

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

September 9-10, 2004

Seattle, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Board Leadership.....3
Perspectives From The Board And Senior Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Managers3
U-Plant Area Closure Update6
Advice on U-Plant Area Closure7
Advice On 100/300 Area Risk Assessment Work Plans8
Board Priorities Workshop8
Sounding Board on HAB Priorities8
Briefing on Records of Decision from the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement12
Presentation on the River Corridor Contract Request for Proposals.....14
Executive Issues Committee Update14
Agency Updates.....15
Agency End State Workshops15
Board Business15
November Board meeting Topics17
Public Comment17
Attendees18
Appendix 1 – Workshop Results19

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.

Executive Summary

Board Action

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or the Board) adopted two pieces of advice, one supporting attention and funding for the U-Plant Area closure, and the other advising the inclusion of groundwater and integrative elements into the 100/300 Area Risk Assessment Work Plan. The Board also approved two letters: one summarizing key conclusions from the Department of Energy (DOE) 200 Area End States Workshops and another responding to DOE correspondence about Board member attendance.

Board Business

The Board affirmed results of the leadership selection process for HAB vice-chair and committee chairs and vice-chairs. Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), was confirmed as Board vice-chair. Arrangements were planned for the Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs meeting that will be hosted by the Board October 6-8.

Perspectives from the Board and Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Managers

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), presented a proactive vision for the Board to address key issues in the upcoming year. This approach and agenda was supported by agency representatives. Roy Schepens, DOE Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), highlighted safety efforts and progress on waste vitrification. Keith Klein, DOE Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL,) invited the Board to contribute input to tradeoff decisions such as removal and capping. Linda Hoffman, Washington Department of Ecology, highlighted concerns with groundwater remediation, worker safety, and Natural Resource Damage Assessments. Dan Opalski, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), spoke to the need for the Board's collaborative process to continue in addressing future issues. Comment included a discussion regarding national nuclear waste storage facilities, the issue at Hanford of accepting "irreversible and irretrievable" commitment of groundwater, and accepting and capping some level of remaining contamination.

U-Plant Area Closure Update

Kevin Leary, DOE-RL, gave an update on the U-Plant Closure process. Discussion centered around this project's role as a pilot for learning and developing procedures for subsequent area-wide remediation projects.

Workshop and Sounding Board

The Board spent a good part of Thursday afternoon in a workshop designed to define goals and action items in pursuing the four priorities for the coming year. Each Board seat was given an opportunity to speak about priorities and commitment in a Sounding Board on Friday morning.

Briefing on Records of Decision from the Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), summarized and evaluated the Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement Records of Decision (SW-EIS RODs). Further discussion of the ROD strengths, weaknesses, and impact on Hanford cleanup followed.

Technical Assistance Panel Item

The Board resolved the manner in which it would contract for an expert review of groundwater modeling used in TPA agency documents.

Presentation on the River Corridor Contract Request for Proposals

Mike Lysand, DOE-RL, answered questions regarding the recent River Corridor Contract procurement process.

Agency End State Workshops

Susan Leckband evaluated the recent DOE-RL workshops on End States, concluding they were very successful. The first workshop was attended mostly by agency staff and contractors, but the second workshop had a lot more public attendees. Susan felt the Board was being listened to at the workshops, and was assured every effort would be made to garner public interest.

November Board Meeting Topics

The outcome of the priorities workshop and subsequent committee activities in October will form the basis for the agenda for the November Board meeting.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

September 9-10, 2004

Seattle, WA

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

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are members of the public. Four seats were not represented: Washington State University (University), Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local and Regional Public Health), Columbia River Keeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen) and Columbia Basin Audubon Society and Columbia River Conservation League (Local Environmental).

Welcome And Introductions

Todd Martin welcomed the participants and asked them to sign cards for staff and members who have recently left the Board. An announcement was made for a tour of the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) at the Tank Waste Committee meeting the following week. Todd later announced the retirement of Max Power, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology). The Board presented Max with a framed cover of the 1994 convening report, signed by Board members, and a clam shovel for Max to use in his retirement on the Oregon coast.

Several new members introduced themselves or were introduced: Leon Swenson (Public at Large) introduced his alternate Dave Watrous. Larry Clucas attended representing the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon); he was introduced at the last board meeting. Harold Heacock from TRIDEC (Local Business) introduced his new alternate, Gary Peterson. Rob Davis was present representing the City of Pasco (Local Government). Maynard Plahuta now represents Benton County (Local Government). The Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force) was represented by its new president, Mike Keizer. Madeleine Brown and Betty Tabbutt, both with Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), have reversed roles (Betty now serving as member and Madeleine as alternate). The member from Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), Rebecca Holland, introduced Dave Molnaa, her new alternate. Nick Ceto, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) introduced his colleague Dan Opalski. Gerry Pollet introduced his alternate, Helen Wheatley, chair of the board of Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), who will be joining the HAB as soon as the appointment process is finished.

June Meeting Summary

The Board accepted the June meeting summary, with corrections from Leon Swenson.

Board Leadership

Ken Bracken's resignation letter was read, in which he expressed appreciation of the Board and what it has accomplished. After a nomination and voting process, Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), has been selected as new vice-chair. The Board affirmed this by consensus.

Perspectives From The Board And Senior Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Agency Managers

Board Perspective

Todd Martin presented the Board's accomplishments and issue status for goals from the prior year. The Board met all listed goals except in instances where TPA agency plans had not yet been released. However, drawing from an analysis from Harold Heacock, Todd bluntly concluded that the impact of Board advice and efforts on policy was "not much." The TPA and waste management plans have certainly been strengthened with the Board's input; the Board has also added to the credibility of agency decisions it supports. Yet policy has largely ignored Board advice and recommendations. Combining with this dissatisfaction were illustrations of a low level of Board participation in drafting formal advice and letters: only 15 members participated in this during the year, with 75 percent of the language contributed by four members.

In this light, Todd said the Board leadership has chosen to take a new approach to goal-setting in the coming year. Rather than comprehensively listing agency plans or actions to which the Board would respond, the leadership proposed four issues on which to concentrate, and suggested the Board develop a proactive stance and vision on each of these issues to take to the agencies. These issues were:

1. The Central Plateau. This presents an outstanding need the Board might answer. Agencies have been struggling to decide among tradeoffs in this area, such as limiting efforts to core zones, or spreading resources to include cleanup of other areas as well. They are in need of stakeholder guidance; the Board could provide values and principles to guide tradeoff decision making.
2. 300 Area Uranium Plume & reindustrialization.
3. 100 Area Final Records of Decision (RODs).
4. Groundwater – whether risk assessments are reasonable.

Todd emphasized the need for member “buy-in” of this approach and these priorities. He mentioned that success in the coming year would be measured not by the actions of the Board, but by the actual policy and outcome achievements that resulted.

TPA Managers Perspectives

Roy Schepens, Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) gave a presentation on the vitrification of tank waste. He began by emphasizing worker safety and DOE emphasis to improve it after a series of “near-miss” incidents at the vitrification plant; these efforts included a safety day and zero-accident presentation. Vitrified wastes are planned to contain 97 percent of Hanford tank waste radioactivity. DOE anticipates two percent (curies) of radioactive waste will remain in lined trenches, and one percent in the heels of tanks after the cleanup. Significant progress has been made on the vitrification plant, and politicians and officials have visited and expressed support. Roy discussed specific technological equipment installed and the subsequent improvements in waste processing. He said permitting for the bulk vitrification system is underway, and mentioned the current status of the permit for sending transuranic (TRU) waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico. Roy closed by again emphasizing safety, noting his personal communication with DOE headquarters in Washington, DC on the recent incidents, and determination to improve work planning for increased safety in the future.

Keith Klein, DOE-Richland Operation Office (DOE-RL), introduced his colleague Mike Weiss, who was present at the Board for the first time. Keith applauded Todd for pointedly addressing the results of Board advice, but pointed out he considers Board impact to include more than this; he believes the HAB does influence agency thinking. Keith stated the Board would have more influence as it better anticipates the direction and speed of the agencies and acts accordingly. Questions DOE is struggling with include 200 Area decisions; the process of U-Plant removal (regarded as a pilot project for public disclosure in future projects), and gauging tradeoffs in tank closure. He saw Hanford at the leading edge of difficult societal decisions, such as determining the level at which cleanup should be considered sufficient. He mentioned cleanup is hazardous to the workers involved, and it may often be best to simply isolate the materials if they don't pose a threat. Along with these uncertainties, however, there is also substantial accomplishment and momentum from recent and ongoing efforts. Work on reducing the plutonium inventory has been proceeding despite costly security efforts. Keith illustrated the difficulties encountered in K-basin cleanup, which is nonetheless 99 percent complete. Workers have gained skill in unearthing drums on the Central Plateau without breaching them.

Keith agreed with the Board's executive committee on priorities for 2005. He thanked the Board for input on the end state workshops. The Board should also be aware, he mentioned, that DOE expects to transfer land on the Hanford site to other agencies in the next two years.

Linda Hoffman, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), introduced herself to the Board. She reaffirmed the mission of Ecology and its commitment to the TPA and to aggressive Hanford cleanup, which would continue under any incoming gubernatorial administration. She called for the Board's work plan for the coming year to develop a “big picture” view of activities on the Central Plateau. This will require a different type of involvement and perhaps a new process to arrive at advice; however, the resulting advice will better serve the needs of Ecology. Linda also noted three concerns Ecology is pursuing:

1. Legal challenge to the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision (HSW-EIS ROD). Ecology is particularly apprehensive that significant portions of groundwater have been categorized as “irreversibly and irretrievably committed,” i.e., polluted without the intent to remediate.
2. Safety issues. Ecology is investigating what role state regulatory tools may play in assuring safety through work plans.
3. Natural Resource Damage Assessments. These have been dealt with by DOE as part of the Risk-Based End States discussion, rather than addressed by themselves.

Dan Opalski, EPA, summarized his previous experience with Superfund and described his perspective on the future role of the Board. First, he stated, what obvious cleanup decisions existed at Hanford have been made; remaining issues will require a public role in decision making. Second, Hanford presents a unique challenge in its size, complexity and cost—the effort needs sustained support and resources from politicians. This support will continue only as a result of continued collaboration. Dan also reaffirmed Nick Ceto’s role as primary EPA representative at Hanford.

Discussion / Questions

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), expressed approval of DOE when it responded to community concerns, as was the case during the Risk-Based End States process. The resulting workshops were very productive, as evidenced by revised variances for the 100 Area. The SW-EIS ROD was also very respectable; it required a lot of work and the product was better than anticipated. The River Corridor Contract Request for Proposals (RFP), however, seemed more problematic. She expressed hope that the concerns noted by Linda Hoffman would be addressed.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local & Regional Public Health), complimented the TPA agency presenters, drawing specific attention to Roy Schepens and the issue of safety. He noted that though some impacts of public input are difficult to notice or measure, the benefits should not be underestimated.

Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, commented further on the DOE decision to strike the phrase “risk-based” from the End States workshops. The prior label led him to expect DOE would provide statistics on hazards, which are difficult to determine. He commented it is good to not promise more than can be delivered. Leon noted the HAB operates on consensus; consensus on end states is harder to achieve than on advice. Keith Klein responded he considered the regulatory process good; the workshops would help clarify agency vision and shape proposals for these areas.

Susan Leckband recommended looking at the “big picture” impact on the agencies. As evidenced by the cranes at work on the 200 Area vitrification site, work is progressing and the wastes are coming closer to being removed. The collaborative process is working. There is still room for improvement; she has seen public input incorporated, and seen it ignored. She remains concerned that areas are still dealt with separately although natural forces cross these borders indiscriminately.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), remarked that the progress toward waste stabilization has been remarkable; the agencies have achieved huge risk reductions this year. He pointed out that Natural Resource Trustee issues will increase in magnitude for states and tribes. He asked questions regarding storage facilities at the Savannah River Site (for plutonium) and WIPP (for TRU waste), and whether waste reclassification contributed to the concerns there. Keith Klein responded that the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) raised questions regarding container transport. However, progress is being made toward decommissioning the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), and he hopes transport issues will be resolved next year. Roy Schepens added that New Mexico required an unusually rigorous regulatory process, to which DOE agreed and is working through the process. He discussed the timeframe and steps in permitting, and concluded that the final schedule for tank waste cleanup has not been impacted.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, voiced approval for the emphasis on worker safety. He pointed out the issue of chemical as well as radioactive toxicity at Hanford, and noted worker exposure to asbestos. However, Keith was alarmed that worker exposure to radiation was used as a justification for leaving waste in the ground. He also wondered about the degradation of trench liners. Keith Klein responded that liners were primarily of use during

placement, but that long-term protection depended on the cap. Keith also noted that in the balance of worker exposure and remediation, while positions could be advocated on either extreme, efforts inevitably face diminishing marginal returns at some point. The decision of what is reasonable, and when removal should stop, involves complex questions and judgments.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, asserted that the issue of safety should be broadened from worker safety to considering the region as a whole after remediation work has finished. She commended the work done in K-basin, as well as tank waste cleanup. She wondered what danger was posed by leaving scant material in the tank heels. Roy Schepens made a distinction between quickly decomposing radioactive elements and those with much longer half-lives, such as Cesium and Strontium. The TPA will be honored in the statistical level of radiation removed, and this will include the majority of Cesium and Strontium. He is convinced that remainder levels will be safe, but also emphasized continued monitoring afterward. The timing of tank farm closure is also an issue, he said; having caps in place sooner lowers the risk of groundwater contamination from rainwater transport.

Pam Larsen highlighted the tenuous political status of WIPP storage, and asked what would happen if plans to send waste there fell through. Roy replied that TRU waste would not remain at Hanford; if not sent to WIPP it would be vitrified and sent to Yucca Mountain.

Martin Yanez, Public-at-Large, declared the discussion of WIPP and Yucca Mountain was unacceptable and disrespectful and that cavalier decisions were being made that affected the poor and people of color. The decision to deposit waste in these areas contradicted the positions of the people living in those areas.

Madeleine Brown, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), felt the Board should suggest a workshop or dialogue on the topic of whether Hanford should or should not keep or accept wastes. She asked what the decision process and basis was to select sites such as Yucca Mountain, Savannah River and WIPP. Roy Schepens pointed out the state role in regulating these facilities; Keith Klein pointed out that a Congressionally-determined process on the national level was responsible for site determination. Linda Hoffman remarked that while states have a role, theirs is a reaction to basic national planning. She had participated in related discussions, but was not among the top decision makers—and pointed out her frustration when her point of view was occasionally ignored in these discussions.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), commented that this aspect of the Board meeting felt less contentious than the previous year, and true accomplishments were made. She felt that all participants have learned from the collaborative process and the next, necessary steps involved vision.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government Interests), noted there was no commitment made in the HSW-EIS ROD to consider new groundwater remediation technology. He commended the local DOE office in their efforts, while wondering what resources and funding were available from DOE headquarters to ensure technologies are developed further. Keith Klein responded he was hopeful about emerging technologies, but dealing with already-contaminated water is very difficult. This also includes irreversible and irretrievable groundwater directly under the tank farms, which is off-limits for remediation because it would entail drilling through the contaminated site to the water and would thereby drastically increase further contamination and flow risks. Remediation can target contamination in the vadose zone—between the surface and the water table—and must otherwise deal with the spread of affected water.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), brought up the issue of pre-1970 TRU waste, for which he mentioned the Board has consistently recommended retrieval. DOE had a database of this waste from litigation in 2000 that is not included in HSW-EIS. Gerry disputed the amount of TRU cited by the TPA agencies, asserting there was eighteen times as much TRU waste present as was currently slated for removal.

U-Plant Area Closure Update

Kevin Leary, DOE-RL, summarized plans for the closure of the U-Plant area, emphasizing that as the first area closure of its kind, the public process will have lessons for Hanford and elsewhere. Some challenges include integrating Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Comprehensive Environmental Response,

Compensation & Liability Act (CERCLA) regulations, and the monitoring of caps as well as facilities post-closure. Kevin outlined the schedule for public review of various units of the remediation effort. He noted HAB advice #132 referring to an intruder scenario has been incorporated into waste site documents. There is a tour being offered this autumn through the barrier analog site and Board members are welcome to attend.

Discussion / Questions

John Price, Ecology, noted that it is more efficient to carry out an area-wide closure than to deal with components in a piecemeal fashion. There are yet tradeoffs that must be faced; he asked the Board to consider an opinion on whether DOE should use its resources first to address the five highest-risk sites, or spread those same resources to clean up 50 lower-risk sites.

Nick Ceto mentioned that resources are becoming tighter and the plan gives the HAB an opportunity to influence tradeoff decisions, such as where to remove waste and where to cap. The canyon closure is part of the larger issue of the Central Plateau, and what is of importance is the cumulative impact of work. The process used in this instance will serve as a model for subsequent canyon facility decisions.

Ken Niles questioned whether adequate plans are being made surrounding the option to leave and cap waste: do the TPA agencies include monitoring, contingency plans and trigger points for each capping decision? How large should the caps be to prevent lateral water movement? How do they address aspects that go beyond the jurisdictional unit, such as pipelines that extend beyond the area designation? Kevin Leary replied that the pipeline issue was discussed, and that U-Plant would serve in an administrative and regulatory sense as a template, not as much as a pattern to answer technical questions. He said this would be revisited later. The influence of caps on decontaminants will be included in the final plan.

Keith Smith, questioned the value of U-Plant as a template, since risks are lower there than at other facilities. Funding seems to be concentrated on buildings when it could be applied to higher risk issues, he said. However, he doubted whether the Board needed to voice support for project funding. River and Plateau Committee members confirmed that U-Plant closure funding had been brought into question.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), broached the issue of whether the plans took into account current predictions regarding global warming. Extended scenarios now anticipate wetter conditions than previously assumed. He asked what parameters (e.g., rainfall) were being used in modeling cap safety and lateral water motion. Kevin replied that global warming was included in the modeling, as was fire. Kevin stated that DOE is drawing from top experts to develop a rigorous plan. Preliminary models simply used the four wettest years on historic record.

Tim also responded to the mention of fly ash use, noting that fly ash generally contains toxic waste, and asked about the rationale behind using it. Kevin acknowledged these concerns, mentioning that the fly ash they use has passed several toxicity tests. It and zeolite clays are inexpensive materials which absorb radionuclides and thus serve as an added safety measure.

Becky Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), asked Kevin several questions regarding the V 03 building. He replied the building is ancillary and, although it will be demolished, it is not slated for this until after 2006. Characterization of the residues in V 03 has yet to be done and the subcontractor for the 10 U-Plant building demolitions has not yet been selected.

Advice on U-Plant Area Closure

Rick Jansons, "Non-Union, Non-Management" Employees (Hanford Work Force), presented the advice, noting that he had received and incorporated several comments from Board members.

Gerry Pollet suggested the advice not be limited to the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS). Tim Takaro was wary of language implying Board endorsement of the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI). Nick Ceto clarified Tim's intent, that the Board supports a holistic approach but reserves opinion on the specific method employed. Rob Davis remarked U-Plant would not serve as a model because other projects would begin before U-

Plant closure was completed and evaluated. Rick Jansons explained that it would be a pilot to learn and to discover what questions and priorities should be considered in other projects.

The advice was approved, with changes.

Advice On 100/300 Area Risk Assessment Work Plans

Todd Martin introduced the advice, noting the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment document will determine whether additional remediation actions will need to take place. It is currently a work plan only; he assured the Board they will comment on the plan itself when it is developed. However, he felt the current advice would serve to give “fair warning” to the agencies by stating the Board’s position on two issues: the need for an integrated, comprehensive view of risk, and the inclusion of groundwater exposures throughout the corridor in the calculation of risk.

The advice was adopted.

Board Priorities Workshop

The Board divided into three groups to discuss vision, products and action steps for each of the four major areas proposed by the leadership as priorities for the upcoming year: the 100 and 300 Areas, the Central Plateau, and groundwater. The compilation of results of the groups’ discussions can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of this summary.

Sounding Board on HAB Priorities

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government Interests), expressed his desire as a new member to understand the continuity of the Board’s approach from previous meetings. He wondered whether, in staking out a new approach, they might prematurely neglect other important elements. Todd Martin noted that several issues carried over from last year, including the 100 and 300 Areas and the Tank Waste Closure EIS. These and other items will continue to be addressed via committee and Board meetings. He expected that new issues will also surface after the election. However, despite this, he expected the majority of the Board’s upcoming work to be discretionary, and would like the Board to focus on a couple of key items rather than continuing to operate via the prior approach.

Each seat was given three minutes to discuss their biggest hope for the Board, the largest challenge they perceived, and the personal and organizational commitments they would make to help achieve these goals.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government Interests), stated his priorities were that Board members would fully participate and that new members must be given background. In addition to long-term issues, the Board must address immediate ones such as understanding the RODs and what might be done to assist the agencies. He suggested the Board restructure its committees and use more committees of the whole to insure better collaboration and participation. He noted that, in regard to the 300 Area, the Board must wait for the City of Richland report. He closed by noting DOE should give stronger consideration to addressing already contaminated groundwater through new technologies.

Charlie Weems, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), outlined two priorities: addressing groundwater and determining how the findings of the expert panel will be used by the Board and regulators. He was interested in DOE’s ability to transfer land, particularly in the 200 Area. He noted that it is difficult for the public to obtain enough information to provide timely and effective public comment. Also, he questioned what role the Board will have and how it might respond to threats posed by DOE. Finally, he stated his concern with the question of End States in the 300 Area, and the lack of an overall sense of impacts that long-term storage or waste importation may have on the Central Plateau.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business Interests), felt all major issues revolve around the 200 Area, which should therefore become a Board priority, since there is no clear path forward on cleanup items there. There is a clear path on tanks, the WTP, and the CDI. 200 Area issues—groundwater and buried waste—are unresolved. 100 Area questions are well defined and work is proceeding there. In the 300 Area, there is the question of future use;

no clear plan exists for the future Monument. The two sides have not come together on this, and the Board will want to address the issue when comment is made this autumn.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), expressed his appreciation for the new direction of the Board and for the broadening of participation. No matter what focus or topics are tackled, these are positive priorities.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government Interests), expressed his concern with groundwater contamination, the River Corridor, and what is termed the “blending zone,” noting its direct impacts such as potential radiation transfer through harvested clams. He considers the HAB a great success and does not agree they have had “not much” impact. Public involvement and education are key means in addressing Board priorities.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, stated that safety is the primary issue, for workers and surrounding area. She is worried by discussion of cleanup only as far as it is “practicable,” and wants to see the area restored to its natural health. She said, for these reasons, public involvement aspects are important, and Board members (including herself) need to reach out more. She expressed resolve to work and fight for DOE funding support.

Susan Leckband, “Non-Union, Non-Management” Employees (Hanford Workforce), suggested the Board publish a position paper on 200 Area End States and identify key tradeoffs when funding is short. This will require more committee of the whole meetings and concerted effort to narrow Board focus to policy, not details. She suggested hosting a Central Plateau meeting to develop End States and formulate Board actions. The Board must understand the risks of waste importation and what alternatives exist if other states refuse Hanford waste. The HAB should also be familiar with the mechanics of land transfers and how to mitigate a failed remedy selection if a land transfer is imminent.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), stated that the Board should limit itself to five issues at most, in order to focus its impact. DOE could give presentations at Board meetings on other issues. Upcoming topics of importance include decisions about what radioactivity will be removed and what will remain in the 200 Area. This area will never be totally clean and open to the public, so people must understand the contamination and its movement. Protection of worker rights in the River Corridor contract and the End State of the 300 Area are other important issues. He suggested the Board work on a 200 Area master plan, using committees of the whole to prepare for full sessions of the board. Committees should prepare the structure of workshops, in order for the Board to avoid dealing with minutiae. He felt groundwater was a concern addressed through the EPA and the Hanford communities, and that the Board therefore did not need to focus on it.

Leon Swenson, Public-at-large, was struck by the number of issues, as well as the need for members to spread responsibility among themselves and reaffirm their level of commitment. He felt committees of the whole suffer from leadership problems, since no one person has responsibility. The Board should be selective in its choice of target issues. Individuals should work according to their passion. He did not see the fact advice was written by four people as negative, as these members were talented at communication and had a passion for those issues. Members and alternates should be fully involved in some area they care about. The challenge is to narrow the Board’s focus to a practical number of topics. He asked what the agencies most need from the board, and answered with a commitment to develop an integrated picture for the 200 Area and to deal with the Tank Waste EIS when it comes out.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), appreciated the value and longevity of the Board, and advocated the strong continuity of this stewardship. For priorities he mentioned groundwater and integration of approaches to the 100 and 200 Areas. There should be commitment to the impact on workers in the 300 Area cleanup. Also, an analysis of caps and their longevity should be conducted.

Mike Keizer, Central Washington Building Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), expressed his commitment to the Board and to learning as a new member.

Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government Interests), remarked that the workshop process of the previous day was helpful. She believes in the concept of committee operations – having a few dedicated individuals coalesce thinking and bring it to larger group, since the entire group is too diffracted to accomplish as much. The Board should define and follow priorities, a few key goals. Some particular interests she

mentioned were adding weight to political discussions of funding the TPA, ensuring future sources of contamination are eliminated from the area, and remaining flexible.

Madeleine Brown, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), envisioned a need and opportunity to produce elegant work to guide agencies in the 200 Area. The Board should focus on a few simple and difficult things. They must keep pressure on the agencies; think of what would be lacking now had the Board never existed. DOE must conduct sincere and thorough public involvement. The Board must continue to be a flag-bearer for the TPA and uphold the dignity of workers. She also supports committees of the whole.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations) wanted to see the expert panel results used by the Board and circulated effectively to the public. The Board could also be influential in establishing appropriate funding levels – this is an obvious area where tradeoffs occur. They should consider what resources are available to regulators—do regulators have the best tools to make cleanup decisions? It will be a challenge to keep the “big picture” in mind while narrowing the Board’s focus. The Board must also work to involve new members and respond to unexpected issues. She expressed her commitment to committee meetings, formal advice, and to getting things to the public, such as by organizing public meetings.

Earl Fordham, Washington Department of Health (Ex-officio), stated that groundwater is not an issue the Board can leave to other institutions. His colleagues in the Department of Health conduct independent lab work and publish a state annual report available to the Board. The Department offers itself as a resource and partner to the Board. He thinks the Board’s largest challenge is to avoid becoming entangled in minutiae and keep issues on a policy level.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), remarked that in the past the Board has reacted to decisions the agencies have already made, so it is no surprise the Board had little success in changing their mind. The Board should be ahead of DOE, and work proactively to shape decisions before they are made. Gerry noted what he felt were overlooked issues: reactor final disposition is not in the HSW-EIS. Pre-1970 buried waste and composite analysis should be included in a site-wide EIS; it is not currently being considered at all. The court ruling on disposition of TRU waste in New Mexico could be a surprise, for which Hanford must prepare. There is also doubt regarding Yucca Mountain’s acceptance of metal fuel. Gerry also was concerned that regulators were not changing the safety culture at Hanford. Subcontractors push the envelope on “managing the site.” Additionally, DOE budgets for Hanford are being cut. There is currently public support to remediate the contamination correctly, and this support should be drawn on while it exists.

Larry Clucas, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), saw the Board in transition from being a watchdog to being a group whose thinking the agencies will take into consideration. The Board should write a white paper on what Hanford should look like in 30 or 50 years. Groundwater must continue to be a Board interest.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government Interests), began his comments with the dictum, “first, do no harm.” He expressed frustration that it was difficult to find out what is being planned and by the time he hears about it, the decision has already been made. He asserted that while the Board should not get involved in minutiae, individuals must get involved at the “nuts and bolts” level. He agreed with TPA agency representatives that a decision must be made as to what is considered “safe enough”; there is no place on earth that is totally safe. He also wondered if radioactive decay might make some types of disposition more, rather than less, problematic in the future.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy(State of Oregon), emphasized the need for the Board to be proactive; that while reaction is a responsibility, it is necessary to think ahead. He took capping as an example. As large risk issues are dealt with, there is a need to determine future cleanup: how much residual waste is acceptable; how much land should be capped; criteria for acceptable capping. He committed himself to that issue as well as that of groundwater.

Jim Curdy, Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), described concepts to apply technology to Hanford remediation, such as immobilizing groundwater by freezing it. He also supports a supercollider project.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, said helping agencies identify milestones for technology development is a key element. He seconded Ken’s comments on capping; it is a large undertaking requiring large amounts of material

taken from somewhere else. He agreed the Board must develop an overarching cleanup policy, and afterward work out technical details that will support it. He emphasized the need to consider the implications of policy for the workforce, so they don't have to scramble and suffer from changes.

Penny Mabie read a prepared statement that Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), had sent, describing the steps and challenges in following the Board's new priorities. She committed herself to working on tank issues. Finally, she suggested the Board might present the report on progress next year instead of Todd doing so.

Shelly Cimon, Public-at-Large, agreed the Board should become involved in national nuclear waste policy. She felt the tensions between and within the agencies and the Board were healthy, and evidenced a passion for change. She credited Craig Cameron, EPA, and John Price, Ecology, for developing a ROD strategy for the 200 Area that may be helpful to the Board to use as framework for understanding needs in the Central Plateau. She wants to see more emphasis on technology development.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local & Regional Public Health), expressed his respect for everyone involved, including the Board and the agencies. He described the human compulsion to feel like things are "done"; this must be offset by considerations of quality, restoring the area to its natural state for descendants to enjoy. National issues were also important, he added, citing DOE research and development has lost funding in recent years.

Gary Peterson, TRIDEC (Local Business Interests), mentioned DOE funding for B-Reactor was in question. He was interested in brownfield development and noted that, with creativity, new economic uses for the 100 and 200 Areas might be developed. He will devote his energy to these areas.

Nancy Murray, Public-at-large, voiced her commitment to join the River and Plateau Committee.

Rick Jansons said his priority is developing documents outlining what the public feels is acceptable regarding capping, consolidation of sites, and canyon disposition. The Board must be proactive in influencing budgets and contracts. He called for more use of committees of the whole.

Dave Watrous, Public-at-Large, spoke about member involvement, saying each member has unique talents and does some things better than others. Members should commit to do what they do best, whatever that might be.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental and Public Interest Organizations), brought up the issue of Natural Resource Damage Assessments, and suggested a workshop with Trustees to identify where contamination will result in large damage assessments. This should not be postponed until the remediation process winds down. She also advocated a technical workshop on capping, and developing figures that could be given to the public regarding the waste that will be left on the Central Plateau.

Max Power, Ecology, referred to Linda Hoffman's comments the afternoon before as key: the need to develop a framework for evaluating and framing Central Plateau cleanup. This type of framework is built from values and principles. Specific items such as U-Plant closure can be seen in value-based terms, and such a framework would help participants to ask the right questions when confronted with tradeoffs.

Nick Ceto, EPA, commented that broadened participation will enhance the Board's credibility. Focused, proactive efforts will be effective; EPA appreciates early input so they can use it in advocating their position. The question of whether or not to remove contamination is difficult and at the root of 200 Area and groundwater issues. Participants must ask how much risk they are willing to bear, considering costs and risks involved in removal. He suggested the Board get involved in the national policy debate surrounding long-term storage and disposal sites such as Yucca Mountain and WIPP. If these change, Hanford cleanup will be altered significantly; national repositories are necessary to any Hanford scenario.

Howard Gnann, DOE-ORP, supported looking at the big picture, prioritizing, developing a vision for the 200 Area, and enhancing member participation. He also advocated for greater diversity on the Board.

Mike Weiss, DOE-RL, commented that by protecting the workers, the public is also protected. He reminded the Board that everyone involved—agency staff in particular—does not have total control over the situation, and that what is considered “right” is not always the same for everyone involved.

Todd Martin thanked the members and remarked that the greatest challenge is to shut out the noise long enough to focus on one thing. The Board leadership will take the comments from the sounding board and it will be reflected in the subsequent board schedule.

Briefing on Records of Decision from the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement

Maynard Plahuta summarized the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement Records of Decision (HSW-EIS RODs). He considered the RODs better than expected, but he still had significant reservations. The RODs’ strengths included limiting the volume of imported off-site waste in trench disposal and better coverage of transport concerns. As for weaknesses, the RODs ignore pre-1970 waste and TRU waste, despite the equivalence of these wastes to those included. The RODs did not address the impact of additional, offsite imported waste, nor did they address the handling of already contaminated groundwater. The only public comments listed were from EPA, the Tribes, and the Department of Ecology; Maynard questioned whether truly no other citizens commented. Maynard listed the responses made to particular comments on lining and monitoring trenches, and taking measures to improve worker safety. No mention was included of changing incentives to promote safety; however, penalties imposed recently are large, which may accomplish this outside the ROD. In response to questions about groundwater commitment, the ROD made no attempt to examine available technologies for remediation. Long-term stewardship was not well addressed, and was postponed for inclusion in a future plan. In response to comment on the adequacy of groundwater analysis, DOE simply defended their initial analysis based on its conservative assumptions, rather than including the items in question in a revised analysis. Therefore, Maynard felt the adequacy of analysis seems to still remain an open question. His overall assessment was that, despite much discussion, there was no actual risk analysis.

Gerry Pollett added that the EIS was so inadequate the State sued DOE regarding TRU. The legal definition of mitigation was not included; he felt this would influence the issue of committed groundwater. The RODs contained no indication that contaminated groundwater was limited to that directly under the tanks. Another issue—one basis of the State’s court challenge—is that the ROD is not limited to existing waste, but includes the right to follow the plan alternative to accept TRU waste, without addressing the additional impacts. Reports estimate remote-handled TRU (RH-TRU) storage has higher risks at Hanford than anywhere else. Gerry added the transportation analysis in the ROD had not been improved; DOE modeled a single drum failure, which Gerry did not consider as a sensible scenario when trucks would be hauling multiple drums. He said the Board should work with Ecology to define inaccuracies in the HSW-EIS, since DOE must go to Ecology for permitting.

Keith Smith pointed out the EIS was notable for what it ignored, such as solid waste in the Purex tunnels. He felt DOE’s approach to worker safety was inadequate. Some contractors do not understand the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS). DOE should show them how to do it right. Contract incentives can be problematic, he argued, and often result in cover-ups.

Susan Leckband asked the regulators whether they have same concerns, and whether they would use permitting processes to address them. Max Power replied he was not able to say much, as the matter is currently in litigation. However, there is information available on the Ecology website. Max stated Ecology will continue to work on permitting, which may or may not be litigated.

Nick Ceto disagreed with Gerry about the EIS being inadequate. He agreed it is not perfect, and had sent comments on the Final EIS, which were acknowledged in the ROD. Nick argued that the EIS did not prevent EPA from getting cleanup done under its CERCLA authority or affect the ability to make decisions for site cleanup.

Technical Assistance Panel

Rick Jansons discussed the status of the scope of work draft for the technical review panel the Board is hiring to comment on the HSW-EIS and other documents. The board sought consensus on the approach taken; Rick outlined two views that had been previously presented. First, that the Board would not interfere with the review panel after

the hiring process; the panel would consider the three documents in question and present their findings. The other point of view included the board giving specific direction regarding what issues be addressed in the findings.

Jeff Luke supported the first viewpoint. He noted that the Board must go to lengths to avoid influencing the panel, since employing them could already be considered a means of exerting influence. He had this in mind while drafting the statement of work. He mentioned that if the Board had questions or required clarification, they could express this formally as a response to the report. Jim Trombold was of a similar mind, stating the Board should agree on the questions but completely remove themselves from the process. Others also noted the importance of the panel's impartiality in the review.

Ken Niles spoke on the other viewpoint. He expressed concern that the scope of work was too limited to communicate in detail what needed to happen and to insure that the panel look at whether the models being employed were adequate. Meeting with the panel was, in his view, necessary to raise these issues, whether or not the panel chose to endorse or refute them.

Harold Heacock commented that the purpose of the technical review is to achieve a broad assessment, and that a detailed examination of the assumptions behind the models was not originally intended. Wanda Munn remarked the current scope of work is and should be specific enough to select experts for the panel, without dictating the form of the results.

Gerry Pollet felt that open meetings done through a transparent process might allow further interaction between the Board and the panel without biasing the result. He felt that the scope of work, in specifying the agency documents to review, did not require the panel to consider alternative, non-agency expertise, which he considered necessary for a balanced review. The scope of work might be revised, he suggested, encouraging the experts to respond to non-agency inputs. Al Boldt, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), suggested it might also help for the panel to explicitly state the degree of certainty involved and other implied assumptions, and to give some estimate of the range of anticipated impacts.

Leon Swenson asked whether an opportunity could be provided for the Board to pose some of the more technical questions to the experts, in such a way that it would not presuppose the answers. He also was interested in the timing of the work, as the Tank Closure EIS would not appear until later. Todd Martin explained that the timing issues would be resolved in the contract and timeframes were identified in the scope of work to give the panel a sense of bounds.

Tim Takaro mentioned how agency assumptions may be questionable, for example, their use of four wettest historical years in modeling hydrology does not take into account predictions that global warming will create conditions wetter than that. He did not think these concerns were provided for in the scope of work. Tim suggested it be made more specific and include an analysis of future predicted conditions. Rick Jansons replied that the current scope asks for assumptions of the models.

Jeff Luke pointed out in response that the experts will follow citations in the three stipulated reports, and in that way would include non-agency and general sources of knowledge. He considered the scope of work to be the mechanism to solve the issue. Sitting down with the panel was, for him, the wrong approach. The public must be assured of impartiality. Ken Niles replied that he did not believe all issues could be addressed in the scope of work. He wanted assurance, not hope, that the panel would address his concerns.

Susan Leckband suggested the State of Oregon formalize their questions so they can be incorporated into the statement of work. Ken wondered whether members would support having questions of that specificity included. Rick mentioned that Dirk Dunning, State of Oregon, did provide very specific questions, and that the Board could insert additional specific questions, but he felt that the philosophical question before the Board would not be resolved in this manner. Tim Takaro suggested that the draft report be reviewed and sent back with comment if it failed to address Board members' concerns. Al Boldt proposed the State of Oregon write a letter detailing its concerns, which could be included as one of the documents for the panel to consider.

Jeff Luke observed that it seemed to him the product being discussed was different from what was originally intended. He thought the report was planned to detail differences between the modeling analyses in these three documents alone, and to explain if, why and how different results were obtained. The Board now is discussing the

inclusion of an additional, external source for comparison as well – if they come up with different results, why and how. Now, we want a panel to make comparisons against another outside source. He wondered if this reflected the Board's historical interest. Dick Smith agreed, mentioning the process should be limited and its scope should not expand.

Nick Ceto compared the issue to a contract EPA had made with USGS regarding groundwater; similarly, it did not ask the scientists to consider and compare all the possible models, but to analyze those models which had been used, to point out where the sensitivities of the models lay. In this way the report can assure the Board the model being used is reasonable.

Harold Heacock concluded that two issues had been confused. The original request was to give a comparative evaluation of the analyses. The second issue deals with concerns regarding validity of the models used in those analyses. These should be brought to the attention of the panel if they are to be evaluated, he said, but are separate pieces of work. Ken Niles remarked that while comparing was the original intent, judging the validity of the models is fundamental for any of them being useful. He wanted the statement to include sensitivity analysis.

Nick Ceto suggested the Board include language to address preferential flow, and whether it should be modeled differently, without mentioning specific mechanisms. This, he felt, would not introduce bias.

Todd Martin stated that the Board should abandon the venture if they could not reach agreement. Jeff said he thought agreement was possible using the language Nick suggested. The subcommittee was charged with continuing to work on the scope until agreement could be reached on the issues discussed. Board members expressed confidence that the subcommittee could come to some resolution.

Presentation on the River Corridor Contract Request for Proposals

Mike Lysand, DOE-RL, answered questions regarding the River Corridor Contract Request for Proposals (RFP) and Board members were given a copy of the presentation on this contract from the River and Plateau committee meeting last month. Mike noted DOE's intention to meet the posted decision date of January 1; responses to the document must be received by October 7.

Nick Ceto expressed interest in an accelerated work schedule in the 200 Area and in relevant information submitted to bidders. He had noticed 618-10 and -11 were ambiguously included in the RFP, yet not guaranteed in the contract.

Gerry Pollet expressed apprehension that the remediation of fourteen high-risk buildings is being delayed for five years. He questioned what effect this might have on the anticipated project completion date of 2012.

Mike replied that the buildings delayed were facilities that Pacific Northwest National Laboratories and the Office of Science felt had to be maintained to fulfill their mission. The contract varies the incentives it provides over a range of timetables in order to promote early completion. Progress to date suggests the timelines will be met. Mike suggested the Board ask the Office of Science to attend a meeting and discuss their strategy. 618-10 and -11 are included in the contract and intended to be completed, but the cost for this is not specifically included. Because it involves a high degree of uncertainty, full inclusion of 618-10 and -11 in the contract might have prevented DOE from evaluating bids on a well-established basis. The contract is written, however, with some flexibility in timeframe and a corresponding sliding scale of incentives for an early finish. Mike clarified the DOE will remove the buildings.

Executive Issues Committee Update

Todd Martin explained several letters to the Board from Howard Gnann regarding representation on the Board, both the removal of seats with no attendance and the rotation of individual representatives. The Executive Committee met and wrote a response, in cooperation with DOE-ORP. In instances when organizations are absent from meetings, the Board will write a letter to the organization involved, and forward it to DOE-ORP for mailing per federal rules. After each Board meeting, EnviroIssues will analyze who has missed two meetings, and a warning letter will be sent to the seat holder. After the third absence, the seat will be reevaluated to see if another

organization can represent the same constituency. Consistent with the Board charter, there will be a biennial review of all the seats to ensure the HAB remains reflective of the stakeholder community.

Rick Jansons noted that some aspects of term limits would harm the board, and that members need time in order to become familiar with the issues. Jerry Peltier observed that while many members rotate through the Board, there is a “core” of continuing representatives who provide knowledge and training to new members. It would be a mistake, he said, to lose this “core.” Larry Clucas mentioned the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board as a negative example, reiterating that new members face a steep learning curve.

Madeleine Brown voiced her agreement with the tone and content of the Board response letters. She asked whether the criteria for an “excused absence” was contained in the charter, and noted the term “business” was not well specified.

Keith Smith pointed out unions certainly would not allow other entities to decide who their representative will be, and he pointed out that the TPA agency representatives do not have term limits on their positions. Todd remarked that when DOE-ORP initially looked at member terms, there had not been much turnover. However, within the last eighteen months, there has been significant turnover and this may not be as much a concern.

Howard Gnann remarked that it was nice to see previously vacant seats filled, but that he disagreed with sentiments expressed about member rotation; he felt the charter requires this. He said the charter should be appraised to make it more reflective of how the board operates. Al Boldt asked what process is required to amend the charter; Todd replied that this is done in open Board meeting and has been carried out twice in the past.

Agency Updates

Nick Ceto summarized recent developments: the K-basins milestones were approved; the schedules for M-96 and M-84 were being held up by the contractor, so some milestones were moved back. The schedule for 2015 soil remediation will get signed. The ROD strategy is still in progress and USGS is on board for groundwater remediation; some of this has been held up by water in the vadose zone. They are considering technologies to desiccate these soil zones. Some of these possibilities were created as a result of participants having questioned capping as a solution.

Agency End State Workshops

Susan Leckband reported on the two previous workshops, concluding they were very successful. These workshops produced fruitful conversations between the TPA agencies and the public, which will continue. DOE promised to change the language used in its documents. Further information on the workshops is available on the DOE website. The 300 Area workshop will be delayed until the City of Richland’s assessment is completed in March.

Harold Heacock noted that the first workshop was largely attended by agencies and contractors. The second workshop had a lot more unaffiliated, broader public. Susan noted that DOE-RL made an incredible effort to welcome the public. The Board was being listened to, and was assured every effort would be made to garner public interest. Nolan Curtis, Ecology, reminded Board members who know of other constituencies to encourage them to attend.

Tim Takaro asked whether the “public” present were actually HAB members and contractors, or citizens there for their own interest; Susan replied the latter. Leon Swenson noted that contractors were also real citizens, and were encouraged to come and speak to the issues as individuals.

The River and Plateau committee developed a letter to describe what Board members understood from the workshop. The Board approved the letter with revisions as suggested.

Board Business

Committee Reports

Results of the committee leadership selection process:

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Chair</u>	<u>Vice-Chair</u>
Public Involvement & Communications (PIC)	Amber Waldref	Susan Hughes
Budget & Contracts (BCC)	Gerry Pollet	Harold Heacock
River & Plateau (RAP)	Pam Larsen	Maynard Plahuta
Health, Safety & Environmental Protection (HSEP)	Keith Smith	Tim Takaro
Tank Waste (TWC)	TBD	Leon Swenson

Leon Swenson discussed the Tank Waste Committee. With Doug Huston's departure, the committee needed new leadership, yet current committee members are constrained from serving both by their leadership in other committees and by personal commitments. Leon suggested joint leadership between a technical chair and an administrative chair. Todd Martin promised the Executive Committee would consider the issue of committee restructuring in light of the relative lack of manpower.

Leon pointed out that committees should also reassess their work scope in light of the results of the priorities workshop at this meeting. He also recognized that within the committee, the assignment of issue managers may not optimally reflect their abilities and interests and the committee will have to reconsider assignments, especially with the addition of new Board members. TWC was scheduled to convene the following Wednesday for a tour of the WTP and cold test facility. He invited any interested members of the Board to attend.

Maynard Plahuta announced the River & Plateau Committee would not meet in September; during its October meeting it would consider the U-Plant closure, Executive Committee information from yesterday's workshops, and the yearly work plan.

Betty Tabbutt, speaking for the Public Involvement Committee, proposed using a diversity outreach contact matrix for the TPA agencies. The Committee is preparing a fact sheet on tank waste, intended to promote public comment and involvement for the Tank Closure EIS, now due for release in the Spring. The Committee will present the fact sheet for the Board's review and approval during its November meeting. Susan Leckband will review and update the Board website. It was suggested that several external links be added, such as that of the EPA. Writing a "primer" on the HAB was also discussed, but considered a lower priority.

Keith Smith welcomed Mike Keizer to the Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee, and noted the Committee held a joint meeting with the Budget and Contracts Committee, and would likely do so again in October.

Gerry Pollet, Budget and Contracts Committee chair, announced a joint meeting with HSEP on the stop-work issue. BCC will also address the River Corridor contact. Gerry mentioned the Government Accountability Office presented a very helpful analysis of the tank waste program and of cost-savings from accelerated cleanup plans to the committees in August. DOE must allow these agencies to present to the Board, and he wanted it to be noted in the record that he asks DOE to allow the Army Corps of Engineers to present the results of their review to the Board as well. Gerry also stressed the importance of examining the overall result of target budget cuts.

Planning for Site-specific Advisory Board chairs meeting

Todd Martin discussed a DOE-scheduled meeting on Risk-Based End States that would be held in Chicago in early October, and which senior EPA and tribal officials would attend. The meeting will be held the same time the chairs of the Site-specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) will visit Hanford, October 6-8. Todd expressed resentment that agency staff were aware of the conflict when they planned their meeting and stated a personal opinion that the Board should not send a representative to Chicago. DOE also requested community and local representation late in the process, which he felt was a sign of disrespect. Max Power mentioned that EPA regulators would be in Chicago and could report back to the Board.

Todd noted that representatives from multiple perspectives were needed for the panel, being held the Tuesday of the SSAB Chairs meeting. There was a discussion about a Lego display model, constructed from disposition maps, which had been a useful visual display. Tim Takaro mentioned the Lego display was stored near his office, and it might still be useful. Todd and Max noted that DOE no longer provides disposition maps as part of its planning;

DOE has given a disconnected response to inquiries on the issue, and unfortunately due to the scheduling conflict will not have a presence to answer these inquiries at the SSAB chairs meeting.

The HAB will also host an evening function for the chairs for which ideas and help were requested.

November Board meeting Topics

HSEP and BCC will continue to work on the stop-work advice for November. Other November agenda topics will come out after the Executive Committee has a chance to discuss the outcomes of the priorities workshop and sounding board.

Public Comment

Max Power thanked the Board, and encouraged members to “step back” from the details, to consider process and vision. The Board, he felt, is strong evidence that lay and technical people coming together create better public policy. The diversity and collegiality of this collaboration is a beacon to the world; more dramatic international issues could use similar collaboration. He also spoke to the significance of “visioning” for the Hanford effort, particularly from a political viewpoint – several large and influential states will finish their own cleanup agendas in the near future, reducing the visibility of the issue nationally. Participants at Hanford must have a long-term view to mobilize continuing attention and resources to carry the project through to completion.

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Madeleine Brown, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Member	Gary Petersen, Alternate
Larry Clucas, Member	Gerry Pollet, Member	Dave Rowland, Alternate
Jim Curdy, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Jeanie Sedgely, Alternate
Rob Davis, Member	Leon Swenson, Member	Richard Smith, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Margery Swint, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Tim Takaro, Member	Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Charles Weems, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member	Martin Yanez, Member	Amber Waldref, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Kristy Baptiste-Eke, Alternate	Dave Watrous, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Allyn Boldt, Alternate	
Susan Leckband, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	
Jeff Luke, Member	Rick Jansons, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-officio
Todd Martin, Member	Dave Molnaa, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-officio
Ken Niles, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate	
Jerry Peltier, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Nick Ceto, EPA	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Keith Klein, DOE-RL	Dan Opalski, EPA	Michael Jensen, EnviroIssues
Kevin Leary, DOE-RL		Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
Mike Lysand, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Mike Weis, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	
Howard Gnann, DOE-ORP	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Nuvotec - ORP
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec - ORP
Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP	Linda Hoffman, Ecology	
	Max Power, Ecology	
	John Price, Ecology	
	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest	
-------------------------------	--	--

Appendix 1 – Workshop Results

100 Area Success Pictures

By September 2005 we will have:

- Evaluated our expert panel report and how it affects risk assessments
- Re-evaluated the baseline in order to affirm or change the records of decision (RODs) through public involvement
- Advised what the public process should look like for B Reactor
- Pulled together our end state values
- Gathered land transfer information
- Provided our input and helped decide the final disposition of all nine reactors
- A better decision process and another evaluation of alternatives in N Springs
- A better grasp of what capping means in the 100 Area
- A clearer definition of where the river begins
- Pushed DOE to talk about what happens if N Reactor fuel doesn't go to Yucca Mountain
- Worked with the Natural Resources Trustee Council
- Confidence in our understanding of the interim RODs and what has and hasn't been accomplished (gaps)
- Consulted early with the agencies on what is being considered for final RODs
- Helped the agencies negotiate milestones that address risk reduction and technology development to respond to source term remediation
- Reviewed and consulted with the agencies on forthcoming data
- Understood the implications of the National Monument Plan
- Provided advice on 100 Area cleanup decisions (i.e. Reactor final disposition and river pipelines)
- Educated ourselves and the public
- Encouraged integration of 100 and 200 Area groundwater issues

100 Area – What's it gonna take?

To achieve our success pictures, we need to have conversations about or we need:

- A workshop on our expert panel report
- To give advice on our values on end states
- To ask the agencies and tribes for information on land transfers – our product is a land transfer principle
- To make a committee decision on whether RODs should be re-issued
- To identify pressing interim RODs
- To understand the proposed final RODs
- To do committee reviews on the River Corridor contract
- To review alternatives to pump and treat in N Springs
- To track K Basin sludge removal and basin cleanup
- A capping workshop
- To identify major issues/successes
- To identify significant risks
- To learn about the national monument plan
- To discuss natural resources risk assessment
- To discuss 618-10/11 cleanup and when it happens
- To discuss if reindustrialization is acceptable
- To have a tutorial on uranium and tritium
- To have a public dialog

300 Area Success Pictures

By September 2005 we will have:

- Identified the problems and proactively identified the issues
- Compared the issues identified with advice given in the past
- Reviewed the City of Richland Marketability Analysis
- Continued end states discussions
- Visited 300 Area sites
- Received information on the current ROD and possibly issued advice about revisiting the ROD
- Helped define land use
- Helped with the 300 Area end states workshop and development of the vision
- Have developed a position on 300 Area cleanup objectives and purpose (i.e. reindustrialization, residential, etc.)
- Discussed risks of different cleanup options
- Educated the public and ourselves

300 Area - What's it gonna take?

To achieve our success pictures, we need to have conversations about or we need:

- To issue advice on the focused feasibility study
- To refine what comes out of the 300 Area end states workshop
- To work with the Natural Resources Trustee Council

Groundwater Success Pictures

By September 2005 we will have:

- Provided a statement of work for the expert panel stating what the board needs from them
- Received a useful report from the expert panel which helps us say whether the models' assumptions were appropriate
- An understanding of the cumulative impacts of recommendations and decisions based on the groundwater modeling analyses used in Tank Closure-EIS, Hanford Solid Waste-EIS, and the Composite Analysis
- An understanding of the definition of highest beneficial use and will have clarified our position regarding it
- Knowledge of what's happening to groundwater as a function of time
- Tracked groundwater with every decision
- Asked DOE what cleanup avenues will be used where full cleanup is not feasible
- Offered advice for funding of technology development
- Reviewed the goals and legal requirements around groundwater under the tanks
- Educated the public about our expert panel's results and helped the public understand the disconnects in site-wide groundwater integration (possibly another round of public workshops on integration)
- Encouraged technology development for deep contamination remediation
- Worked with the Natural Resources Trustee Council to stay on top of irretrievable and irreversibly committed groundwater issues as they relate to Natural Resources Damage Assessment
- Convinced agencies to direct more resources to remediate contaminated groundwater
- Helped the agencies prioritize resources to high risk waste sites

Groundwater – What's it gonna take?

To achieve our success pictures, we need to have conversations about or we need:

- A presentation from our groundwater experts on their review which we will use for upcoming advice

- To discuss how to share the expert panel results with the public and use the results to facilitate public dialog
- To ask agencies to do public outreach on groundwater
- A committee of the whole that will comment on the Tanks EIS
- To discuss the implications of the Black Rock Reservoir
- To understand the mixing zone
- To discuss technology development for remediation
- To discuss funding for source term technology development

Central Plateau Success Picture

By September 2005 we will have:

- Figured out the process and the right questions to ask regarding disposition of canyons
- Determined the public process for canyon disposition
- Provided input on a public process for reviewing canyon alternatives and their cumulative risk assessments, including making space for diverse voices outside of the consensus process
- Driven creation of a cumulative risk assessment for various canyon alternatives
- Determined how to help the agencies respond to the public and ensure that access to the process exists
- Produced a position paper on what the 200 Area would look like with strategies to accomplish it
- Issued advice on funding and schedule of retrieval of pre-1970s transuranic waste (TRU) and cleanup of burial grounds
- Determined the interim validity of the area closure approach (ex: U Plant)
- Inventoried what's already been said and develop any needed new values and principles to guide cleanup decisions
- Identified key tradeoffs (including risk, allocation of resources, etc.)
- Produced a Tank Waste EIS fact sheet for the public
- Had a Board end states discussion
- Pushed the agencies to integrate our stated value of having an integrated risk analysis, and then respond to the agencies' proposed priorities
- Gathered public priorities and driven development of a comprehensive strategy
- Helped make sure RCRA and CERCLA don't interfere with each other
- An understanding of what's proposed to be left behind after Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D)
- An understanding of what the risks are from waste importation and exportation
- A national dialog on environmental justice, especially related to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico and Yucca Mountain
- An understanding of proposals re: what's going to be cleaned up and what's going to be left behind

Central Plateau - What's it gonna take?

To achieve our success pictures, we need to have conversations about or we need:

- A document on lessons learned on the decision process and remedies selected
- A document guiding the tradeoff decisions in the Central Plateau
- To request information from the Tri Party Agreement (TPA) agencies regarding cumulative risk
- The Public Involvement and Communications (PIC) and River and Plateau (RAP) committees or a committee-of-the whole to deal with public process issues
- To understand what the conversations are that DOE is having regarding the tank closure EIS
- An ad hoc committee to develop the 200 Area position paper, based on the information from the expert review reports and 200 Area end states workshop
- A workshop that takes previous board advice, information, and reports, and use it to create a vision for the Central Plateau (Staying at the policy level, decide on timeline and deadlines, e.g. 50 years, 100 years, etc.)
- A workshop that creates a priority list for funding (with limited funds, where do we want to spend the money?)

- 200 Area Master Plan
- Agency roadmap to RODs
- Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI)
- Tank Waste EIS
- Interconnectedness of decisions
- Cumulative impact of decisions
- End state risk analysis
- Tanks final disposition after the Tank Closure EIS
- B/C cribs
- In / out boundary decisions
- Points of compliance decisions
- Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) and Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF)
- Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF)
- Tank farm worker exposure
- Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Decontamination & Decommissioning (D&D)
- Post I-297 response
- Washington Public Power Supply System end states – advice on old reactors
- Capping workshop
- Politics of dwindling support as sites close
- Remediation versus institutional controls
- Increasing or decreasing the footprint

Process / Operations Suggestions

In order to achieve our success pictures, we need to:

- Rethink committee structure
- Use committees of the whole
- Focus each board meeting on one of the board's priorities
- Have a committee-of-the-whole prepare for sessions for the full board and then the board refines (Future Site Uses Working Group model)
- Provide issue manager training (Issue managers look at guidelines already developed)
- Have issue managers work on things they have a passion about
- Consider the board schedule
- Package information and discussions and committee learning in such a way that new members can get up to speed, know what to read and pay attention to, and participate in board discussions