

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

June 3-4, 2004

Kennewick, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Executive Summary	1
Welcome and Introductions	3
Announcements.....	3
April Meeting Summary	3
Advice on Diversity Outreach	3
Advice on Technical Assistance for Final Hanford Site Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS).....	4
K-Basins Update	5
Risk Assessment Tutorial	6
Tank Vapor Exposure Protection Improvements.....	7
M-45 Change Package	7
Advice on Tank Closure EIS	7
Waste Treatment Plant Permit Modifications.....	8
Committee of the Whole on Risk Based End States (RBES)	8
Committee Reports	9
TPA Agency Updates	10
Leadership Retreat Report	12
September Board Meeting Topics	13
Public Comment.....	13
Attendees.....	14
Appendix 1 - Risk Assessment Workshop Notes	14

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of 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 Actions

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) adopted three pieces of advice: one addressing public outreach to culturally diverse communities; one addressing the need for technical assistance for the Final Hanford Site Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS) and one addressing the Tank Closure EIS. The Board also approved two letters: one addresses the M-45 Change Package; the other addresses Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) permit modifications.

Board Business

It is time for the Board's annual committee leadership selection process. The HAB will be hosting the next Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs meeting in October. There will be a national stakeholder workshop on public involvement in the fall. The SSAB Environmental Management charter was renewed for another two years.

K-Basins Update

The Board received an update on the schedule and plans for sludge removal. The Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) has been evaluating if there is any way to get the sludge into its final waste form more quickly. DOE-RL has a commitment to remove the sludge from the east basin by 2007.

Risk Assessment Tutorial

The Board received an overview of on-going risk assessment processes at Hanford and how these processes affect cleanup. Board members also participated in a workshop where they were able to talk with agency representatives and contractors involved with the risk assessments.

M-45 Change Package

The Board heard a briefing on the Change Package, which is out for public comment until June 7, 2004. The Change Package creates an Appendix I to the milestone process, which focuses on tank retrieval. The Board approved a letter commending the agencies for their collaborative effort on this change package.

Committee of the Whole on Risk Based End States

The Board received an update on the outcomes of the Committee of the Whole meeting on Risk Based End States (RBES). Board members will be observing Interagency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) workgroup meetings and will be attending the RBES summer workshops. The Board approved a letter from the chair outlining the Board's participation in the workgroups and workshops.

Leadership Retreat Report

The Board received a briefing on decisions made at the leadership retreat. The Board priority list has been compiled in a slightly different fashion, in order to help the Board be more flexible and allow for quicker responses when issues arise unexpectedly. Also, the Board will go back to six Board meetings next year.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

The Hazardous Waste Permit for the research, development and demonstration (RD&D) of the bulk vitrification plant will be out for public comment at the end of June. The plant will be vitrifying real waste from tank S-109.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

The Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) construction is going well. EPA is concerned with delays in the River Corridor contract as it relates upcoming milestones. Monitored natural attenuation (MNA) has not been an effective remedy for groundwater cleanup in the 300 Area; there is a feasibility study that should be completed in the spring that will look at other ways to get the water to meet cleanup goals. 233S demolition is complete.

U.S. Department of Energy

DOE-RL expects an announcement regarding the River Corridor Contract within the next week. WTP construction is continuing on schedule. The Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) and Ecology are discussing an Appendix H waiver for tank C-106. Work on tank S-112 should resume within the next week. Testing of bulk vitrification continues with another 1/6th scale test.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
Draft Meeting Summary
June 3-4, 2004
Kennewick, WA

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental & 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 three public comment periods, two on Thursday and one on Friday.

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are members of the public. Four Board seats were not represented: City of Pasco (Local Government), Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Washington State University (University), and the Columbia Basin Audubon Society and Columbia River Conservation League (Local Environmental).

Welcome and Introductions

Todd Martin opened the meeting and welcomed all the participants. He introduced one new Board member: Jeanie Sedgely, alternate for Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health). Todd also introduced Larry Clucas (who may take Norm Dyer's seat on the Board representing the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board) and Nolan Curtis, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology).

Announcements

Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government), and Norm Dyer will be leaving the Board.

Bill Kinsella, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), will be taking a job at the University of South Carolina. He hopes to stay involved with the Board and visit occasionally.

Beth Bilson will be leaving the Department of Energy (DOE) and moving to Fluor Corp.

April Meeting Summary

The Board approved the April meeting summary without changes. The Board also approved the Committee of the Whole summary with changes from Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large.

Advice on Diversity Outreach

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), introduced the advice from the Public Involvement Committee. This advice urges the agencies to get involved in multi-cultural outreach, especially to Hispanic communities. The goal of this outreach would be to better inform Hispanic communities of issues of concern at the Hanford Site and give members of these communities opportunities to get involved.

Martin Yanez, Public-at-Large, stated that there is a great need for this type of outreach at this time, as the Hispanic population in areas near Hanford has increased significantly in recent years. Martin suggested that the Hispanic radio station, where he works, and the Hispanic newspapers are both high visibility opportunities that are currently under-utilized by the agencies.

Discussion / Questions

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), suggested that the advice not be limited to only the Hispanic population, but should also include the Russian and Bosnian communities in the area. Bill

Kinsella supported Bob's suggestion, adding that the advice could include a reference to other communities. There was general agreement from all Board members that the advice should be multi-cultural in nature and this point was added to the advice.

Rick Jansons, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), expressed concern with the phrase "environmental justice" as used in the context of the advice. Bill stated that it is appropriate as it is used, as these types of issues come up frequently in minority communities.

The advice was adopted.

Advice on Technical Assistance for Final Hanford Site Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS)

Rick Jansons introduced the advice. At the April Board meeting the original advice regarding the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS) included a section requesting an independent analysis to assist with understanding the technical aspects of the HSW-EIS. For the advice now, the scope of the analysis has been broadened to include the Composite Analysis and the Tank Closure EIS. Gerry Pollett, Heart of America Northwest, explained the scope was broadened because of the extensive overlap in the assumptions used in the three documents.

Discussion / Questions

Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, stated his main concern with the advice is that it is too open-ended. He suggested that the scope, timeline, and expectations be clearly defined. Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), agreed that the duration of the review and the scope of work should be clearly laid out in the statement of work.

Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland (Local Government), stated that this independent review could be a win-win situation for the agencies, too. He suggested that the agencies could be involved in developing the statement of work, so that they could also benefit from the panel's analysis. Ultimately, the review could help to assure that the assumptions used in each of these reports are consistent with one another.

Nick Ceto, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), suggested that, if the Board thinks that they may need a similar type of review in the future, it might be a good idea to do a single procurement with wide ranging specifications, so that the technical advisors could be called on quickly. Howard Gnann, DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), stated he is not sure that type contracting will work, but he does think an independent review is a good idea. Howard also suggested that there is a possibility the review panel could get an advance copy of the modeling used in the Tank Closure EIS, in order to give them sufficient time to review the information. He asked that committee members give him an idea of the type of people they are looking for, in order to speed up assembly of the review panel.

It was decided that a small group of individuals from the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) and Tank Waste Committee (TWC) would draft the work plan and those who wish to can see it and comment.

Bill raised the question of where the line is between the technical and non-technical assumptions in these documents and asked that this distinction be made in the advice. Leon suggested that the review panel would be responsible for a concise and quantitative assessment of the information they are provided.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), expressed concern about timing: presumably, the Tank Closure EIS will be out in September and the draft Composite Analysis will be out at the end of the year. He asked if the proposed time limiting the advice would cover both of these documents. Todd responded that he did discuss this with Howard and they are going to work to be sure they are sharing everything they have. The timing of the Tank Closure EIS is the main concern, as it could be spring before it is ready.

The advice was adopted.

K-Basins Update

Matt McCormick, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), gave an update on K-Basins cleanup. DOE-RL is behind in removing the sludge from the K-Basins. The original plan was to move the sludge to T-Plant for storage, where it would be treated as remote-handled waste and shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). DOE-RL has been working with EPA and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) to see if there is any way to get the sludge into the final form more quickly. They have also been evaluating the decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) of the basins, especially the questions of how to get the east basin emptied and get the leaks and contaminated soil beneath cleaned up. DOE-RL has developed a plan to get the sludge cleaned up and moved to WIPP without storing it at T-Plant. The new time frame moves the mobilization and stabilization of the sludge from 2007 to 2017. DOE-RL has a commitment to remove the sludge from the east basin by 2007, so that the remediation contractor can begin remediation of the soil.

Agency Perspective

Larry Gadbois, EPA, commented that both DOE and EPA are disappointed that the K-Basins cleanup is so far behind. They entered into the recent negotiations acknowledging the tardiness of the cleanup and looking for a path forward. The goal of getting the sludge treated and shipped early is good for all parties, but the enforceable date is actually 2024. EPA is still looking at the dates with DOE, but the most important thing will be to get the waste rated and shipped to WIPP.

Introduction of Advice

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), stated that the advice focuses on the delay in sludge cleanup schedule and the path forward. It gives some background on the problems faced during K-Basins cleanup and addresses what DOE-RL is planning to do going forward. The delay has gone on for too long and the advice recommends that they keep on top of the problem to prevent any future delays. The sludge pumping technology is new for this project, so the advice also states that technology must be safe and well engineered.

Discussion / Questions

Doug Huston, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), asked how much uranium is contained in the sludge; he was guessing it has quite a bit, based on where it came from. Matt stated that the Record of Decision (ROD) signed in 1999 designated the waste as transuranic (TRU), while at the same time recognizing that it possibly contains some low activity waste (LAW) as well. Matt said he could get the information on sludge composition for Doug. WIPP does have requirements and the sludge will be filtered and sifted to meet those requirements. The uranium that is filtered off will be treated as spent fuel.

Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, asked how certain DOE-RL is regarding the volume of uranium in the sludge and how that volume might impact the anticipated number of drums. She acknowledged that this is probably not a question that could be answered during the Board meeting.

Several Board members expressed that the advice needed to be stronger and more to the point. Maynard replied that he initially thought the background section of the advice was extraneous, but he now thinks it is necessary and helpful, especially for individuals who may be unfamiliar with the history of the project and the K-Basins in particular.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), stated that Fluor was called before a Price-Anderson hearing in Washington, D.C., due to inadequate safety documentation found during an Operational Readiness Review (ORR). Pam was concerned, as she had never heard of a Price-Anderson hearing for an ORR. Apparently, the hearing went badly and Fluor expects to be fined. She asked Jeanie Schwier, DOE-RL, to respond with DOE-RL's perspective. Jeanie explained the hearing came up when DOE Environmental Health did a cross-check and found problems that were localized to the spent fuel group.

Price-Anderson is involved when there is something considered to have been done incorrectly or when a law has been broken. Perhaps there were some who thought that they were ready to start work, but when they did the model, they realized there were unexpected problems that couldn't be overcome. The actions they've taken to date are being considered for mitigation. She expects a decision in 6-8 weeks.

Nick Ceto suggested the Board might want to comment on the fact that the waste will now be treated rather than stored at T-Plant. He also pointed out that Ecology worked hard to get DOE to ship this material to WIPP; it is very important that Ecology was able to secure this commitment. Al Boldt, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), stated that, while it is great that the waste is being treated, he does not want the advice to embrace shipping waste to WIPP too strongly, due to the current issues in New Mexico. Amber agreed, as there are reasons that WIPP will not take the waste now and the Board should respect these.

The advice was adopted.

Risk Assessment Tutorial

Gariann Gelston, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), introduced the Risk Assessment Tutorial. RAP has been trying to get a solid understanding of the risk assessments at Hanford. They decided it would be helpful for everyone on the Board to be better educated about these risk assessments.

John Morse, DOE-RL, gave a primer on risk assessment, including an overview of what risk assessments are currently underway and how these assessments are coordinated to ensure completeness, consistency, and credibility. John stated that regulatory requirements, Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones, DOE order 435.1, and assessments in support of technical decisions are some of the major drivers for risk assessment. Some uses for the information gathered from risk assessments are the evaluation of possible routes of exposure of contaminants to humans and ecological receptors; development of exposure pathways; determination if contamination poses a sufficient risk to humans and the environment to warrant cleanup; development of cleanup levels; and demonstration of compliance with cleanup levels. Current risk assessments planned and/or underway include: HSW-EIS, Tank Closure EIS, Site-Wide Risk Assessment (Composite Analysis), and risk assessments for the 200 Area Operable Units and the River Corridor Baseline. These risk assessments are coordinated in several ways: there is an Interagency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) workgroup on Risk Coordination; the Composite Analysis is maintaining an active interface with all on-going risk assessment activities; and the Site-Wide groundwater model is routinely updated as a result of groundwater monitoring results. The Composite Analysis will become the starting point for a tool that will maintain a comprehensive "Risk Baseline" for Hanford. John stated that, while DOE recognizes they cannot be 100% consistent, they are taking steps to ensure consistency and help standardize the details. Some of the steps they are taking to help maintain consistency include: all Central Plateau risk assessments utilize the Risk Assessment Framework as specified in the response to HAB Advice #132; the IAMIT workgroup on Risk meets routinely to address risk scenarios, assumptions and models; the Composite Analysis is maintaining an active interface with all on-going risk assessment activities and provides a consistency check for inventory, waste form release, and vadose zone transport assumptions; and, the Hanford Site Groundwater Model is used as the underlying basis for all risk assessments with a groundwater pathway.

John Price, Ecology, urged Board members to participate actively in this tutorial, as risk assessments are important in determining how cleanup will impact human health and this is where the HAB can have an impact.

Discussion / Questions

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizens), reminded the Board that while Risk Assessments are possibly the best tool available, there is a certain degree of uncertainty associated with the assumptions used in these assessments. She urged the Board to keep this in mind when participating in the tutorial. She stated that, just because the assessments are consistent, it

doesn't mean that the assumptions are perfect, and the consistencies may just make the problem worse, or hide an inherent flaw.

Jim Trombold stated there seem to be a lot of assumptions used in these risk assessments and the science seems to be leaning towards stabilization. He suggested that perhaps it would be beneficial to put more money and effort into characterization and learning more about where we're starting from before getting into the transportation pathways.

For the workshop, Board members were divided into groups and given 20 minutes to visit stations set up around the room. DOE and contractor staff provided information at each station. The station topics were: tanks, River Corridor, 200 Area, and Composite Analysis. Questions and comments recorded during the workshop, along with the staff at each station, can be found as an appendix to this summary.

Tank Vapor Exposure Protection Improvements

Dale Allen, CH2MHill Hanford Group (CHG), reviewed the vapor exposure pathways and some of the recent improvements that have been made. Of the nearly 150 recommendations to improve the safety program, about 125 have been implemented. They have been taking numerous nitrous oxide samples and continue to do so. They have begun sampling the head space in tanks and expect to have all of that sampling completed in June. CHG has recently updated its chemical hazard and awareness training, which does a great deal to inform workers about what is in and around the tank farms. This training is given to all workers in the affected areas, not just CHG workers.

M-45 Change Package

Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP, summarized the major changes to M-45 as presented in the Change Package. Appendix I has been created for tank retrieval and closure, establishing a comprehensive regulatory process, including Waste Management Area (WMA) integration studies, and adding focus on retrieval of a WMA. Negotiations on the change package were completed on February 26, 2004 and the public comment period runs from April 7 – June 7, 2004.

Regulator Perspectives

Laura Cusack, Ecology, stated that the most important outcome of these negotiations was the creation of Appendix I. The change package focuses on retrieval and what is required for retrieval. She also pointed out that the way the deadlines for retrieval are listed has changed. Instead of listing each separate step towards retrieval with a separate deadline, it now simply states the time period in which retrieval must be completed. Laura noted that the milestones in this change package are specific to C Tank Farm. The process will have to be completed or go through the Appendix H process by 2006, at which time new priorities will be set for the next several years. Those priorities will be put out for public comment at that time.

Introduction of Letter

Doug Huston stated that TWC was pleased with the cooperative process used to produce this change package. The letter is simply a commendation to the agencies for the cooperative effort; it is not an endorsement of the change package. The letter does come to the Board with consensus and is to be the sum total of the Board's comment on the M-45 Change Package.

The letter was approved as a HAB product.

Advice on Tank Closure EIS

Doug stated that the concept for this advice has TWC consensus, but the words do not.

Gerry Pollett, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizens), introduced the advice. The scope of the EIS reads like a menu: it has a list of alternatives with treatment of the waste and a set of assumptions for how much is retrieved and how a tank is closed. The advice focuses on the treatment aspect of the EIS and says that treatment options evaluated should be based on the TPA and meeting the 2028 deadline for treatment of all tank wastes. Gerry stated that the baseline assumption should be based on compliance. If the alternative does not comply, that should be clearly stated in the EIS and the impacts should be clearly listed.

Discussion / Questions

Madeleine Brown, Washington league of Women Voters, would like the advice to come across a little stronger. It needs to register alarm or concern over the fact that none of the alternatives studied are TPA compliant. It must be explicit and reinforce the fact that the TPA is the basis for all cleanup that happens at Hanford.

Howard Gnann stated that the EIS is not the driver; it is only a bounding-type analysis. All of the alternatives studied are meant to bound various types of possibilities. DOE-ORP would like to try to educate people on the contents of the EIS as early as possible, realizing that there are some constraints along the way.

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, stated that, as she understands it, there is one alternative that comes close to meeting the TPA. If Ecology were commenting on the EIS today, they would likely note that none of the alternatives meets the TPA; however, Suzanne said she is not worried, as she is aware of how these alternatives were arrived at. She noted that Ecology would use the information in the EIS to get a better handle on the direction to go, in order to meet the TPA. For example, if one of the alternatives doesn't get to 2028 because there aren't enough melters in the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP), then Ecology would make sure that 2028 was met by increasing the number of melters. Gerry agreed with Suzanne, but added he would still like to see a TPA-compliant alternative included in the EIS.

The advice was adopted.

Waste Treatment Plant Permit Modifications

Doug Huston introduced a letter reminding and encouraging the agencies to consider previous Board advice when reviewing the proposed WTP permit modifications. The letter also tries to summarize salient points of some applicable past advice. The letter did come to the Board with full committee consensus.

The letter was approved as a Board product.

Committee of the Whole on Risk Based End States (RBES)

Pam Larsen reported on the Committee of the Whole meeting. Regulators and DOE discussed how they used the Board's advice and comments on the previous RBES document. Each of the agencies also talked about the new RBES document and the upcoming public end states workshops. (There will be a series of end states workshops this summer, sponsored by DOE, not the HAB.) The presentations led to breakout sessions about the new RBES document. This was not a meeting to prepare advice, but rather to increase communication with the agencies. At the meeting, participants reached consensus on the following points: the Board will provide support for the process of the RBES workshops; Board members will be asked to volunteer to participate in one or more of the IAMIT workgroups; participating Board members will bring information back to the Board for action.

Shirley Olinger, DOE-RL, stated that Board member's travel will be paid for attending the workshops. Also, invitations to the workshops have gone out to the Hanford listserv. DOE is working to get more than the usual crowd to attend these workshops and is even considering ways to encourage worker participation. Shirley added she would still like to hear from the Board on one outstanding issue: how to balance the short-term risks with the long-term risks.

Regulator Perspective

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, stated that Ecology is committed to a process of stakeholder dialog on end states. Ecology is supporting the workshops as part of its public involvement activities and as an extension of the IAMIT workgroups. Ecology is encouraged by the Board's willingness to support and participate in these workshops. Nolan noted that Ecology is willing to assist those who might want to produce documentation from these workshops; however, Ecology does not have plans to produce its own document.

Nick Ceto explained he has been very clear as to EPA's reservations about DOE's end states initiatives. He does think that the IAMIT effort is a good idea going forward, but he has some reservations about DOE's reasons for doing the workshops. Nick noted that, based on what he is hearing from other sites, RBES continues to be DOE complex-wide issue.

Discussion / Questions

Amber asked what type of documentation will be available after the meetings for the public to review. Shirley confirmed that the agencies are not planning to issue a separate report from the meetings, but they will be taking notes at the workshops and the notes will be available online. Also, the RBES document will be revised based on the feedback from the first workshop. The revised document will be available at the second workshop in August.

Betty stated she would like the workshops to include a full explanation of the treaty obligations and expectations as background for all workshop participants, regardless of the tribe participation. Pam noted it might also be helpful to remind participants that the natural resource trustees can sue DOE if cleanup is not sufficient. She asked if DOE thinks there will be any changes to the RBES process with Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson leaving DOE Headquarters (DOE-HQ) in the near future. Shirley stated that they are trying to make the process useful for Hanford regardless of who is at DOE-HQ.

Todd reminded Board members that the Board has agreed to assist with the summer workshops. The input from those workshops will feed both the Tri-Party end state process and the RBES document that Shirley is preparing; the key will be for everyone to remember that these are different processes, even though they are happening in one workshop. After the workshops are completed and the RBES document is issued, the Board has the option to issue advice on the process.

The process for involvement in the IAMIT workgroups was reviewed. Ideally, there would be at least two Board members involved in each workgroup. Since travel will not be paid for attending the workgroups, Board members will be able to participate via conference call.

Committee Reports

Tank Waste Committee (TWC): There was a meeting in May and several of June's Board products are the direct result of that meeting. The committee will not have any calls or meetings in June.

River and Plateau Committee (RAP): The committee has been asked to meet with the Natural Resources Trustees Council on issues of mutual concern. That meeting will take place in August. John Stanfill, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), will be liaison between the two groups. The committee may meet in July if the HSW-EIS RODs are ready.

Public Involvement Committee (PIC): At the last meeting, the committee decided to try to focus on issue-related advice summaries. The first one will focus on tanks, which will be helpful for all of the upcoming documents this fall. Committee members are also working to see how the Board's website can be better utilized.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection (HSEP): The committee would like a face-to-face meeting with the new health contractor, as there is a lot of energy over the changes that are occurring.

Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC): As a result of discussions about the committees at the Leadership Retreat, BCC is more likely to meet jointly with other committees in the coming months than alone. They are tracking a number of cross-cutting issues. There will be a committee call in June to determine if a July meeting is warranted.

TPA Agency Updates

Ecology

Max Power, Ecology, explained that the Hazardous Waste Permit for the research, development and demonstration (RD&D) of the bulk vitrification plant will be out for public comment at the end of June. This is a one-year permit for constructing a full-scale test facility that will treat waste from tank S-109, in order to do a real world demonstration and see what the glass will really look like. The permit will probably not be open for comment through the September Board meeting, so comments should be submitted by individuals and/or their organizations.

Questions

Dick Smith asked what happens if the test facility produces a bunch of boxes of unqualified waste: how will it be disposed of? Max stated that Ecology's understanding is that S-109 was selected because that waste will not produce that type of problem. Keith Benguiat, DOE-ORP, added that there are quality assurance steps along the way to prevent that issue.

Al Boldt asked if DOE-ORP has gotten Nuclear Regulatory Commission concurrence on the waste that was selected. Keith Benguiat stated that they have not.

EPA

The Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) construction is going well. The liner for the next two cells is almost installed. EPA is concerned with delays in the River Corridor contract; there are milestones requiring a schedule for work in the 300 Area, but work on these schedules has been difficult, as Bechtel doesn't know how much longer they will be out there. There was a meeting with Bechtel recently to ensure that the important priorities for cleanup are the ones Bechtel will focus on in the remaining months of the contract. Bechtel and DOE responded to Ecology and EPA's concerns and some of the cleanup priorities have been shuffled a bit. The regulators will be reviewing these changes next week.

In April, the Board produced advice on the 300 Area and the eight sites that will be cleaned up to unrestricted land use. EPA heard the Board's frustration with that process, but EPA did feel it was important to have DOE sign off on the land use action quickly. Nick thinks that the most prominent concern expressed by the Board regarded groundwater cleanup decision in the 300 Area. Monitored natural attenuation (MNA) has not been an effective remedy. There is a feasibility study to be completed in the spring that will look at other ways to get the groundwater to meet cleanup goals. The anticipated delivery date for the draft feasibility study is March 2005.

EPA is still somewhat uncomfortable with the RBES initiative from DOE-HQ. Nick reiterated that the efforts in the workshops sponsored by EPA and Ecology are not intended to support DOE's RBES initiative. They are going to work through this information for the public and the stakeholders, as it is important for future decisions, but they will not be driven by DOE deadlines to produce a product. EPA wants to participate in the end states workshops in order to ensure that cleanup decisions made are consistent with the public's future expectations.

233S demolition is complete. This demolition was well done and sets a good precedent for future building demolitions. 224B demolition will be done in stages, somewhat different than 233S; the plan has been signed off. The building itself will only be prepared for demolition, as EPA is still hoping to do integrated

closures within geographic areas in the Central Plateau. Ultimately, EPA is looking to get the most work done, at the right time, in the most cost-effective way possible.

There have been changes in regional EPA management: Mike Gearheard has moved on, to be replaced by Dan Opalski in a couple of months. The local team is still the same. Also, EPA will be moving their offices, hopefully before Christmas.

DOE-RL

Jeanie Schwier stated that the transfer to the new occupational medicine contractor has gone well and they expect Advance Med to be operational on Monday. DOE-RL also expects to see an announcement on the River Corridor contract in the next week.

DOE-ORP

Howard Gnann gave updates on some of the on-going projects. Construction of the WTP continues to ramp up and will peak in late 2005. If everything stays on schedule, the four pre-treat/receipt vessels will be seated in the basement of the pre-treatment building. DOE-ORP and Ecology signed the Appendix H package yesterday regarding the waste retrieval from tank C-106. Work on S-112 should be restarted in the next week; the tank is currently about 85% retrieved. The C-200 series tanks are being retrieved using a vacuum retrieval technology, which is the third retrieval technology DOE-ORP has deployed. That work should start in July. DOE-ORP is still testing the supplemental waste treatment process, bulk vitrification (BV). There is one more one-sixth-scale test and DOE-ORP is trying to contract for the full-scale prototype. DOE-ORP is no longer actively pursuing changes to the TRU waste designation with the state of New Mexico.

Questions

Harold Heacock asked if the BV demonstration is still being funded with fiscal year 2004 dollars. Howard responded that yes, there is FY 2004 money committed to a full-scale prototype BV plant.

Gerry Pollett recalled several of the cleanup alternatives in the Tank Closure EIS are dependent on a change to the TRU waste designation. He asked Howard how this would be handled, in light of the fact that DOE-ORP is no longer pursuing the changes to the designation. Howard stated they have begun the technical discussions with the regulators about eight tanks, but due to the political climate and other outstanding issues with New Mexico, now is not the time to push the TRU issue. Howard made it clear that DOE-ORP is not backing away from its goals for TRU.

Bob Larson, Benton Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), stated that he saw in the newspaper that Advance Med will be taking over for the Hanford Environmental Health Foundation (HEHF). He also heard from one of his neighbors, a former doctor at HEHF, that Advance Med will not be retaining any of HEHF's doctors. Howard stated that he is unable to comment on this as he is not familiar with the contract. Gerry suggested this may be an issue for HSEP, as it looks like Advance Med may not have anyone who is familiar with Beryllium sickness if the HEHF doctors with the experience were not offered jobs. DOE-RL made a commitment to have a visiting expert and a doctor on staff who are experts on beryllium sickness. Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, stated that Advance Med has already agreed to come and talk to HSEP as soon as they are officially on board. He also asked that the medically knowledgeable members of the Board attend the meeting.

Board Business

April Site-Specific Advisory Boards (SSAB) Chairs Meeting

Todd and Shelly attended the SSAB chairs meeting in Washington, D.C. The meeting covered several topics, including the DOE-HQ RBES initiative, legacy management, and planning for the next chairs meeting which the Board will be hosting. Todd asked that Board members start thinking about tours and other interesting things for the chairs to do while they are visiting. He also noted that the hosting board

traditionally throws a nice reception, so he would like assistance in planning this event and suggestions on where to get funding for it.

Another meeting in the planning stages is the national stakeholder workshop. Most of the energy seems to be focused on a workshop on the future of public involvement for sites that are moving to new administration under DOE's Office of Legacy Management. Todd noted that the Board's leadership team thinks that involvement with the workshop would be beneficial, but hosting the workshop would not be advisable, as the Board will be hosting the next SSAB chairs meeting around the same time period.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, asked if the other board chairs acknowledged the continued need for public involvement, even when their cleanup efforts move to Legacy Management. Todd stated that they did, and that the main concerns regarded their diminishing ability to get the information they need to issue advice. Max Power stated that the officials in Legacy Management do seem to recognize the need for public involvement. They are looking at the long-term options and impacts and evaluating where they will need to take responsibility and what types of public involvement are necessary. Max acknowledged that the HAB is not directly affected by the changes from Environmental Management (EM) to Legacy Management, but he encouraged the Board to be supportive and proactive in helping those Boards who are affected.

General Board Business

Todd notified Board members that the HAB's 2-year EM charter was renewed.

Ken Bracken will be leaving the Board, leaving the vice-chair position open. Susan Leckband and Maynard Plahuta were nominated for vice-chair to replace Ken. EnviroIssues will be collecting nominations and sending out information about a selection process, which will be subject to consensus.

It is also committee leadership nomination time. Todd reminded Board members that members are not allowed to hold dual leadership roles.

Leadership Retreat Report

Three years ago, the Board began the priority list process for determining issues to address each year. This process has resulted in a fairly detailed list of issues. This year, Board leadership is recommending that the process be changed to make the substance of the list more general. Leadership is making this suggestion as they anticipate a fair amount of chaos in the next couple years and there isn't a great deal of definition of the decisions the agencies will be making. This will make it difficult to hit the 40% - 60% that is typically the goal for the priority list.

The list developed at the retreat includes:

- Development of a Standards Primer.
- Development of values, principles and strategies for waste management cleanup in the Central Plateau.
- Decision on the uranium plume in the 300 Area, reindustrialization and what that will mean for the 300 Area.
- 100 Area final RODs.
- Groundwater.

The Leadership discussed the allocation of work across committees and determined that Committee of the Whole meetings may be the best way to address these broad issues. The leadership has committed to making sure that committee workloads are respective of priorities, so some regular committee work may be put off.

Todd stated that leadership also discussed how the Board is working. They came to consensus on enforcement of the membership requirements in the charter. If a seat has three unexcused absences from Board meetings, that seat may essentially be removed from the Board. The Leadership will now try to

determine how involved seats and members are with the Board and ask for the agencies help in replacing seats that have not been participating.

Leadership recognizes that the Board has stepped up its public outreach and has even begun to produce its own fact sheets. As this success grows, it might make sense for the Board to do even broader public outreach.

In reviewing the Board over the past year, it was determined that five Board meetings is not sufficient to get the work done, so the Leadership is proposing six meetings for next year. These meetings are scheduled slightly differently: instead of being on the 1st Thursday and Friday of the month, the schedule was developed looking at 52 weeks in the year, pushing some meetings further into the month.

Discussion / Questions

Susan Leckband stated that leadership is trying to think “outside of the box” this year. The new plan gives more flexibility and gives the Board the ability to deal with the most important issues as they arise, rather than being committed to a work plan.

Shelly Cimon suggested that one of next year’s Board meetings be held in LaGrande, OR. Todd stated that they were trying to have three meetings in the Tri-Cities and three meetings outside the Tri-Cities. There are traditionally meetings in Seattle and Portland, which leaves one meeting open. Yakima was selected as part of the outreach to the Hispanic community, but this is open to discussion between now and when the schedule is adopted in September.

Nick stated he thinks the stated priorities are definitely the ones the Board needs to focus on. He agrees it is important that the Board picks its battles and stays focused. He suggested that, if the Board feels there is too much to do, the Primer should be the first thing dropped.

September Board Meeting Topics

- End States discussion from the first two workshops
- Board leadership and Tri-Party Agency check-in
- River Corridor contract
- Tank Waste Fact Sheet
- Tank Closure EIS
- Actions regarding the request for Technical Assistance

Public Comment

Bryan Kidder, CHG, introduced Lily Parnell, the new Workplace Injury Health Benefits advisor at CHG. She will work to assist employees with completing enrollment and claim forms and answering employee questions. Lily stated that she is excited to get started and is glad that she will be able to help employees with a task that is frequently difficult and confusing.

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Norma Jean Germond, Member	Betty Tabbutt, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Tim Takaro, Member	Jeanie Sedgely, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Richard Smith, Alternate
Doug Huston, Member	Martin Yanez, Member	John Stanfill, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Kristy Baptiste-Eke, Alternate	Margery Swint, Alternate
Robert Larson, Member	Allyn Boldt, Alternate	Art Tackett, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Madeleine Brown, Alternate	Dave Watrous, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Amber Waldref, Alternate
Todd Martin, Member	Gariann Gelston, Alternate	
Bob Parks, Member	Rick Jansons, Alternate	
Gerry Pollet, Member	Bill Kinsella, Alternate	Al Conklin, Ex-Officio
Keith Smith, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-officio
Leon Swenson, Member	Ken Niles, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-officio
Margery Swint, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Alternate	Jeff VanPelt, Ex-Officio

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Keith Benquiat, DOE-	Nick Ceto, EPA	Dale Allen, CH2MHill
Mary Burandt, DOE-	Michael Goldstein, EPA	Bryan Kidder, CH2MHill
Helen Bilson, DOE-	Larry Gadbois, EPA	M. Jarayssi, CH2MHill
Matt McCormick, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
John Morse, DOE-RL	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Stacey Howery, EnviroIssues
Shirley Olinger, DOE-	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
Jim Rasmussen, DOE-RL	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Woody Russell	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Andrea Hopkins, Fluor Hanford
Jeanie Schwier, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Ron Jackson, Fluor Hanford
Yvonne Sherman, DOE-RL	Max Power, Ecology	Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
K. Michael Thompson, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Mary Todd-Robertson, Fluor Hanford
Howard Gnann, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Nuvotec - ORP
Steve Wiegman, DOE-	Eric Van Mason, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec - ORP
Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	John Lindsay, Washington Group
		Janice Parthree, PNNL
	Charley Kincaid, PNNL	Michael Priddy, WDOH

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Julie Atwood	Lilly Parnell, CH2MHill	Rick Wejtasek
Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald		

Appendix 1 - Risk Assessment Workshop Notes

Station 1 (Tanks) – Tony Knepp, CH2MHill; Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP

- ~ Feed back data
 - ~ Sharing Data
- } Between Tank Closure EIS and Assessments
- ~ Elements of Risk Assessment Chart
 - misleading from travel time from tank to Groundwater

Station 2 (River Corridor) – John Sands, DOE-RL; Mike Thompson, DOE-RL; Larry Gadbois, EPA; Dib Goswami, Ecology; Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL

- ~ 18-year old visit to B Reactor. What is the risk? Why?
- ~ For children, look at age-appropriate dose-response. (Especially on and along the river.)

Station 3 (200-Area) – Mary Todd, Fluor Hanford; Roy Bauer, Fluor Hanford

- ~ How will the Central Plateau be assessed with other areas like ALE after the fences come down?
- ~ River and Plateau committee meeting October – information out from Phase 1 to get Hanford Advisory Board input on the question – “Are we on the right track for Phase 2?”

Station 4 (Composite Analysis) – Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL; Bob Bryce, PNNL; Charlie Kincaid, PNNL; Amorett Bunn, PNNL

- ~ Need to describe relationship between field data and global inventory and process knowledge
- ~ Need to acknowledge what the model doesn't capture, e.g. – climate change, population changes, etc.
- ~ Policy Question: Why not use the EPA or Washington state standard (e.g. 15 mrem/y) instead of the DOE standard of 100 mrem/y.
- ~ Avid recreational user should swim