognized the timing issues with having a new set of reviews on a tank waste treatment plan. However, when reading the advice, she said the Board's recommendations to DOE get lost. She expressed concern there is a disconnect in the advice between what constitutes a baseline and an integrated assessment. She emphasized the need to make sure the baseline answers questions and has assessment capability.

Board Discussion and Questions

Ken said the assumption is that DOE-ORP is doing bits and pieces of the advice principles. Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, said DOE is re-baselining the WTP. Once the baseline is revised and sent to DOE-HQ, it will be an integrated baseline. The baseline includes assumptions, such as bulk vitrification as the supplemental treatment and full funding for FY07. She said DOE would share the baselines with the Board, which should go a long way to answering many of the issues in the advice. DOE needs to complete test plans for bulk vitrification to determine whether it is cost effective and robust enough to pursue; not having the tests finished is hindering DOE's ability to comply with TPA milestone M-62-08. Ken asked whether the baseline would look at reasonably foreseeable difficulties. Shirley said it would have to consider contingencies. The expert review panel indicated places where further testing could be done and corrective actions could be made. She noted the baseline is not as mature as the WTP EAC, and the baseline dates are contingent upon scale-up of a lot of test plans. As long as the Board is flexible on timing, she said DOE is addressing most of things the advice suggests.

Pam said she does not support recommending an NAS review of the plan, since it has already been studied by credible organizations and would just delay progress. Several Board members agreed. Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, said he has seen projects reviewed to death and run out of money. If the new integrated plan really needs to be studied, the time and costs associated with the review should be considered.

Gerry commented that the point of the advice is to indicate the Board's concern there is no plan to treat all tank wastes. The entire region needs to understand that the DSTs have shown significant corrosion and the life of the DSTs is unknown. He does not believe there is any way the Board can agree to let waste sit in the DSTs for an undetermined period of time. Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), said he is worried Congress is going to see this as an additional cost and pull funding from the WTP. Shirley said contingencies are built into the baseline, and typically consist of money or scheduling. Ken asked whether one of the contingencies is whether Yucca Mountain will open. Shirley said no contingencies are tied to whether Yucca Mountain opens. The plan calls for building a storage facility, but if Yucca Mountain does not open, additional storage would have to be built. Ken indicated it would be useful for the Board to review and comment on DOE's assumptions, since moving forward under the assumption that Yucca Mountain will open is a pretty big assumption. Shirley said DOE has to choose assumptions for the baseline, and the risk mitigation plan will outline impacts if the baseline is wrong.

Keith Smith asked whether the baseline includes an early start-up for the LAW Facility. Shirley said the baseline does not include an early start for the LAW Facility. She explained that DOE will consider the expert review of bulk vitrification with lessons learned from the WTP. Before a hot bulk vitrification test can be conducted, technical issues and additional scale-up must be resolved. DOE is hoping to resolve these issues in FY07, and start construction in FY08. Suzanne Dahl added that TPA milestone M-62-08 required DOE to issue a report on bulk vitrification pros and cons in June, but because of the WTP delay, the data will not be available until 2009 or 2010.

Board members discussed whether the builder or operator of the WTP would be responsible for worker training. Ken Gasper, Benton County (Local Government), said it is important to know that DOE has a plan for worker training at the WTP so there is no ambiguity when new contracts are put in place.

Jerry Peltier said some recent testing indicates DSTs are corroding, but DOE does not have plans to retrieve waste from all DSTs, so the assumption is that DOE is going to allow DST corrosion to failure. Instead, he suggested identifying a point where the risk of failure due to corrosion is too high and the waste must be removed. He noted that the Board does not want to build more tanks and put completion of the WTP in jeopardy. Rob Davis said the TWC's goal for the advice was to find a way to support DOE by recommending a get-well plan. Rob said DOE issued a report in March on DST integrity to meet TPA milestone M-48, and some Board members found it lacking. He noted the report considered tank failure to be the end of life for the tanks.

Tim Jarvis, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), cautioned that before an assessment, planning, or review of the tanks can happen, a credible inventory of what is in the tanks is necessary. Also, when decisions are made about how to treat tank waste, a mass balance of where constituents are going is necessary. Gerry asked how many SSTs are budgeted for retrieval in 2007 and 2008. Suzanne said she believes that to meet the current milestones, retrieval would be complete in all of C-Farm and two S-farms. Shirley said the plan includes only one tank waste retrieval technology, but DOE is developing multiple technologies to get as much waste as possible out of the tanks. Gerry said the TPA requires all tanks to be emptied by 2018, but he said retrieval is on pace to leave waste un-retrieved in roughly 100 tanks, with no plan to empty them. He expressed concern that the region does not completely understand the risks associated with tank retrieval, and said new baselines should be shared with both the Board and the public. He said DOE will have to tell Congress the price tag for building new DSTs, but this needs to be explained in the context of the increase from the WTP delay being much greater than the increased cost of building additional DSTs. He encouraged Ecology to push for a complete plan that includes schedules to meet all principles.

Susan Kreid asked whether the principles for tank waste retrieval are Board principles expressed in previous advice or new principles developed in committee. Todd and Gerry said the draft advice is a combination of previous Board advice and newly developed principles. Susan suggested explicitly stating that the draft advice builds on previous Board advice principles.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters, asked how important it is to have enforceable milestones for the WTP. Does the Board believe additional WTP project delays could be avoided with enforceable milestones? Ken said enforceable milestones are very important to the WTP project, since just making a new schedule does not provide incentive to stick to the original schedule. Suzanne agreed it is essential to have commitments and enforceable schedules for the WTP. Ecology has decided that more near-term and interim milestones are necessary initially, until the WTP is up and running. Several Board members suggested including the need for near-term and interim milestones in the advice.

Since there are a lot of overlapping issues between the draft advice and advice issued in April, Todd asked whether it makes sense to have them relate. The Board agreed the advices should be related. Shirley requested the Board let DOE know as soon as it determines what it believes should be included in the integrated assessment plan, because if it is different than what DOE is currently doing, significant discussion will be necessary.

Rob expressed concern about needing to de-couple retrieval of SSTs and the completion of the WTP. He noted that the WTP delay impacts other project schedules, such as the tank safety analysis. These schedule impacts need to be part of the integrated plan. Todd said the Board's April advice addressed the ripple effect of the WTP delays, but it makes sense to take the issue to committee to determine if additional advice is necessary.

Several Board members expressed concern about WTP operator training. Some felt this topic should be the subject of a separate piece of advice. Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), said WTP training and qualification is only part of a broader problem surrounding the training and qualification of the entire Hanford workforce.

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL, said there needs to be meaningful dialogue with DOE about what work product the Board expects from DOE.

The advice was adopted.

Board Budget

Todd discussed Board budget issues. Given the Board has operated with a flat budget during the past several years, increases in travel costs and inflation make it difficult for the Board to continue to function effectively.

Todd introduced draft advice on the Board's budget. He explained that the advice is in response to substantial budget difficulties experienced by the Board this year. The advice describes the decline in the Board's budget since 1994, and discusses the Board's ongoing efforts to minimize costs and adopt efficiencies. However, given increased travel costs and inflation rates, the reduced budget limits the Board's ability to function efficiently and reduces the Board's financial surplus. The Board budget request for 2007 is an increase of \$83,440 from FY06 to FY07. Todd noted the FY07 budget presented in the draft advice is based on the Board's priority list, which is based on five meetings per year and a committee meeting schedule that is consistent with past years. Specific budget numbers are based on a back-out of past work plan assumptions.

Board Discussion and Questions

Greg deBruler suggested showing the Board's budget historically, relative to the site budgets. If the assumption is the Board is a value, which equates to better decision-making, then DOE needs to adequately fund the Board's work. Greg commented that if the Board's expenses were based on a realistic look at the

work the Board should be doing, the Board's annual budget would be up to \$600,000 or \$700,000. He believes there is more work the Board could do if it had adequate funding. He added that there have been numerous requests for Ecology to take the lead role in managing the Board, and if DOE is unwilling to let the Board operate the way it should, then Ecology should manage the Board and bill DOE. Jim Trombold emphasized securing adequate funding is fundamentally about the Board's function and existence and he does not believe having Ecology manage the Board's budget should be the subject for this advice.

Todd asked whether the Board is ready to take on additional work; the proposed budget includes enough funding to accommodate that need. Keith Smith expressed reservation about the Board taking on more work, which might be too much for the volunteer members. He stated the Board's budget should be based on the existing workplan. Greg said additional work could require more work groups, an extra committee meeting, or other contingency needs, which should be budgeted for. He added that when determining the Board's budget, DOE should consider the work the Board could have done, not just what it accomplished in past years with inadequate funding.

Ken Niles suggested looking at Board budgeting the way DOE looks at its budgeting. He said it is important to include a statement about the Board's value, as well as a statement addressing the Board's ability to pay for technical consultation. Todd explained the last time the Board requested technical assistance, on the TC&WM EIS before it stalled, funding did not come from the Board's budget. Betty Tabbutt advocated that part of Board independence is to have its own pot of money for things like technical assistance and not always having to beg DOE for funding. Conversely, Jim Trombold said he thinks it is better to have the Board budget less specific, since he does not want to see the budget hung-up on a funding request for independent technical review. Several Board members supported having less detail in the budget description. Maynard Plahuta said the Board should have budget details for its own controls, but the budget should be simple and broad when it is presented to allow as much flexibility as possible. Todd cautioned that the more budget management the Board does, the less substantive work it can focus on.

Nick noted there is nothing in the draft advice reflecting the Board Chair's stipend. Todd said funding for the Chair's stipend has never been part of the Board's budget.

Rob commented that if DOE wants Board committee issue managers to be available to discuss issues, there should be some level of compensation for issue manager work. He added that compensation should be extended to the Board's vice-chair and possibly to committee chairs.

Todd explained the Board charter says a third party will administer funding, and all FACA stipulates is that DOE provide enough money. Shirley said Board funding used to be part of DOE's overall program management funds, but a few years ago Congress made advisory board funding a separate line item, reducing the flexibility. However, if the Board were managed by a separate agency, it would cease being a FACA board and DOE would not pay for travel.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, asked whether DOE needs a letter from the Board requesting adequate funding. Shirley said DOE understands the need to rectify issues relating to past years' flat budgets, and does not need a letter from the Board requesting increased funding. She said DOE would look at the Board's work plan and historic operating costs to set the Board's budget. She encouraged the Board to identify a need for additional technical support. Todd said he is confident DOE is willing to fund the Board's work based on receiving good faith, non-inflated estimates. .

Dick Smith said he does not believe the Board should issue advice on the Board's budget as long as there are productive ongoing negotiations between DOE, regulatory agencies, and the Board leadership. Board members generally agreed, suggesting instead a letter on behalf of the Board. Ken Niles added that advice could be issued on the topic if negotiations with DOE do not go well.

The Board agreed what began as draft budget advice would instead be sent as a letter. Todd will report back in November on the budget status.

Chair Nominations

Norma Jean Germond reminded the Board that Chair selection will be conducted in November, and she described the chair selection process. The Board nominates a chair and DOE makes the appointment. Nominations can include current Board members and alternates; nominees from outside the Board are also welcomed. Nominations must be accompanied by a written statement of a willingness to serve. Nominations are open from September 7, 2006 to October 15, 2006. Information should be sent to EnviroIssues.

Board Discussion and Questions

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said Ecology's meeting with DOE Assistant Secretary Jim Rispoli was positive, including discussion of how to maintain the Board's role and independence; however, Ecology and DOE have not been able to have follow-up conversations. Under FACA and the EM SSAB charter, there is a desire on DOE's part to run SSABs without a paid chair or fiduciary management by a third party. Given the effort it takes to chair the Board, Ecology is concerned how an unpaid chair position impacts the pool of applicants. Ecology does not agree with having an unpaid chair, but Nolan noted that Ecology and DOE have not discussed the issue completely.

Gerry Pollet expressed concern that not paying a chair would significantly limit those able to serve in the position. He stated that if it is important for the Board Chair to speak with independence and have credibility within the region, he or she needs to be compensated. Shirley verified that FACA does not stipulate that an advisory board chair cannot be paid; that is a policy decision made by Jim Rispoli.

Norma Jean explained that Board Chair selection requires a quorum or a two-thirds majority. If there are more than two nominees, the one receiving the majority of votes will be selected. She said nominations from the floor will be allowed, but, hopefully, candidates will be identified prior to the meeting.

Todd said the previous chair was not paid; however, all nominees at the time he was selected were asked whether they needed to be paid, and all said yes. He suggested asking nominees if they need to be paid in order to serve.

Board 2007 Priorities and Meeting Schedule

Todd announced that no changes were made to the Board's priorities since the discussion in June. Shirley said the TPA agencies drafted a list of priorities they would like the Board to focus on in 2007. Todd noted the agencies' priorities correlate closely with the Board's list.

Board Discussion and Questions

Jerry Peltier appreciated hearing the agencies' priorities for Board work in 2007. He recommended all the Board's committees review that list and look at their work plans to make sure everything is covered.

Pam Larsen said she was under the impression the end states process was complete, and asked why it appears as a priority for the TPA agencies. Dennis Faulk, EPA, said the TPA agencies are completing final risk assessments along the Columbia River, which could result in land use changes and applies directly to end states. He added that only one end states decision has been made for the Central Plateau. Dave Brockman emphasized there are upcoming decisions on which the agencies would welcome Board input. Pam asked that TPA agencies provide the Board with a timeframe for upcoming decisions, so the Board can queue up issues in the committees.

Todd said the next step is to discuss priorities in committee, to identify issues on which the Board can provide advice. He thanked the agencies for providing their priorities for Board work.

Agency Updates

DOE-ORP

Shirley Olinger announced the State of the Site (SOS) meeting locations: October 17 in Kennewick, October 18 in Seattle, November 1 in Hood River, and November 14 in Spokane. DOE will announce the meeting times once they have been set. Meeting planning included thoughts and concerns expressed by the Board's Public Involvement Committee (PIC). Shirley said there is some concern about needing to have a meeting in Portland. Ken said it is not acceptable to the State of Oregon not to have an SOS meeting in Portland. Greg agreed, adding that this is the most critical time for Hanford cleanup, and Portland is a significant constituent base for cleanup issues. He said he expects DOE to provide a rationale for excluding Portland, and there is still time to reevaluate the decision. Jim Trombold said it seems like the SOS meetings are not reaching many people, and he challenged the Board's member organizations to promote turnout at the meetings.

DOE-RL

Dave Brockman announced the completion of TPA milestone M-91-40. He said DOE continues to emphasize groundwater cleanup, and an additional \$20 million has been proposed in the budget for technologies to remediate groundwater contamination. DOE received a lot of advice on the CERCLA 5-Year Review, and a lot of work is going on to address the advice. New information received a lot of debate and discussion within DOE-RL. He said to expect to see something out in late fall, and he looks forward to briefing the Board on the outcome. He noted that the budget from the Energy and Water appropriation committee passed by the House of Representatives for 2007 will be on Continuing Resolution probably through November and December, which means DOE needs to spend funds conservatively.

Ecology

Jane Hedges, Ecology, discussed Ecology's continued emphasis on public involvement. She explained that Tim Hill, public involvement lead for Ecology, moved to a new position which leaves a big hole for Ecology in the Tri-Cities. She announced Ecology's new bi-lingual Spanish/English Hanford brochure, and said Ecology makes a concerted effort to develop public information materials in other languages. She offered to provide copies to all who are interested.

Jane noted public comment periods are open for the following projects:

- WTP two-by-two melter configuration permit modification. There is a November 9 public meeting and the comment period is 45 days.
- Air operating permit, which includes a proposal to remove facilities from the permit as the CERCLA process moves forward.
- 300 Area Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA). The public comment period closes on September 29.

Jane expressed concern about the M-91 waste certification milestone, since DOE is behind on meeting the milestone, and does not believe it can catch up. Part of this is due to delays at the WTP, but there are other things that can be certified.

Paige Knight asked whether Ecology is willing to conduct public outreach sessions in other places. Jane said she was certain Ecology would be interested. Shirley said DOE is going to Portland for another outreach event, so there might be an opportunity to coordinate. Erik Olds, DOE-ORP, confirmed that DOE has been contacted by two rotary clubs in Portland to provide information sessions.

EPA

Nick Ceto applauded Ecology for developing a bilingual information brochure, which he said serves as a beginning to address the lack of outreach to the Hispanic community. Nick said EPA is short-staffed, but is trying to increase their resources. EPA recently hired someone to look at tank farm closure issues and ensure work activities meet permit requirements. Also, the EPA Office of Environmental Assessment in Seattle is now engaged in Hanford issues, which includes services such as groundwater modeling and human health risk assessment. He noted the EPA office in New Jersey is also helping on ecological risk assessment. The EPA Hanford office has funding to hire contractors as necessary.

Nick discussed current milestones and comment periods. He noted that EPA recently discovered plutonium in a water sample and contaminants in groundwater. The City of Richland was notified as soon as the data was received, and additional monitoring will be performed. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) operation in the 300 Area is likely to continue for a long time, which needs to be incorporated into permits.

The M-15 Change Package includes Central Plateau decision documents. The original TPA deadline for the documents to be given to the TPA agencies was 2008. For a variety of reasons, primarily a lack of data, the agencies are pushing back some deadlines. The comment period on the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) Record of Decision (ROD) amendment to open waste streams to ERDF is currently open. The 100 BC Reactor area has some upcoming milestones, and EPA and DOE will discuss extending some. The UW-1 ROD is still being developed to identify a good path forward. The Columbia River Toxics Strategy (CRTS) staff is actively doing work on the Columbia River, and are going to be in the Tri-Cities to coordinate work with the Hanford ecological risk assessment. Mary Lou Soscia is heading up CRTS efforts, and Nick suggested she could attend a Board meeting to provide an update on CRTS work.

Pam said the City of Richland plans to comment on the 300 Area EE/CA. She is pleased with the decision to keep some buildings, which has cleanup implications, because Richland provides water to the area and water lines go through contaminated soil. These lines have to be replaced, which was not included in the project cost. Replacing such utilities will make the 300 Area much more capable of future reuse. Susan Leckband asked whether Nick is comfortable not taking down some of buildings in the 300 Area given the surprise contaminant discoveries in other buildings in that area. Nick explained there are some sites with identified waste streams, but it is difficult to determine the risk and buildings left in place will require intensive characterization. Keith Smith reiterated the need to be cautious, since drawings of waste site locations were not made for this area, and significant contamination stems from uses that are not on record. Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), said the Council of Governments supports the City of Richland's effort to keep some 300 Area buildings.

Issue Manager Training

Since there are lot of new Board members and the issue manager process is not universally clear or operating effectively and efficiently, Board leadership presented an issue manager training. Board members received a handout to guide issue managers through the process of working issues.

The issue manager process is necessary to ensure issues are developed in committees and come to the Board in a structured and disciplined way. Issue managers typically are individuals with knowledge or interest in specific topics. Issue managers need to balance their individual interests, the Board's interest, and their committee's interest. They also need to be sensitive to Board and agency resources.

Board members walked through the process of developing an issue for committee and Board discussion:

- 1) At a committee meeting, an issue manager receives a mandate to frame an issue and get more information
- 2) The issue manager takes the issue to the agency liaisons (DOE, EPA, Ecology), who will contact the appropriate contractor or program manager
- 3) The issue manager should ensure the agency liaison, committee chair, facilitator and any ad-hoc committee group is kept informed or conversations with a program manager.
- 4) The issue manager then takes the issue back to the committee for discussion, and should make sure the agency liaison, program manager, and facilitator are informed if agency staff attendance at a committee or Board meeting is necessary

Issue managers are in charge of working issues to develop draft advice, educate the committee and Board, and track issues until they are ripe for discussion. Issue managers need committee support to bring an issue to the Board. Issue manager resources include an issue manager checklist and an updated contact list of committee-specific agency liaisons.

Board Meeting Schedule

Bob Parks requested Board meetings not be scheduled on DOE Fridays off. Todd noted Board meetings do not always land on DOE days off and there were problems when the Board tried to meet at other times in the month.

Board members agreed on the following dates and locations for 2007 Board meetings:

- February 1-2 in Richland, WA.
- April 5-6 in Portland, OR.
- June 7-8 in Richland, WA.
- September 6-7 in Seattle, WA.
- November 1-2 in Richland, WA.

Some Board members asked why no Board meeting was scheduled for Spokane, WA. Susan Kreid suggested that since Board meetings are limited and Spokane is being addressed by a SOS meeting, the Board should consider having a committee week in Spokane to discuss issues of interest to Spokane constituents. Spokane constituents have not seen the Board's committees at work, so it could also be an educational opportunity.

Committee Reports

River and Plateau Committee (RAP)

Jerry Peltier, the new RAP Committee Chair, provided an update from the committee. He said RAP is ready to discuss the M-15 Change Package at their October meeting. He indicated a need for an issue manager to develop the issue. Pam Larsen remains as RAP Vice-Chair. Jerry reiterated RAP will consider the TPA agencies' priorities for the Board and see where the committee's work meets agency priorities. The committee will also review TPA agency responses to advice developed by RAP.

Tank Waste Committee (TWC)

Rick Jansons said the TWC will discuss the double-shell tank integrity report at their October meeting. He noted that issue managers have already drafted advice on the topic, but the advice requires more information and input. TWC is requesting responses from DOE-ORP and Ecology to issue manager concerns. TWC will also examine a Heart of America Northwest report on tank leaks and will continue to track WTP issues. Rick noted that several reports are scheduled for release in the fall, for which TWC will request presentations from the TPA agencies. Rob Davis is the new TWC Vice-Chair.

Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP)

Keith Smith said HSEP has not met recently and he anticipates the need for an October meeting. Issues HSEP continues to track include beryllium and non-rad exposure and hexavalent chromium exposure. The committee also has not completed its leadership selection for 07.

Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC)

Gerry Pollet said BCC topics include the ACE report on the WTP EAC. He indicated a need to coordinate with TWC to develop a plan for conducting a joint follow-up to advice. BCC will also consider bringing advice about renegotiating the Bechtel contract based on recommendations from ACE and the Government Accountability Office (GAO). Other BCC items in the coming months include input on Requests for Proposals, the FY07 Hanford budget allocation and a discussion of benefits that has been put off for the last four to five months. Harold Heacock continues as BCC Vice-Chair.

Rob Davis said the TPA agencies and the Board were caught off guard last year during the SOS meeting in Richland when former workers discussed claims and benefits issues. Changing benefits for people who were working on site is a major issue. He encouraged developing a proactive approach to the issue.

Public Involvement Committee (PIC)

Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest, is the new PIC Chair and Susan Hughs, Oregon Department of Energy, is the new PIC Vice-Chair. Helen explained that PIC has been discussing the locations for the SOS meetings, and developed advice identifying the need for strong facilitation at SOS meetings. Helen discussed the process for evaluating the SOS meetings now that they are using a new meeting format. She said this would be part of a broader evaluation of agency public involvement efforts.

Public Comment

Gai Oglesbee, Richland resident, offered written public comment, which she also read to the Board. Her comment is included as an attachment to this summary. Todd thanked her for her input.

Board Business

Todd reviewed November Board meeting topics:

- RAP – review of risk assessments
- TWC – DST integrity report and tank leak characterization
- Joint BCC/TWC – WTP issues
- BCC – Bechtel contract renegotiation
- Presentation from Columbia River Toxics Strategy program
- Board Chair selection

The November Board meeting is in Hood River, OR. Since Board facilitation is unavailable in September due to a lack of funding, Todd asked committee chairs to be sure and review committee conference calls for September and the October committee meeting schedule (October 10-12). Norma Jean reminded Board members that Board Chair nominations need to be received by October 15.

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Tom Carpenter, Member	Bob Parazin, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate
Jim Curdy, Member	Bob Parks, Member	Mark Panther, Alternate
Rob Davis, Member	Jerry Peltier, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Member	Dave Rowland, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Michael Silverstein, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Dick Smith, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	John Stanfill, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Art Tackett, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member		Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Susan Kreid, Member	Barry Beyeler, Alternate	Charles Weems, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Al Boldt, Alternate	Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Kenneth Gasper, Alternate	
Gwen Luper, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-Officio
Todd Martin, Member	Jerri Main, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-Officio
Ken Niles, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Steve Chalk DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Bill Barker, AREVA
Joe Franco, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Suzanne Heaston, BNI
Keith Klein, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
Dave Brockman, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
	John Price, Ecology	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
Eric Olds, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnerland, Ecology	Barbara Wise, Fluor Hanford
Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP		Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec-ORP
Roy Schepens DOE-ORP	Craig Cameron, EPA	Wayne Lei, OR Hanford Cleanup Board
	Nick Ceto, EPA	Janice Parthree, PNNL
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Terri Tramb, PNNL/DOE Reading Room
	Larry Gadbois, EPA	Lynette Bennett, WCH
		Michael Fox, WCH
		Mike Priddy, WDOH

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Julie Longenokee, CTUIR	Jacqueline Rams, DynCorp	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
Beverly Penny, CTUIR – DOSE	Gai Oglesbee, National Nuclear Victims for Justice (NNVJ)	George Jackson