

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING February 13, 2007 Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
Status of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF)	1
Tritium Cleanup in the 100 Area	4
100 Area Cleanup Status.....	5
Orphan Waste Sites Process.....	6
M-15 Supplemental Characterization Status	7
200-ZP-1 and 200-PW-1 Feasibility Studies	8
Sitewide Groundwater Integration Activities	9
Committee Work on Groundwater Values Flow Chart	10
Committee Work Planning and Committee Business.....	12
Action Items / Commitments	13
Handouts	13
Attendees.....	14

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

Welcome and Introductions

Jerry Peltier, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made.

Changes to the January RAP meeting summary were incorporated, and the summary was adopted.

Status of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF)

Joe Franco, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), updated the committee on cessation of operations at ERDF due to a leachate pump failure and falsification of compaction data. Neil Brosee, Deputy Director of Washington Closure Hanford (WCH), also discussed the ERDF issues, WCH's response, and the path forward.

From May to December 2006, the automatic leachate pump system failed on ERDF Cells 1 and 2. This problem took six months to discover because of a lack of frequent inspections of daily mechanical flow log records. The lack of pumping caused leachate to back up into the drainage layer, but not into the landfill wastes.

Currently, WCH is troubleshooting the automatic leachate pump system, manually operating the leachate pump, and revising system operations and data oversight procedures.

During a recent review of ERDF soil compaction test information, data were found to be missing or falsified. Data falsification resulted from a technician filling in data tables without taking readings. Abnormalities were noted during a management assessment, and the extent of data falsification is still under evaluation. The problem went unnoticed because periodic surveillance assessments showed consistent satisfactory results and the technician performing the tests demonstrated competency. To date, there have been no indications of settling in ERDF.

Neil said compaction data need to be verified, since they are the foundation of the design criteria for the final cover. WCH is performing tests to record data from alternate test methods, revising procedures to require routine data review, and working with DOE and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on confirming landfill design criteria are met. Neil emphasized safety is the highest priority for WCH. WCH is working closely with DOE and EPA on corrective actions, and is using a phased approach to restore operations at ERDF.

Joe explained that DOE management is concerned about the recent issues at ERDF. DOE-RL plans to strengthen its oversight, including daily oversight of ERDF activities, focus on planning for high hazard cleanup work, identifying lessons learned, and implementing the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS). He emphasized DOE-RL will continue to coordinate with EPA to maintain safety during ERDF operations.

Regulator Perspective

Nick Ceto, EPA, said the ERDF issues are serious and EPA is disappointed they occurred. EPA has consistently been concerned about conduct of operations, quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC), and management of contractors. He noted DOE and WCH have taken the ERDF issues seriously. The work plan approved by the agencies included using a 105,000 pound bulldozer for compaction, but instead WCH used smaller equipment without an agency-approved modification plan. He said EPA is evaluating the effectiveness of using smaller equipment to address concerns such as adequately crushing debris. In addition, WCH did not use compaction measuring equipment properly, which may reduce the accuracy of the measurements. For example, he noted that several measurements were higher on loose fill than on compacted areas, which should have been an indication the measuring device was not working properly.

Nick said EPA wants to ensure ERDF is well-built and well-managed. Operations are shut down until issues are addressed and the fill is correctly compacted. EPA is making an effort to investigate issues and look at ways to improve oversight. The agencies are trying to get ERDF operating again as quickly as possible. Nick said EPA will be more prescriptive moving forward, and has asked for third party oversight of the overall operation.

Committee Discussion

- *Have any preventative management measures been put in place?* Neil said the preventative measures program is being reviewed. The program is run by a subcontractor under the WCH contract, and Neil has direct oversight. Rob Davis expressed concern that WCH saves money using subcontractors to do work, which results in a failure to follow preventative measures.
- *What are the consequences of the delay in identifying these issues?* Neil said water is backing up into the landfill waste and potential erosion issues need to be evaluated.
- *Is the compaction test done after the waste is deposited or when the site is capped?* Neil said the compaction test is done after the waste has been placed in a landfill cell. The capping phase of work activities has not started, so caps will not be put on for several years.
- *Is there debris other than contaminated soil being disposed of in these cells? How is the compaction potential of miscellaneous debris accounted for?* Debris from contaminated buildings is being disposed of in these cells. Material with compaction potential, such as duct work, is compacted before being placed in the landfill.
- *Is WCH testing compaction each time the equipment makes a pass to determine whether compaction is adequate?* Neil said compaction tests are done at five locations at 35 feet and at 70 feet.
- *What is WCH doing to implement ISMS?* Keith Smith commented that elements of ISMS do not seem to have made it to the worker level, as some workers are skeptical that things will change to improve safety. He believes this is a cultural issue. Neil said WCH completed implementation of the work planning process, which involved workers. He said the more workers are involved in the work planning, the faster the change process can happen. He noted the challenge now is implementing the work plan in the field.
- *How is WCH making sure subcontractors are implementing ISMS?* Neil said WCH has built a shadow organization to review subcontractor performance, which will continue until WCH is satisfied ISMS has been adequately implemented.
- Vince Panesko expressed concern about future ERDF issues, and wondered whether institutional knowledge of these issues will be maintained with new site managers. John Stanfill said these issues amount to a failure of institutional controls, which the Tribal Nations are very concerned about.
- Jerry commented that the ERDF project has been going on for years, and wondered why compaction has just now become an issue. Nick said the early disposals at ERDF were almost all soil, but now there is more debris that requires developing a different disposal method. Also, the discovery of fabricated data led to a more detailed review of compaction work.

Tritium Cleanup in the 100 Area

Neil Brosee described the tritium exposure event resulting from an anomaly investigation in the 100 Area. A burial ground containing contaminated material from B Reactor operations has been retrieved and the material sorted and treated over the past three years. Among these materials some anomalies were retrieved, which require specialized disposition. Recently, four small compressed gas cylinders were retrieved, and WCH received information from Idaho National Laboratory (INL) about dispositioning them inside a closed ventilation system. During disposition, the first three cylinders were found to be empty and contained no tritium. The valves on the fourth cylinder were open and the cylinder was presumed to be depressurized. When workers attempted to remove the head sample they set off the tritium detection alarm and tritium was later found in the trailer.

Once tritium was detected, the burial ground site was secured, workers were concentrated in safe areas, and samples were taken from all workers. All worker samples and bioassays were found to be clean. DOE's Savannah River Site is experienced with tritium and provided input on how to move forward. The area was recovered and released on February 10, and no additional burial ground work is being performed. WCH is applying lessons learned from this incident to tritium controls on several other jobs. Neil explained that performing work safely is WCH's primary goal, and disciplined operations is necessary to prevent future problems.

Joe Franco said DOE takes exposure issues very seriously. DOE is concerned about communication with contractors during the recent tritium event. He noted there is also a belief among the work force that the work being done was appropriate even though it was not being done as part of a work package. DOE is emphasizing improving its oversight by having independent review of contractor work.

Regulator Perspective

- Dennis Faulk, EPA, said the tritium exposure event was a conduct of operations failure, since WCH performed the work outside the approved work package. He said EPA is also concerned about radiological control (RADCON) errors that contributed to the tritium release. EPA will be considering the implications of RADCON errors on repacking and moving spent fuel. Nick Ceto added that the RADCON errors demonstrate why it is important to seriously consider how the tritium release event happened and how contamination was spread.

Committee Discussion

- *How were workers able to determine the cylinder was empty?* Neil said workers purged the cylinder with nitrogen, but set off the contamination alarm when they drilled the hole and took the sample syringe to the tritium air monitor.

100 Area Cleanup Status

Donna Morgans provided an issue manager report on the status of 100 Area cleanup. She developed a table which organizes the 100 Area waste sites by operable unit, reactor area, and applicable cleanup milestone, and categorizes them as either remediated or unremediated. Of the remediated waste sites, the table documents the number requiring vadose zone institutional controls, and the number and percentage of waste sites included in the risk assessment for the 100 Area cleanup. She said a good number of waste sites were included in the risk assessment; however, she noted that some remediated waste sites were not included in the risk assessment for one of the following reasons: 1) No action sites with no soil sample collection required; 2) Media other than soil was collected; and, 3) Undetermined reasons. In addition, for areas where cleanup progress is not far along, a limited number of waste sites can be included.

Regulator Perspective

- Dennis Faulk said Donna's table does a good job showing how many waste sites are left to remediate before 2012. He is surprised there are fewer waste sites requiring deep vadose zone controls than he expected. He noted that there are other issues at some waste sites (e.g., B/C Cribs), where work scope increases make completing the 2012 remediation milestone unlikely.

Committee Discussion

- John Sands, DOE-RL, said all waste sites are not the same, and suggested adding the square footage of each waste site to the table. He also suggested considering the amount of funding provided for waste site remediation, since the work and funding are ramping up to address future work.
- Jerry commented that, percentage wise, DOE does not seem as far along with waste site remediation in the 100 Area as it should be if it still plans to meet 2012 deadline.
- *Are the remediated waste sites the easiest ones to cleanup?* John said they probably are, and that the burial grounds are proving difficult to remediate. For this reason, Maynard Plahuta cautioned that the percentage of remediated waste sites figure may be misconstrued to indicate DOE is close to being finished with cleanup.
- *Did Donna observe a lack of characterization data in her review of 100 Area cleanup?* Donna said she did not see anything that would indicate data samples or characterization were not adequate.
- Rob Davis proposed presenting the table and the committee's discussion to the full Board. Donna will work with the agencies to fill in the table with additional information. The committee agreed to look at table modifications at the March committee meeting in preparation for presenting the table at the April Board meeting.
- *Why are unremediated waste sites not included in the risk assessment?* Jill Thompson, WCH, said the waste sites included in the risk assessment are those where data is available and adequate cleanup levels have been verified. Data for unremediated sites are still unknown, but the risk assessment will determine the path

forward for addressing unremediated waste sites. Dennis explained that all waste site cleanup decisions are interim decisions, so this is more of an operational risk assessment than a true risk assessment.

Orphan Waste Sites Process

Dennis explained that the orphan waste sites process stems from the need to ensure all waste sites are accounted for. Jeff Lerch, WCH, provided an overview of orphan sites evaluations in the River Corridor, and discussed the types of items considered in the orphan waste sites process. Evaluations of orphan waste sites include a review of historical resources, field investigations, gap analysis, integration of historical research and field investigation results, and a summary report for each reactor or operational area and inter-areas. Orphan waste sites work is scheduled in sequence with cleanup work for each operable unit.

Regulator Perspective

- Dennis said the orphans waste sites process works well. For example, through the process EPA found several French drains in the B/C Cribs Area that were not accounted for in cleanup plans.

Committee Discussion

- *Was any subsurface waste identified by geological surveys?* Jeff said WCH looked at several sites to perform geological surveys, which are never done randomly but always based on correlating information.
- *Is the detailed information for the waste sites consistent with the database used in the orphan waste sites process?* Jeff said information on the waste sites and orphan waste sites is one common set of database tables. WCH intends to provide the database system to DOE.
- *Is WCH considering pre-Hanford land use and infrastructure in the orphan waste sites evaluation?* Jeff said some pre-Hanford sites are registered historic sites. WCH is proposing to go into the field in the spring to determine how to address historic sites that contain contaminated materials. Vince Panesko said the uncertainty of orphan waste site locations is something that will have to be dealt with. He said it is important to recognize uncertainty and not conclude all waste sites have been found.
- *How can WCH be certain searching the waste sites database will comprehensively account for orphan waste sites?* Jeff said WCH relies on several sources of information to identify orphan sites, including the database, historic records, and field investigations. The likelihood of missing a large waste disposal site is minimal. New waste sites are identified through the systematic evaluation process, but also during remediation work. Whenever WCH gets information indicating the potential existence of orphan waste sites, those sites are investigated

M-15 Supplemental Characterization Status

Bryan Foley, DOE-RL, provided a status update on the progress for waste sites supplemental characterization, which comes out of the M-15 change package that was signed by Keith Klein and has been sent to the regulators for review and approval. Supplemental characterization will be obtained in advance of the remedial investigation / feasibility study (RI/FS) work plan process under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), which determines how to clean up waste sites on the Central Plateau. Bryan explained the rationale for performing additional characterization to support waste site cleanup decision-making, which includes obtaining stakeholder advice, supplemental information on the extent of contamination, and supplemental data to characterize the deep vadose zone; addressing data gaps where analogous and representative site relationships could be strengthened; and accelerating confirmatory sampling to support decision-making.

The process to identify additional characterization data needs includes compiling existing waste site data, grouping sites based on conceptual models, evaluating data needs at each model group and identifying data collection activities by waste site

Bryan said DOE is interested in whether the committee would like updates on the work plan for identifying characterization needs. The work plan, describing supplemental information for model groups, will be submitted to EPA and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) on March 31. If the committee is interested, DOE can present the conceptual waste site model groups in more detail in April.

Regulator Perspective

- Craig Cameron, EPA, said the M-15 change package being considered by EPA and Ecology will drive much of the supplemental information. He noted the process to determine what is needed for additional characterization data has been very collaborative. EPA believes the process is on track, and will review the work plan carefully to see if it meets characterization needs and follows the data quality objectives process. There are a few waste sites that need more characterization, which have been sent to another operable unit.

Committee Discussion

- *Will the work plan be available for review and comment?* Craig said the regulatory agencies will review the work plan. If any Board members have specific issues with the change package, those can be discussed.
- *How does this relate to other waste site work, such as PW-1 and ZP-1?* Craig said there are other waste site cleanup activities and operable unit groupings where work is moving forward, which are not covered by the RI/FS work plan. Dennis said DOE and the regulatory agencies have all the data they need to make cleanup decisions for PW-1. There are a few waste sites that need more characterization, which were transferred to other operable units so that PW-1 cleanup is able to stick to its original cleanup schedule.

- *Did identifying characterization needs produce any surprises?* Bryan said it was a matter of going through each operable unit to determine the data needs to improve decision-making for waste site cleanup. He said DOE is evaluating what were thought to be representative, analogous waste sites, to identify additional data needs. Craig said DOE and the regulatory agencies are trying to be strategic about the kind of data needs for each waste site.
- *Does the work plan address the next steps in cleanup or end states?* Bryan said the work plan guides the next cleanup steps.
- Committee members generally agreed they would like DOE-RL to provide more detail on the conceptual waste site model groups at a future committee meeting. The committee is also interested to know how this work fits in with the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS).

200-ZP-1 and 200-PW-1 Feasibility Studies

Jerri Main provided an issue manager update on the 200 Area ZP-1 and PW-1 Feasibility Study workshop held on Feb 7-8, 2007. She noted there is a lot of new data on waste sites in these areas. Shelley Cimon said she is pleased to see DOE has integrated the operable units and source term areas. She suggested the committee consider possible advice regarding the new waste site information.

Regulator Perspective

- Dennis said there is more information on the waste sites in these areas than is portrayed, and waste sites without adequate data are not being evaluated. The complete suite of data should be considered in a full site profile, and he emphasized the need to have as much site-specific information as possible.

Committee Discussion

- Vince expressed concern that DOE does not have adequate information to properly develop a model, since the model's presumption of subsurface chemistry, geology, contaminant flow paths, etc. is incomplete and provides faulty results.
- *How has DOE incorporated information from the workshop?* Dave Brockman, DOE-RL, noted that DOE-RL's strategy for dealing with specific chemistry is important to determining the level of confidence for moving forward. Specifically, there was good information about considering historical chemical processes and changes in groundwater chemistry. DOE-RL is considering sources of uncertainty to evaluate and address. Ultimately, he said the preferred cleanup alternative has to be carefully explained and discussed.
- Jerri commented that part of the challenge will be figuring out where and when to stop looking for information. Dennis said DOE and the regulatory agencies have a commitment to discuss a tribal use scenario, which needs to happen soon. He said EPA will review the proposed plan, which is due from DOE-RL on September 30, 2007.

- *Why is there a time crunch for the regulatory agencies and DOE-RL to discuss a tribal scenario and risk assessment?* Dennis said the selected baseline for the risk assessment is a residential scenario. If a tribal use scenario is approved, the agencies would consider making it the baseline; however, decisions need to be made quickly to meet the regulatory timeframe.
- *Is there a document that discusses the input assumptions for the risk assessment?* Dave said that information is typically available in the feasibility study. Gerry Pollet said DOE is required to publish a notice identifying any restrictions there may be to meet applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) when doing a risk assessment. Gerry encouraged DOE-RL to develop a schedule for producing a document with new exposure scenarios.
- *Are there opportunities for public and/or Board comment on the proposed plan feasibility study before it is released?* Dave said no official comment process is scheduled, but DOE-RL would like to have and consider additional available information. Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, suggested DOE-RL could set up individual issue manager meetings to get answers to Board members' questions.
- Susan Kreid commented there seem to be community information resources that should be consulted. Dave said DOE-RL plans to speak with a site historian to identify some of these resources in the community.
- Dirk Dunning expressed concern that DOE does not have adequate information for a final decision. A second stage of remedial investigation work is necessary to obtain adequate information to support the decision-making process.
- Committee members who attended the workshop agreed to describe for DOE-RL what made the workshop useful so DOE-RL can improve future workshops.

Sitewide Groundwater Integration Activities

Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, discussed the effort to improve groundwater cleanup decision-making at Hanford. He discussed cleanup challenges, including organizational complexities involving two DOE offices, three prime contractors, and multiple regulatory frameworks. Matt outlined DOE improvement actions which include:

- Consolidating vadose zone responsibility within the DOE-RL Groundwater Remediation Project.
- Realigning Hanford cleanup contracts consistent with Memorandum of Agreement between DOE-RL and DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) to integrate groundwater and vadose zone work.
- Forming integrated project teams to address ongoing cleanup issues.
- Developing and implementing a configuration control process to ensure modeling and risk assessment approaches are consistent.

Matt described key 2007 cleanup activities, including:

- River Corridor cleanup and baseline risk assessment activities.
- Developing scope for the River Component of the risk assessment.
- Developing a strategy for final cleanup decisions for River Corridor source and groundwater operable units.

- Focusing on cross-cutting characterization efforts to ensure multi-project objectives are achieved efficiently.
- Establishing and implementing coordination tools, including integrated field work schedules.

Regulator Perspective

- Dennis said EPA is encouraged by DOE's efforts to improve cleanup decisions. It is particularly useful in coordinating the TPA agencies, and enables DOE and the regulatory agencies to share all information during the decision-making process.
- Dib Goswami, Ecology, said there was a lack of integration in the cleanup program and the groundwater and vadose zone integrated project team is a step in the right direction. This effort brings together Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and CERCLA regulatory processes. He said Ecology hopes the groundwater and vadose zone integrated project team can take an active role in pushing cleanup forward.

Committee Discussion

- *How often does the Groundwater and Vadose Zone Executive Council meet?* Matt said meetings are held every two months.
- *How does the Groundwater and Vadose Zone Executive Council plan to measure success?* Matt said DOE is revising the groundwater management plan to include the vadose zone. DOE wants to include performance indicators and metrics in the plan to improve integration. A second draft of the integrated plan is scheduled to be complete at the end of March 2007, at which time it will be made available to stakeholders.
- *Does DOE have a centralized numbering system that identifies all RI/FS documents, to indicate what work has already been done and avoid redundancy?* Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, said two major efforts were made to develop a document numbering system, and aggregate area management reports were written, putting all the information in one place.

Committee Work on Groundwater Values Flow Chart

Rob Davis made an issue manager presentation on the most recent iteration of the groundwater values flow chart. The issue manager work group included Pam Larsen, Jerry Peltier, Shelley Cimon, and Rob.

In addition to the latest draft of the flow chart, Rob provided a categorization of Board values based on previous Board groundwater advice and a summary of policy statements.

The flowchart identifies opportunities for public input during the decision-making process. Rob noted there are internal and external influences on decision-making. The flowchart attempts to move away from prescribing how to conduct groundwater cleanup,

to provide policy-level values about potential actions. Jerry said the goal of the committee's discussion is not to make a decision on the flowchart, but to continue the discussion about the product. Jerry outlined the CERCLA process for making groundwater cleanup decisions. He said the amount of data, technical requirements, etc. make it hard to capture everything that influences groundwater decisions.

Committee Discussion

- Dennis suggested the primary value expressed by the flow chart should be to return groundwater to its highest and best use. If that is not practicable, the flow chart would apply values that determine what is an acceptable timeframe for identifying other options. He said groundwater cleanup decisions will come down to determining an appropriate timeframe and how much to spend.
- Jerry stated that clean water is mandated by law. Dib said the State's policy is that DOE has to do everything practicable to achieve drinking water standards. Gerry Pollet suggested also considering advising DOE to investigate available groundwater treatment technologies.
- Gerry Pollet said the flow chart does not have to describe regulatory rules, but should advise DOE to follow them. Gerry commented that it is not a given that DOE will actually attempt to cleanup groundwater, since there is no plan or goal for groundwater cleanup at Hanford. DOE needs to develop a goal and plan to cleanup groundwater, and the flow chart is the vehicle for describing the Board's values for such an effort.
- Dennis noted that cleanup target dates and values may differ by operable unit, and that specific markers in the flow chart would be useful. The goal of the groundwater management plan is to cleanup groundwater to its highest and best use. Gerry noted that is not a goal if it does not have a measurable end date. Dib described Ecology's suggested groundwater cleanup goal: "The clear goal must be restoration of groundwater to beneficial uses within a reasonable timeframe. Use of natural attenuation is not compatible with the state's cleanup and waste management priorities, unless all practicable efforts to remove contamination above standards have been made. It is vital that any statement of values and goals begin with recognition that the groundwater beneath Hanford is a valuable resource of the people of the State of Washington. Natural attenuation should be used only for the low-concentration, peripheral parts of a plume: the parts that are not cost-effective to capture and treat. Other, active technologies must be used to remove the most-concentrated centers of plumes."
- Harold Heacock expressed concern about implementing a one-size-fits-all approach. He believes some waste streams along the Columbia River could be treated and removed in a reasonable timeframe. These waste streams should be prioritized over waste streams in the 200 Area that will not reach the river, or do not currently have a practicable solution for remediation. Maynard Plahuta said he believes this approach would be the result of applying the flow chart. When a contaminant stream cannot be immediately remediated, the flow chart needs to have a return loop to identify what

can be done in the meantime. Maynard suggested developing priority decision points (e.g., identify source terms, do no further harm, etc.).

- Gerry said Board advice on groundwater needs to address contamination that can be cleaned up today, and state that it is unacceptable to allow contaminants to spread.
- Maynard said more information is necessary to determine which contaminant streams can be addressed immediately, which contaminants are at risk for spreading, where the source terms are, etc. Susan Kreid said obtaining more information can be one of the flow chart decision points. Harold cautioned that more environmental damage could be done by removing a contaminant stream than by leaving it to naturally attenuate.
- The issue manager work group will use the committee's input to revise the draft flow chart.

Committee Work Planning and Committee Business

- The committee discussed future meeting topics:
 - 100 Area cleanup risk assessment waste site chart
 - ZP-1 and PW-1 advice discussion
 - Groundwater values flowchart
 - 300 Area infrastructure
 - Engineering Evaluation / Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the subgrade Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)
 - Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI) work plan
 - CERCLA Five-Year Review Recommendations
 - Interface with Natural Resource Trustees Council
- Jerry reviewed the agencies' priorities letter and discussed items for the committee workplan. Susan Leckband liked Jerry's idea that at the end of the year, the Board review whether it responded to the agencies' topics and how those topics fit in with the Board's work.
- Mike Thompson said there will be a presentation on April 18 from DOE and Savannah River National Lab, "Natural and Enhanced Attenuation for Chlorinated Solvents: New Developments and Tools." The presentation will be held at the Washington State University Tri-Cities Consolidated Information Center
- Mike Thompson said a workshop is scheduled to discuss funding for groundwater contamination remediation technology activities for Fiscal Years 2007 and 2008. The workshop will involve members from the Board, Tribal Nations, and the public, and will provide an overview of Hanford's groundwater situation, Fiscal Year 2006 activities, Hanford groundwater projects, and a discussion of technology and remedy ideas.
- Barbara Harper, Chair of the Natural Resource Trustees Council (NRTC), discussed the need for collaboration between the committee and the NRTC on similar interests and information requests from DOE. She suggested having a joint meeting, and said both groups could benefit from the expertise of the other. The committee decided to

invite Barbara to the next committee meeting to discuss NRTC issues and send Susan Leckband to the NRTC meeting to discuss the Board's current work. Barbara also suggested a need to exchange meeting summaries and will discuss the web availability of NRTC summaries with her administrative staff.

Action Items / Commitments

- Donna will work with the agencies to make revisions to the 100 Area cleanup table. The committee agreed to look at additional modifications at the March committee meeting in preparation for presenting the table at the April Board meeting.
- Vince Panesko will be the issue manager and committee point of contact in continued work on the work on the 200 Area ZP-1 and PW-1 Feasibility Study with Dave Miller, Argonne National Laboratory.
- Dick Smith agreed to review the M-15 change package for the committee.
- The issue manager work group on groundwater values, composed of Jerry, Pam, Shelley, and Rob, will revise the draft flow chart.
- Vince and Susan Kreid will begin drafting advice for the committee's consideration on tapping the knowledge of former workers.

Handouts

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

- Status of the Environmental restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), Neil Brosee, WCH, and Joe Franco, DOE-RL, 2/13/2007.
- DOE-RL Oversight, Joe Franco, DOE-RL, 2/2007
- 118-B-1 Tritium Cleanup in the 100 Area, Neil Brosee, WCH, and Joe Franco, DOE-RL, 2/13/2007.
- 100 Area Cleanup Status, Donna Morgans, 2/13/2007.
- End State and Final Closure: Orphan Sites Evaluations, 2/13/2007.
- Supplemental Investigation Work to Support Remedy Selection, DOE-EM, 2/13/2007.
- Improving Cleanup Decision making At Hanford, Mike McCormick, DOE-RL, 2/13/2007.
- Groundwater and End State Advice Values, Shelley Cimon, Rob Davis, Pam Larsen, Jerry Peltier, 2/13/2007.
- Groundwater and End State Advice Values, Shelley Cimon, Rob Davis, Pam Larsen, Jerry Peltier, 2/13/2007.
- Groundwater Values Flowchart, Shelley Cimon, Rob Davis, Pam Larsen, Jerry Peltier, 2/13/2007.

- Natural and Enhanced Attenuation for Chlorinated Solvents: New Developments and Tools, presentation announcement, DOE and Savannah River National Laboratory, 2/13/2007.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon (phone)	Jerri Main	Gerry Pollet
Rob Davis	Donna Morgans	Mike Priddy
Dirk Dunning	Vince Panesko	Dick Smith
Harold Heacock	Bob Parazin	Keith Smith
Susan Kreid	Jerry Peltier	John Stanfill
Susan Leckband	Maynard Plahuta	

Others

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Janet Badden, CHG
Joe Franco, DOE-RL		Karen Caddey, CHG
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Craig Cameron, EPA	Barbara Harper, CTUIR
Matt McCormick, DOE-RL	Nick Ceto, EPA	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
John Sands, DOE-RL	Rod Lobos, EPA	Becky Austin, FH
		Mark Byrnes, FH
Sharon Braswell, DOE-ORP		Tom Fogwell, FH
		Virginia Rohay, FH
Dinesh Gupta, DOE-HQ		Janice Williams, FH
Blaine Rowley, DOE-HQ		Barb Wise, FH
		Tyler Gilmore, PNNL
		Mark Triplett, PNNL
		Brian Mathis, Stoller
		Annette Cary, TCH
		Dale Bignell, WCH
		Rick Donahoe, WCH
		Jeff Lerch, WCH
		Jill Thompson, WCH
		Steve Weiss, WCH
		Charlene Andrade, WDFW (phone)