

## **FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

### **HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING March 12, 2008 Richland, WA**

#### **Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions .....	1
Information Management.....	1
Deep Vadose Zone Treatability Test Plan .....	4
DOE-RL Update on Central Plateau Activities .....	6
B Reactor Update.....	7
Site Wide Technology Letter & ZP1 Operable Unit .....	8
Supplement Analysis (SA) to Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement (HCP-EIS).....	9
PW 1/3/6 Operable Unit Feasibility Study .....	10
Committee Discussion on Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC) Advice on Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 Budget Request Draft Advice.....	13
Action Items / Commitments .....	15
Handouts .....	15
Attendees.....	16

*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.*

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

Maynard Plahuta, River and Plateau Committee Chair, welcomed everyone and introductions were made. The committee approved the February meeting summary.

Jamie Zeisloft, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), announced that the Columbia River Component workshop has been rescheduled. The workshop was supposed to be help on March 18 & 19, but has been deferred. Jamie said he would keep the committee updated on the new workshop date.

#### **Information Management**

Jerri Main discussed issue manager work done on records management and legacy management. Jerri said the issue managers spent some time reviewing past advice and found many documents pertaining to information management that may either need to be updated or reiterated by the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board). Jerri said the issue managers have also been researching the cost of Institutional Controls (IC) for the Central Plateau and found that no standard exists for calculating the cost and duration of ICs. Jerri felt this should be addressed so that comparisons can be made in making

cleanup decisions. Jerri said the incremental cost of managing ICs is not as high as some might have suggested and should not be used to prevent someone from digging up material.

Jerri summarized what the administrative record is and how it is applied in cleanup decisions through the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). She described it as the body of evidence that helps make the decisions for cleanup. Jerri said the agencies collect records for other administrative purposes besides evidence for cleanup as well and the issues managers would like to work with the TPA agencies to make sure records are not destroyed when they are not needed for the administrative records because the documents could be useful for other purposes. Jerri also discussed the moratorium on records disposal.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said agencies at Hanford tend to over compensate when putting documents in the administrative record. The lead agency person is supposed to sort through the record and remove supporting documents that do not pertain to the decision. Someone looking through the record should be able to follow the logic of how decisions were made based on the documents included in the record. Dennis qualified this by saying the process does not always go as smoothly as it is suppose to. Dennis provided an example of where a particular record that should have been in the administrative record was not included and had to be tracked down. Dennis suggested that the issue manager group focus on how documents are memorialized and the current requirements for close out reports.
- Ginger Wireman, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said including a cover letter as a part of the administrative record that has a list of key search words would make the documents searchable in the files. Ginger said Ecology's current database lists documents by title number which makes it hard to locate specific files.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Keith Smith said the agencies need to ensure they are keeping up with technology. Keith provided an example where a database became outdated and the agencies had to find the person who created the database to provide them access so the agencies could recover the information. Jerri said DOE-RL is storing all of their records in an image database so it does not need to be translated or coded which should help with archiving. Bob Suyama said DOE also has a process for migrating data when they close out a computer and all the applications that run on the computer migrate to a central location so they will not be lost.
- Susan Leckband said that when she served as issue manager for this topic she attended a national meeting on long term stewardship. Susan said Oak Ridge has a good example for how to teach long term stewardship. Susan said there is a lot of information on this topic at the national level and the Board should ask for help from individuals like Karen Lutz, DOE – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), who was

at Rocky Flats when it closed. Susan emphasized that records management requires adequate budget to ensure the records are preserved.

- *How do the agencies prevent duplicate records?* Bob said the documents are scanned in at Hanford, but the original records are stored in Seattle. Susan elaborated that the plan calls for the scanned documents to be stored separately from the hard copies.
- Maynard felt the best time to make sure the records are complete is when a project is being closed out. There should be guidelines that require the project team to make sure the records are in order before the project can close. Susan said most projects start out with funding for records management, but it is the first thing to get cut during budget shortfalls. Jerri said DOE-RL has a budget category for long term planning and theoretically when they close out projects they have money identified for that task.
- Jamie said there is a rule included in the mission contracts to develop a site-wide long term stewardship program; a key component would be records management. Keith said it is great that was included in the contracts, but the issue managers should follow up to make sure it is done satisfactorily.
- Maynard said during last months committee meeting Dave Miller, Fluor Hanford (FH), said there is a thirty year cap on costs, but there have been many different statements made on the timeframe. Dennis explained that different timeframes are used for different locations at Hanford. The EPA has said ICs are needed until the hazard has attenuated which means ICs will be needed in the Central Plateau in perpetuity and it is difficult to estimate the cost for this scenario. Dennis said there is a need to develop standard assumptions for certain compounds because of the length of time they will remain in the environment.
- *Does EPA have a Geographic Information System (GIS) for identifying ICs?* Dennis said a graduate student from the University of Washington created a mapping program that geographically mapped decisions so at the end of the cleanup you would be able to see what was done in each location and link to the decision documents. Dennis said this tool is still available on the Internet. Pam Larsen said she remembered seeing a database that allowed you to click on a piece of property and it would tell you what requirements there would be for that particular property. Dennis said he was not aware of the program Pam described but would contact Mike Bellot of EPA who may have information on a geographical program on ICs.
- Susan said one of the biggest holes in records is deed restrictions. Pam said the local cities and counties do not think it is their responsibility to manage the records for deed restrictions. Susan said DOE or a federal entity will be responsible for any contamination left in place.
- Dennis asked if the issue managers are considering advice on records management. Jerri said they are thinking about products and are considering if the advice issued in the past needs to be restated. She said at some point they may need a workshop to address some of the issues.
- Sandra Lilligren said Waste Management in Phoenix recently had a meeting on records management. Sandra thought the meeting was very useful because it brought

people from around the world to talk about how they are using creative techniques for records management; she offered to share the proceedings from that meeting.

- Wade Riggsbee suggested the issue managers make a decision to focus on a certain level of records management. Wade thought the group should look specifically at Hanford and how the agencies are handling records and what plans exist for ensuring the preservation of important documents.

### **Deep Vadose Zone Treatability Test Plan**

John Morse, DOE-RL, said the Deep Vadose Zone Treatability Test Plan Draft A begins thinking about new technological methods for treating technetium and uranium in the deep vadose zone. The plan will not serve as the final decision for treatment in the vadose zone across the site. John said some standard technologies exist to address contaminants in the deep vadose zone, but DOE-RL is considering new technologies should be used in concert with the standard ones. The plan attempts to come up with alternatives to address other key components; John emphasized that by doing this, DOE is not ignoring the other contaminants of concern. The tests done in the BC cribs will help to determine if air desiccation can be used to effectively mitigate some of the contaminants in the soil. John reiterated that DOE is not implementing a final remedy but is testing remedies. The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RIFS) process is moving forward and DOE is working in tandem with that process to address some of the persistent deep vadose zone contamination. John said DOE-RL is currently working to incorporate comments from EPA and Ecology. DOE intends to meet with regulators on Thursday to provide more information on what will be included in Rev.0 before it is sent out to the public at the end of the month.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Dennis said EPA thinks the vadose zone should be a separate program having its own long term funding due to the time it will take to remedy the problem. Dennis said he reviewed Dick Smith's comments regarding the use of stripping technologies to get the contaminants out of the ground and into the groundwater so they could be pumped out. Dennis said EPA has been resistant to that approach because they would like to keep the contaminants out of the groundwater. Dennis said the agencies feel like they cannot move forward to explore a stripping technology without sufficient public support.
- Dib Goswami, Ecology, said the first draft of the deep vadose zone plan looked at several technologies but excluded solutions for technetium and uranium. The regulators are planning to have more discussions with DOE upon release of the next draft. Dib said Ecology is looking for comments and encouraged committee members to let Ecology know if there are other remedies that need to be considered in the plan. Dib said another topic that came up at the workshop was cold testing. Dib felt the BC crib tests are a good approach to cold testing since new technologies may be tested at

the site.

### *Committee Discussion*

- Dick felt most of the remedies included in the vadose zone plan were infinite in duration. Dick said the stripping technologies are the only true “treatment methods” because all the others hold the contamination in the soil instead of removing it. Dick said he is concerned because no one really knows how the fixative technologies will work and what will happen when something is injected into the ground. Dick said there is a risk that the cure could be worse than the problem.
- *Is the difference in geology around the site being considered in these technologies?* John said they are considering the geology and are using the BC cribs because of the wealth of information DOE has on it John acknowledged the solution in BC cribs may not work in other areas.
- *Will the testing confirm volumes of contamination?* John said work is being done separately to confirm volumes as a part of the characterization effort.
- *How many hours of operation will be required to show effectiveness for a technology?* John said that will depend on the technology. DOE will run the desiccation technology for six months and then do confirmatory sampling over a number of years. John thought they would be able to obtain good information within the first six months. The reactive gas technology to address the uranium contamination could see results faster. John said the TPA milestones for these tests go out to 2011.
- *Will the Tank Closure & Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) address this plan?* John said the TC&WM EIS will address the risk of the inventory.
- *How does this work differ from the vadose zone work that DOE-ORP is doing?* John said DOE-RL developed this plan jointly with DOE-ORP and their contractor. DOE-ORP is doing surface barrier tests using a liner. John said the work is separate but related. John said the River Corridor work on uranium also relates to this work.
- Wade said the case studies on deep vadose treatability demonstrated the deeper you excavate the higher the cost. Wade contributed the higher cost due to complications and unknown elements as one goes deeper in the vadose zone. Wade was concerned that not enough time has been spent defining the impacts and looking at the tradeoffs and benefits of using some of these technologies onsite.
- *What is the focus of the study EPA is currently conducting?* Dib said EPA is looking at the overall RIFS as part of M45 milestone. The RIFS looks at characterization in terms of the contamination and a path forward. John added the study looks at reducing infiltration. It incorporates the data collected by RL to look at conceptual models and will develop a path for collecting additional data for tank farms.
- *How does the RIFS work relate to the technology roadmap?* John said the RIFS dovetails with the work the technology roadmap has done but it is not directly related.

John said DOE-RL examined a number of investigations to the vadose zone that were looked at by Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL).

- Shelley Cimon recommended a chart that lays out all of these efforts for the committee to review. John said DOE has some schedules that show the relationship between tank farms, RIFS, and deep vadose zone work. He said they are still working out details in these schedules but could share these with the committee at some point.

### **DOE-RL Update on Central Plateau Activities**

John Price, Ecology, provided an update on the BC Controlled Area Waste Site Analysis. He said the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis is currently open for public comment. The interim action is a tool agencies use to initiate action on a site faster than doing a record of decision (ROD). The process usually takes a year between public comment and the start of work. John said the interim actions need to be consistent with the long term solutions for the site. Ecology expects to do more interim actions as the cleanup continues.

John provided a brief history of the BC Controlled Area. He said the area is Hanford's largest waste site and includes seven square miles of contamination with about 750 hotspots. The waste site was created by the BC cribs and trenches when animals and the wind spread the contamination from the disposal areas. Cesium and strontium are the main contaminants of concern in this area. To clean up the 140 acres, DOE will strip one foot of soil off the surface and transfer it to the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF). In the cases where contamination is deeper than a foot, DOE will use handheld meters to detect the burrows and will dig deeper. John said, DOE will use radiation meters and will also dig them up to locate the hotspots in the contaminated area. The cleanup level will be two times the level for human health protection. Natural attenuation will cleanup any remaining contamination over the next thirty years. This project is scheduled to take three years to complete; however, the project was not allocated any funding in the fiscal year (FY) 2009 budget.

### **Committee Discussion**

- *Is there a revegetation plan for the site?* John said Ecology has already planned to use a native seed mix. Shelley said she would like seed collected at the site to be used for revegetation. Janice Williams, FH, offered to bring the native plant staff person to the next committee meeting to talk about the revegetation plan. John said the revegetation will be done in phases as different parts of the site are dug up. Maynard suggested the Washington State University (WSU) seed program could be involved in the revegetation planning. John said Ecology has talked with WSU who indicated they might not have the seed available.
- Wade said the BC Controlled Area was reseeded years ago and no one has looked at the process of revegetation and learned from the previous lessons. The opportunity is there to evaluate if there was stress to the plant community and radiological impact to

the environment. John reiterated that the public comment period is currently open and the project will be improved based on comments like these.

- *Is there a cost for disposing the contaminated soil at ERDF?* John said Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) was recently using clean soil as fill in ERDF because they were taking so much debris from the 300 Area and did not have enough soil for compaction. This project will generate contaminated soil to use in ERDF. DOE has agreed to bring down the rate at which contractors get charged for disposal at ERDF. John said WCH may still need soil in 2009 so EPA and Ecology are pushing DOE to continue with projects that generate soil.
- *The volume of soil being removed is considerable; where will you get the backfill?* John said because they are only taking twelve inches off the surface they do not plan to backfill and will revegetate on top of that.
- *How will you protect for recontamination from the wind blowing during excavation?* John said they will monitor the site for any problems with contaminated soil blowing around. Dennis said they will also use a fire hose to minimize the wind blowing contamination around. Dick commented that the water used to control the wind could soak the contamination into the ground further. Dick suggested addressing the hotspots through excavation and flushing the rest down.
- Pam Larsen commented that this sounds like a good area to look at under the National Resources Damage Assessment (NRDA). Wade agreed that it is an opportunity to combine emerging opportunities. There is not a lot of funding but there is opportunity to integrate efforts.
- Susan asked if anyone has mentioned the implications of the FY09 budget for this project to the BCC committee. Maynard suggested bringing this item up during the afternoon discussion on the FY09 budget.
- *Will the BC cribs recontaminate the site?* John said this work will run in tandem with the excavation of BC cribs and will share support facilities to maximize efficiencies.

## **B Reactor Update**

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL, reviewed a DOE news release that announced a new policy that supports preservation of the B Reactor while studies to evaluate the options for public access are complete. Kim explained how the historic significance of B Reactor contributed to DOE's decision to preserve it. Dennis said the U.S. Department of Interior National Parks Service study on the B Reactor is almost complete and the agencies have talked about holding a public meeting around the June Board meeting to discuss the study.

Pam said that B Reactor will be shifted away from River Corridor contract because it is now a deactivation and decommissioning (D&D) contract. This change may happen as early as June. Pam said DOE headquarters prefers the Park Service to have a bigger role with B Reactor. Harold commented that the Parks Service budget issues are worse than

DOE's. The Park Service is closing other facilities because they cannot afford to maintain them. Harold said it will be a struggle to have the Reactor maintained. Wade said under federal law the Park Service cannot accept any facility that is contaminated. Wade said he has concerns about the aging reactors because of their design and the way they were encased. The encasement expands and contracts and over time joints will fail and could lead to exposure. The EIS decided to remove the reactors and bury the core due to the health risk from the threat of exposure.

Dennis said he visited the B Reactor last week with the National Remedy Review Board. Dennis commented that he was impressed by the displays provided by the Atomic Heritage Foundation. Dennis said there will be 48 public tours this year, so it will be easier for the public to get out on-site and learn about the history.

Sandra said the tribes sent a letter to the Parks Service about the study that outlines six points of concern that resulted in a tribal resolution. Sandra said Nez Perce sent a letter to DOE in opposition to the establishment of B Reactor as a museum and would like the money go to cleanup instead. Sandra summarized the six points of concern in the Nez Perce letter: 1) sacred place designation, 2) American Indian policy, tribal treaty rights and federal trust responsibility to tribes, 3) if it does become a museum DOE needs to make sure it is safe, 4) taxes, 5) long term stewardship, 6) concerns about B Reactor setting a precedent for other lands around the site.

### **Site Wide Technology Letter & ZP1 Operable Unit**

Shelley provided some background on the draft Site Wide Technology Letter. The HAB worked on a letter to Jim Rispoli, DOE – Environmental Management (DOE-EM) in 2003 asking for the reinstatement of the Site Wide Technology Group. Then in 2006, Shelley wrote a letter for the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) to reiterate what the HAB had said. Shelly said HAB's letter to Jim Rispoli never went out and she has rewritten it if the committee would like to use it. Maynard asked if the committee agree to send the letter to the Board in April. Committee members supported moving forward with the letter with a few suggesting minor editorial comments.

Pam next explained that she helped draft a letter in support of the ZP1 Operable Unit pump and treat work. Dennis provided a presentation during the last committee meeting on the carbon tetrachloride pump and treat plan for ZP1. The pump and treat is an aggressive approach to get rid of the carbon tetrachloride plume and other contaminants. Pam said committee members thought it would be good to voice their support for the plan. Dennis said the National Remedy Review Board recently submitted their comments and the agencies will need to go back and address those. Dennis said the plan will likely go out for public comment during the June Board meeting. Dennis thought the only policy issue that the Board may want to weigh in on is the timeframe it will take to cleanup the plume. The IC period will last for 100-150 years to meet the cleanup standards.



### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Dennis thought the previous HAB advice was a good starting point for the Site Wide Technology Group. Dennis thought the letter should also target the deep vadose zone issues because it will need more attention. Dennis said in general the more specific the committee is, the more receptive DOE will be.
- Dib agreed that by instituting the Site Wide Technology Group, Hanford could get a head start on addressing some persistent problems. Dib suggested emphasizing the past positive actions. Dib also said if there was a cohesive program the issues would progress farther and faster.

### **Committee Discussion**

- *What comments did the National Remedy Review Board have on the plan?* Dennis said their biggest comment was regarding why the plume would pump at 1600 gallons per minute (gpm) when 800 gallons per minute would capture the plume. Also, the Review Board said that more justification was needed for how the 100 part per billion (ppb) plume would attenuate. Dennis said DOE focused on the 200 Area being industrial use, but the requirements under law is to return the area to its highest and beneficial use, so EPA is asking for the focus on the industrial standards to be downplayed.
- *Is the draft B and the feasibility study the same thing?* Dennis explained draft A is sent to regulatory agencies for review, if the regulatory agencies submit enough comments it will go back to DOE and be revised as a draft B before Rev. 0 is released for public comment.
- Cathy McCague asked if the committee would like to go forward with the letter now and consider advice later. The committee agreed to move forward on the letter for Board meeting.

## **Supplement Analysis (SA) to Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement (HCP-EIS)**

Bryan Foley, DOE-RL, announced that the SA will be released for public review on March 24, 2008. Bryan explained that the HCP-EIS evaluated impacts of alternatives for a comprehensive site-wide planning period. The SA evaluated four basic elements (land use maps, designation, policy and procedures) to see if significant changes had occurred since the HCP-EIS was issued. Bryan said Hanford has a lot of regulatory procedures, and some were used instead of the HCP-EIS procedures to make decisions. DOE is using the findings of the SA to determine whether the existing ROD is acceptable. Bryan said he was considering planning a workshop for the SA on April 8 and 9 and asked if this would be interesting to committee members.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Dennis said the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) decision selected unrestricted cleanup along the Columbia River which is consistent with the HCP-EIS. Dennis said the agencies and the committee need to know whether the results of the SA demonstrated that decisions have been consistent. Bryan said none of the documents his team reviewed warranted a land use change in the HCP-EIS.

### **Committee Discussion**

- *Does the SA evaluate documents that are in process and not yet released?* Bryan said they included the U.S. Fish and Wildlife report that is in progress because it was a relevant document, but DOE could not make any conclusions about it until a decision is made in the final document.
- *What are the guidelines for conducting the five year review?* Bryan said the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations do not include a SA concept. The Council of Environmental Policy recommends the SA as a rule of thumb if there are decision documents in place and it has been five years since the EIS has been conducted.
- *Are the plans for the Hanford Reach still consistent?* Bryan said DOE reviewed the draft EIS and based on that they did not see any inconsistencies. Bryan clarified that because the EIS is not final, DOE could not carry it through and say definitively there are not any inconsistencies.
- *Is there a formal public comment period?* Bryan said the process does not require a formal public comment period for the SA, but because of the impact of the evaluation DOE is putting it out for an informal thirty day public review.
- *Does the City of Richland have an interest in the SA's findings for decisions in the 300 Area?* Pam said the decision has been made to leave the buildings in the 300 Area and the city agrees with that decision. However, the city will have to change its land use designation for this area.
- Cathy asked if committee members were interested in the workshop that Bryan offered. Bryan explained that after the SA is released DOE will consider all comments that are provided and a determination will be made to say whether a supplemental EIS, a new EIS, or nothing is needed. Bryan said the results will likely be that nothing is required. Maynard suggested having Bryan come back to the committee during the public comment period to provide an update in lieu of the workshop. Committee members agreed with this path forward.

### **PW 1/3/6 Operable Unit Feasibility Study**

Dick said the PW 1/3/6 Operable Unit Feasibility Study (FS) evaluates the alternatives and approaches under CERCLA criteria. Dick said it seems like extreme examples were used in evaluating the alternatives and not enough effort is taken to look at the range of

opportunities that are available. Dick said the costs of the alternatives cannot be compared unless the analysis has been done at depth to know how deep you would need to excavate. Harold said there are a lot of cleanup programs happening on the Central Plateau and for one program to be effective there needs to be consistency between them all. For example, it does not do any good to cleanup burial sites without cleaning up other sites surrounding them. Dick the issue comes back to the decision of how clean is clean, and what protection level will be achieved. Harold said if one billion dollars is spent at one site the implications for the cost of that project on other projects should be considered. Shelley said the record of decision of the PW 1/3/6 burial grounds will be precedent setting. If the Pu is left in the ground at this operable unit it may not be cleaned up anywhere else on-site.

Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, said DOE is interested in knowing what balancing criteria under CERCLA are most important to explore with HAB and the public. Matt said the implementation of the alternative to remove, treat and dispose (RTD) is a concern with any decision. RTD has impacts that need to be balanced along with the other remedies. Maynard said the level of costs to remove material is a topic the committee would like to discuss further. The issue managers for this topic are Shelley Cimon, Greg deBruler and Dirk Dunning. Maynard said the issue manager group talked about three technologies that meet the threshold criteria: capping, digging, and in-situ vitrification. The issue manager group decided that to use the four or five public policy issues from the Tri-Party Agency's Public Involvement Plan as a starting point. Cathy reviewed the five topics in the plan.

### *Regulator Perspectives*

- Dennis said EPA was not sure the right remedy was selected in the FS, but was also not sure what the right remedy is. Dennis said EPA's comments on the FS were about the differences in the fundamental biases that each agency holds. Dennis agreed that it is important to keep the end state in mind so decisions are not being made in a vacuum. Dennis said the agencies will be having a discussion on the current baseline and hopefully the three parties will be able to come to a unified vision on an end state.

### *Committee Discussion*

- Harold said there is an issue with the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and the deadline for closure. Matt said WIPP will be open for a long time, and the real issue is the transportation risks in shipping TRU waste to WIPP. This is not something that falls under CERCLA, the analysis stops at the fence line of Hanford. Matt said TRU waste would generate thousands of shipments to WIPP. There have been hundreds of shipments to date with a few incidents. Pam said she thought there is a new shipping container being approved for WIPP that will hold a thirty gallon barrel for remote handled TRU and would improve the risk in packaging the waste.
- Pam asked if after the Pu is shipped whether tearing down PFP would become a high priority. Matt said taking PFP down is a high priority because of the potential for an accident during an earthquake or some other event. Matt said the risk of PFP

dominates DOE's risk profile for exposure to workers or the public. A large part of DOE's budget keeps the site safe and taking down PFP will free that money up for other cleanup activities. Matt said the TPA milestone is to demolish PFP by 2019.

- *How do you plan the excavation approach?* Dennis said he did not think they would have to segregate materials because they know where the hot material is. DOE will use a closed containment structure due to the set up of the TRU packs. Dennis said the Pu is so light that it gets everywhere, but the three cribs are the three best characterized facilities on the Hanford Site.
- Matt brought up the issue of pre-1970's transuranic (TRU) material. He said if DOE digs up some of these sites the material could then become TRU waste and HAB has said pre-1970's TRU should be treated the same. Maynard suggested that the topic of TRU waste be discussed at the PW 1/3/6 workshop.
- Dirk suggested that the alternative of capping does not make sense because the Pu is moving at depth. Dirk said the contamination will last longer than the caps so the remedy will not address the issue. Dirk also thought the flood boundaries need to be documented in the area around the site. He said typically water moves down through the soil, but in this location the water hits a surface at fifty feet that sends it laterally across the ground. This means that any water that moves through the ground will move laterally underground as well and could mobilize the Pu.
- John Morse said DOE questions some of the technical details that Dirk raises with Pu mobility in the subsurface. John thought it was better to discuss these technical details outside the meeting. John said you have to differentiate between when the Pu entered the ground in a highly fluid environment and the way it is there now. Shelley asked DOE to discuss the Pu mobility issues at a later committee meeting. Susan thought HAB might need to consider advice on this topic because it is such a big issue.
- Dirk said that land use controls tend to break down after fifty years and after 100 years it should be assumed that these controls fall apart completely. Dirk said something that has not been considered in the deep vadose zone technology is deep excavation with remote handling (digging vertically and laterally). In the 100 Area, future use could include houses, so the possibility of people digging fifteen feet to excavate a basement is real.
- Sandra introduced a concept she learned during the recent Waste Management conference. She said the idea was proposed that when you design a facility, you should design controls so that it can be forgotten. If contamination is going to be left for ten thousand years, it needs to work when people forget about it. Pam said the Canister Storage Building is designed with that in mind because it is passively cooled.
- *Is DOE planning to turn over the Central Plateau to the Hanford Reach National Monument?* John Morse said that decision has not been made yet. When the decision was made to move contamination to ERDF it was understood that some contamination would remain in perpetuity. DOE will have to use ICs to maintain control on the Central Plateau. Dennis thought this would be a good discussion topic at the workshop: We know waste will be left on the Central Plateau because of ERDF, so how should it look? Maynard said the Department of the Interior has made

it clear they will not accept anything with contamination so the 200 Area will not be part of the monument. John said the land use plan is zoned as industrial exclusively; this designation does not preclude use as industrial, but it does not mean that it will necessarily be used in that way.

- Dirk said the first version of the remedial investigation (RI) went to a final when the FS came out in draft. Dirk felt there were unresolved issues with the RI but there was no opportunity to discuss them. Dirk thought that process for releasing the documents did not serve the public process well. Dennis said the workshop would provide a forum for feedback on the FS revisions. Dirk asked the committee to consider high level advice on the process DOE uses of completing the RI before going on to the FS.
- Shelley thought that NRDA should be used as a tool for cleanup approaches on the site. Dennis said NRDA should always be a question asked on a remedy, but that is as far as it should go. Dirk noted DOE policy says NRDA should be integrated in the cleanup but that is not happening. Dirk said if you use the Government Accountability Office (GAO) cost analysis, the money ends up being zero at fifty years. If you do a neutral analysis it would allow you to carry the costs over the long term. Dirk thought this should be a topic for workshop as well.
- Susan suggested that part of workshop should include the white paper the regulators created and HAB Advice #173 and corresponding flow chart on decision making for the Central Plateau remediation.
- *Will the workshop be for the Committee of the Whole?* Maynard said the committee thought the workshop would be mostly for RAP. Dennis recommended that the workshop be a TPA workshop since they will invite other stakeholders and will want to frame the workshop with HAB and other input. Committee members agreed with this approach Dennis said the goal is to have the proposed plan for this operable unit by end of 2008. , so if it goes public by April/May then The agencies will need six months to get the plan ready if it goes out for public comment in April/May.
- Shelley said HAB is hosting SSAB the week of April 21. Dennis said he is suggesting holding the workshop the week before. The committee agreed the week of April 14<sup>th</sup> would be good for the workshop. DOE will look at the public involvement calendar to make sure there are not conflicts.

### **Committee Discussion on Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC) Advice on Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 Budget Request Draft Advice**

Maynard said draft advice on the FY09 budget request has been prepared by the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC). Maynard said BCC has agreed to reformat the draft to match HAB's typical budget advice and the footnotes will be turned into endnotes. Comments on the substance of the advice can be sent directly to Gerry Pollet. Maynard asked that RAP focus their discussion on the DOE-RL budget.

Pam summarized what she learned about the congressional budget during her recent visit to Washington, D.C. Pam said the process for requesting more money is different than it

has been in the past; it is more detailed and has to be documented and signed by a member of Congress. The Tri-City Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) issued a budget request and the City of Richland participated. In the request, TRIDEC asked for a \$100 million increase for DOE-RL, it did not specifically identify projects but mentioned the River Corridor, waste stabilization and HAMMER. Pam said \$35 million was requested for the Waste Treatment Plant, \$25 million was requested for tank waste retrieval, and \$10 million was requested for cold testing of the demonstration bulk vitrification system. DOE-HQ was clear they did not want more money for retrieval because of staffing and capacity issues. Pam said the local community feels that DOE could retrieve more than one tank per year. The Senate has asked for an additional \$500 million appropriations to EM; Hanford is forty percent of the total EM budget and could expect forty percent of the Chairman's mark of \$500 million if it is issued.

Pam said the budget cuts to DOE-RL will mean 400 lost jobs and consequently a loss in cleanup momentum. Pam said nationwide there is a lack of recent college engineers with the majority going into technology. She is concerned about how this will impact cleanup progress. Also, Pam said there is a plus up in the 2009 request for shipping containers, and Pam felt the existing containers should be recycled so additional containers do not need to be purchased. Pam said there is a possibility that the mixed waste processing facility at Idaho could handle remote TRU. Pam thought RAP should look into that possibility.

### *Regulator Perspectives*

- Dennis confirmed that Idaho is looking at becoming the TRU processing facility for the complex. He was not sure how much Hanford waste could go there, but thought it made sense for the smaller sites. Dennis also said the worst case scenario for the FY) budget is a continuing resolution. That would mean contractors will have to plan to 2009 because there will not be any more contracts. Dennis thought the advice had some dollar amounts off on some of the project baseline items and questioned the committee if including dollar amounts was useful.

### *Committee Discussion*

- Maynard agreed with Dennis' comment regarding the dollar values and felt the advice should not include money for each project. Ken Gasper said the Tank Waste Committee did not focus on the numbers during their budget discussion, but thought the committee would agree to take out the dollar values.
- Shelley said a statement should be added at the front of the advice regarding the workforce concerns Pam raised.

The committee suggested the following changes to the draft advice:

- **RL 13:** Use new term for post 70s TRU, take out dollar values, move the investigation for pre-1970's TRU to RL 40. The remote TRU processing facility is not funded and retrievals are cut in half.

- **RL 41:** take out dollar amounts, include “Impact on the continuity of workforce, missed milestones”, move the “300 Area groundwater” in the last sentence to RL 30.
- **RL 30:** add groundwater in 300 Area from RL 41, remove natural attenuation and include “DOE should focus on developing a viable technology”, ROD on ZP1 should say “Funding added to implement the ROD which is the pump and treat in the 300 West Area.”
- **RL 11:** reword to say “Do not fund the shipment and transport of mixed oxide (MOX) fuel out of our cleanup budget.”
- **RL 40:** reword to say “already inadequately funded, the Central Plateau work will come to a halt and will have a cascading effect on the rest of the site.”
- **RL 100:** Ken Niles asked to take the State of Oregon out; take the tribes out too and just speak for the HAB.

Cathy reviewed the plans for the FY10 budget workshop on March 26. She said RAP and TWC need to select one topic from the list previously developed for baseline topics. The committee was concerned the agencies would not be ready to discuss PW 1/3/6 by March 26. The committee decided to save the PW 1/3/6 discussion for the April workshop and to cover SW 1 and 2 during the March 26 budget workshop.

### **Action Items / Commitments**

- Two letters, one on ZP1 operable unit and the other on site-wide technology group, will go forward from this committee to the Board.
- Request to review the 2008 Waste Management Conference (Ken and Pam) at the Board meeting.
- RAP will not have a meeting in April but encourages committee members to attend the PW 1/3/6 workshop instead.

Upcoming topics for the committee to follow:

- Information Management
- SA HCP-EIS
- Plutonium issue of mobility in the vadose zone
- EPA Sampling program
- M91 facility
- Site wide permit (May/June)
- Permafrix

### **Handouts**

*NOTE: Copies of meeting handouts can be obtained through the Hanford Advisory Board Administrator at (509) 942-1906, or [tholm@enviroissues.com](mailto:tholm@enviroissues.com)*

- NPS Manhattan Project Special Site Study, Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, February 27, 2008

- Draft Letter – Reconvening of Site Technology Coordination Groups, RAP Committee, March 2008.
- Recommendation to include Public Participation in Technology Development and Deployment at DOE Sites, EM SSAB, December 8, 2006.
- Draft Letter – 200-ZP-1, RAP Committee, March 7, 2008.
- DOE NEWS – DOE Takes Action to Protection Hanford’s Historic B Reactor, Colleen French, March 12, 2008.
- BC Controlled Area Waste Site Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis, Tri-Party Agencies, February 2008.
- HAB Institutional Controls, Legacy Management & Records Management – Summary of Issues, RAP Issue Manager Group, 3/11/2008.

**Attendees**

**HAB Members and Alternates**

Shelley Cimon	Sandra Lilligren	Keith Smith
Ken Gasper	Jerri Main	Bob Suyama
Harold Heacock	Maynard Plahuta	Steve White
Susan Kreid	Mike Priddy	
Pam Larsen	Wade Riggsbee	
Susan Leckband	Dick Smith	

**Others**

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Ted Repatsky, CTUIR
John Morse, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
	Brenda Jentzen, Ecology	Janice Williams, FH
	John Price, Ecology	Barb Wise, FH
	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Gabriel Bohnee, Nez Perce Tribe
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Peter Bengtson, WCH
	Larry Gadbois, EPA	Dave Rowland, Yakama Nation