

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**

*January 12, 2016
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 1

Draft Advice on the 100-D/H Proposed Plan..... 1

Letter on Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Project Interim Progress Report..... 4

Proposed Changes to Tri-Party Agreement Central Plateau Cleanup Milestone Series M-015, M-016, M-017, M-037, M-086, and M-094 5

Committee Business..... 7

Attachments 9

Attendees 10

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

Opening

Pam Larsen, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. Committee members adopted the December 2015 RAP meeting summary.

Draft Advice on the 100-D/H Proposed Plan

Dale Engstrom, issue manager, provided committee members with an introduction to the draft advice ¹ pertaining to the 100-D/H Area Proposed Plan Rev. 0. Dale noted that the draft advice’s content was very similar to Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) Advice #278, which commented on Draft A of the 100-D/H Proposed Plan. Dale acknowledged that representatives from the U.S. Department of Energy—Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) recognized during past RAP meetings that Rev. 0 of the Proposed Plan did not incorporate extreme

Attachment 1: Draft Advice: Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 100-DR-1, 100-DR-2, 100-HR-1, 100-HR-2, and 100-HR-3 Operable Units (Draft A)

substantive changes from Draft A; therefore, much of the content in the draft advice was similar to that presented in advice #278.

Dale invited committee members to review and comment on the draft advice in preparation for its upcoming presentation to the Board.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The advice draft recommends including a phosphate barrier in the 100-D/H Area to stop the migration of strontium-90 into the Columbia River. However, after discussing the point with Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agency representatives, issue managers decided that the committee could remove the recommendation from the advice. The strontium-90 plumes in the 100-D/H Area are small and not expected to migrate far.

Q. The current draft of the advice does not specifically recognize 118-DR-2-2, a waste site within the 100-D/H Area that is contaminated with technetium-99. Has DOE-RL already remediated this waste site? If the waste site has not yet been remediated, the Board should provide specific comment on the waste site.

R. [Ecology] Ecology can provide additional information on the current status of the 118-DR-2-2 waste site to committee members.

R. Technetium-99 is a very persistent radioactive contaminant that is highly soluble. It is important that the advice specifically call out this contamination, if it is still present, and recommend remediation.

C. Instead of identifying the specific 118-DR-2-2 waste site, the advice could include a point that recommends the remediation for all hot spot contamination in the 100-D/H Area. There are several deep decision units that demonstrate radioactive contamination in the vadose zone below 15 feet, and noting specific examples in HAB advice is often a limiting factor.

Q. How would an additional advice point differ from the sub-points included within the first advice point?

R. The existing advice point discusses groundwater contamination. An additional advice point could call out vadose zone contamination.

C. The draft advice includes many advice points relating to public involvement practices associated with the public comment period for the 100-D/H Proposed Plan Rev. 0. Recent HAB advice has incorporated public involvement strategies to a greater extent, and it may make more sense for the Board to codify these best strategies for public involvement processes in a separate piece of advice moving forward.

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

R. Universal public involvement advice is likely not as useful to the agencies as comment period-specific advice. Specific public involvement strategies need to be included as individual advice points. It serves as a reminder to agencies as to what the public involvement process should look like.

R. It may be a good idea to revisit public involvement principles and advice as a HAB Committee of the Whole. The Board worked on a similar effort approximately ten years ago.

C. The Board may wish to incorporate a line noting support for Alternative Three, presented by Ecology at the December 2015 RAP meeting.

Q. Has the 100-D/H Proposed Plan Rev. 0 been released for public review yet?

R. [Ecology] No. The 100-D/H Proposed Plan will likely be released for public review and comment in late February or early March 2016.

R. The Board should begin formulating and clarifying this advice now. Public comment periods are initially set for 30-days. If the 100-D/H Proposed Plan Rev. 0 moved to public comment in early March, the April HAB meeting may provide the Board with an opportunity to adopt and submit advice within the open public comment period.

R. The draft advice on 100-D/H could be introduced at the February 2016 Board meeting, and then adopted at the April 2016 Board meeting. This strategy would allow Board members to be familiar with the general tenants of the advice, and it would allow issue managers the opportunity to review the 100-D/H Proposed Plan Rev. 0 before the Board adopts it.

Q. If the Board were to adopt this advice in advance of the release of Rev. 0 in February 2016, could HAB perspective influence the document prior to public comment?

R. The Board provided advice on the 100-D/H Area Proposed Plan Draft A in HAB Advice #278, and the Board's advice on the Proposed Plan Rev. 0 will be very similar. Therefore, the agencies already have the Board's perspective on preferred remediation strategies in the 100-D/H Area. Adopting the advice prior to the comment period would likely not influence the new version of the document.

Ryan Orth, facilitator, updated the wording of the draft advice on-screen to reflect committee ideas and clarifications as they were presented.

RAP members noted that the advice would move forward to the February 2016 Board meeting for initial Board review. The draft advice would then be reintroduced for Board consideration and adoption at the April 2016 Board meeting.

Letter on Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Project Interim Progress Report

Pam Larson presented a draft letter³ to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) recommending that additional Hanford Site cleanup funds not be expended on additional work for the Consortium for Risk Evaluation and Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Project. Pam encouraged committee members to review the content and language of the letter and propose changes in anticipation of the letter moving ahead for Board review in February 2016.

Committee Questions and Responses²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. Did the initial review conducted by CRESP cover Hanford's tank farms?

R. The evaluation units included in the study's Interim Report included some tank farms.

C. The letter should include a subject line above the text that clearly summarizes the intent and purpose of the content. This subject line could potentially read "Discontinue funding for CRESP studies from Hanford cleanup dollars."

C. DOE has never commented on the cost of the CRESP Site-Wide Risk Review Project; however, it is likely more than \$4 million. All funding for the CRESP study came from Hanford cleanup funds.

Q. The letter is currently addressed to Dr. Monica Regalbuto, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management. Can the Board direct products to her?

R. Yes. The Board can provide letters and advice to DOE.

C. The letter should not only recommend that additional funding not be expended on the CRESP Site-Wide Risk Review effort, it should also recommend that cleanup funding already redirected for the effort be restored to Hanford Site cleanup efforts.

The committee agreed that the draft letter would move to the Board for review following the incorporation of minor changes identified during discussion. RAP members agreed that the letter would be forwarded to Assistant Secretary Regalbuto, with copies sent to TPA agency leads.

Attachment 3: Draft Letter v0, 1/08/2016, CRESP Site-Wide Risk Review Project

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

Proposed Changes to Tri-Party Agreement Central Plateau Cleanup Milestone Series M-015, M-016, M-017, M-037, M-086, and M-094

Shelley Cimon, issue manager, provided committee members with an introduction to draft advice⁴ on proposed agency changes to TPA milestone series concerning the cleanup of the Central Plateau area (M-015, M-016, M-037, M-086, and M-094). Shelley noted that issue managers had provided advice points pertaining to public involvement principles that were not yet incorporated into the draft advice document; however, she noted that they would be available for review on-screen during committee discussion.

Shelley invited committee members to review and comment on the draft advice in preparation for Board review at the February 2016 HAB meeting.

Agency Perspective

Jon Peschong, DOE-RL, noted that the advice was clear and that he did not have any overarching comments on the advice's early draft. Jon noted that the TPA agencies had further extended the public comment period for the change package to February 12.

Jon provided committee members with additional background on Hanford budget requests and appropriations. Jon noted that a compliant DOE-RL budget (a budget that would allow DOE-RL to meet all of the cleanup milestones incorporated in the TPA) is approximately \$1.7-1.8 billion per fiscal year. Jon noted that DOE-RL receives approximately \$1 billion per year, and he noted that this level of funding is likely to remain consistent despite DOE-RL's annual request for a TPA-compliant budget. Jon noted that the change package worked to bring the cleanup schedule into alignment with these realistic annual budget appropriations.

*Committee Questions and Responses*²

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. [DOE-RL] Could issue managers provide additional background on the incorporation of *Force Majeure* from the TPA?

R. The Force Majeure idea comes from a presentation provided by Jon Price, Ecology, to the Public Involvement and Communications Committee in November 2015.

R. Issue managers may wish to consult with Ecology on this point further to ensure that the idea is accurately incorporated into the advice.

C. The draft advice does not recognize the cesium and strontium stored at the Waste Encapsulation Storage Facility (WESF). Is this because the capsules are not addressed in the current change package?

Attachment 4: Draft Advice: Proposed Changes to Hanford Central Plateau Cleanup Work and Schedule

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

R. Capsules at WESF are not addressed in the change package; however, they may be incorporated into the advice background.

R. [DOE-RL] If the WESF capsules are important to the HAB, then it would be a good idea to incorporate them into the advice. Milestone change packages are about the agencies working to balance priorities; therefore, that information is valuable.

C. The advice needs to be somewhat realistic in its request for additional cleanup. The current version of the advice proposes a large wish list, but this list is neither prioritized nor balanced with proposed cleanup delays.

R. The entire premise of the draft advice (adapting the schedule to the expected budget) is controversial. DOE budget requests should continue to account for cleanup on the schedule currently noted in TPA milestones. It is wrong for TPA milestones to be changed to account for inadequate cleanup funding. Many members of the Board believe that the existing cleanup schedule is reasonable, and, therefore, the U.S. Congress should appropriate cleanup funding that meets this schedule.

C. There is no language in the current draft of the advice that speaks to the possible closure of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in New Mexico. WIPP's transuranic (TRU) waste acceptance permit only extends to 2030; however, shipment of TRU waste from the Hanford Site may continue for another 50-60 years. All of the new milestones proposed in the change package do not take this limitation into account.

R. This advice is likely not the place to incorporate the Board's perspectives on WIPP. The usefulness and effectiveness of the advice could be diminished if it attempts to incorporate too many topics.

C. The terminology of "gives" and "gets" in the draft advice reads adversarial. Is there a different way to convey the same meaning but approach the language differently?

R. The terminology was used in past HAB discussions by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) representatives. There is a general understanding by agencies, HAB members, and the public as to what "gives" and "gets" are in a milestone change package.

C. Will this advice be forwarded to DOE headquarters when it is adopted? Ecology verifies that local DOE offices request TPA compliant budgets; therefore, it seems as though the budget requests are reduced at the DOE headquarters level. The advice needs to make clear that DOE headquarters is failing to set up local offices for compliant cleanup operations.

Ryan Orth, facilitator, updated the wording of the draft advice on-screen to reflect committee ideas and clarifications as they were presented.

RAP members identified that the draft advice required additional updates and committee review before it would be ready to move forward to the Board in February 2016. Issue managers identified that they would incorporate committee suggestions and discuss an updated draft of the advice on a committee call in January 2016.

Committee Business

Review of the DOE Response to HAB Advice #284

Jerry Peltier, Budgets and Contracts Committee chair, reviewed the DOE response to HAB Advice #284, Fiscal Year 2017 and FY 2017 Budget Priorities, and requested that committee members consider the DOE response in preparation for the upcoming budget year. Committee members provided the following comments on the DOE response:

- The proposed 2017 administration budget may be released early in calendar year 2016.
- Work on the 324 Building may begin within the 2016 calendar year. RAP members anticipated that more information on remediation of contamination beneath the 324 building would be disclosed during the February 2016 Board meeting.
- Many of the DOE responses identify that budget requests are driven by schedules contained within TPA milestones. Therefore, upcoming budget requests may be impacted by recent changes to TPA milestones that move back cleanup deadlines. These changes will also impact the Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report.

Jerry thanked committee members for their feedback. He encouraged committee members to continue considering the advice and DOE's response as additional budget information became available in early 2016.

200-PW-1/3/6 Waste Sites

Dale Engstrom noted that negotiations for remediation of the 200-PW-1, PW-3, and PW-6 Operable Units were ongoing between TPA agency representatives. Dale stated that U.S. Environmental Protection Agency representatives identified that a public comment period on the Remedial Design/Remedial Action (RD/RA) Work Plan governing cleanup of the three Operable Units would not be open until negotiations and the Work Plan were finalized. Dale noted that the Board is interested in the cleanup of the 200-PW-1/3/6 waste sites as they contain TRU waste and several decision points for deep contamination.

Committee members identified that a HAB letter may be helpful to agencies at this early point in the RD/RA process. Members approved of this strategy, as it provided the HAB with the opportunity to convey their perspectives early in the development of the Work Plan. Members also noted that HAB advice remained a possibility in the future.

Dale committed to writing a draft letter for committee review prior to the February 2016 Board meeting. Committee members noted that they would discuss the draft letter on a committee call in January 2016.

RAP 3-Month Work Plan ²⁵

RAP will plan to hold a committee meeting in February 2016, and the meeting will tentatively include the following topics:

- Receive a status update on 618-10 Burial Ground vertical pipe unit retrieval
- Receive a status update on groundwater, focusing on poly-phosphate injection in the 300 Area
- Receive an update on the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility, including discussion of facility expansion
- Receive an update on permit modifications to the Solid Waste Operating Complex

In March 2016, RAP will tentatively plan to meet and discuss 200-PW-1/3/6 Operable Units, WESF, the 324 Building, as well as the delay period between drafts of plans and reports.

Attachment 2: Transcribed Flipchart notes

Attachment 5: RAP 3-Month Work Plan

Attachments

Attachment 1: Draft Advice: Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 100-DR-1, 100-DR-2, 100-HR-1, 100-HR-2, and 100-HR-3 Operable Units (Draft A)

Attachment 2: Transcribed flipchart notes

Attachment 3: Draft Letter v0, 1/08/2016, CRESA Site-Wide Risk Review Project

Attachment 4: Draft Advice: Proposed Changes to Hanford Central Plateau Cleanup Work and Schedule

Attachment 5: RAP 3-Month Work Plan

Attendees

Board members and alternates:

Don Bouchey	John Howieson (phone)	Ken Niles (phone)
Jan Catrell	Steve Hudson	Emily Peterson (phone)
Shelley Cimon	Pam Larsen	Dan Serres (phone)
Dale Engstrom	Susan Leckband	Jean Vanni
Gary Garnant	Liz Mattson (phone)	Dawn Wellman
Becky Holland	Emmett Moore	Steve White

Others:

Kristen Holmes, DOR-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Ron Brunke, CHPRC
Jon Peschong, DOE-RL (phone)	Nina Menard, Ecology	Noah Cruz, CHPRC (phone)
		Dale McKinney, CHPRC
		Samantha Herman, EnviroIssues
		Ryan Orth, EnviroIssues
		Brett Watson, EnviroIssues
		Katherine Bittinger, WSU
		Kristine Cornilis (phone)