

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**

*March 15, 2016*

*Richland, WA*

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Opening..... 1

Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility Vertical Expansion..... 2

Committee Business..... 4

Attachments ..... 6

Attendees ..... 7

*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 February 2016 RAP meeting summary.

*Announcements*

Jerry Peltier, Budget and Contracts Committee chair, mentioned the upcoming committee of the whole meeting and noted that the meeting’s purpose was to develop background information for upcoming advice and establish priority funding for upcoming Board work.

Bob Suyama, Tank Waste Committee chair (TWC), mentioned the afternoon TWC meeting, following the RAP committee meeting.

## Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility Vertical Expansion

Liz Mattson, issue manager, provided a background document<sup>1</sup> containing a brief summary of the vertical expansion at the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility (ERDF), based on the information received from DOE-RL at the February 2016 RAP committee meeting. The RAP committee framed questions for further development of this topic, for future agency presentations, and for potential Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) products. The RAP committee discussed writing potential advice regarding a need for public involvement for vertical expansion of ERDF.

### *Committee Questions and Responses<sup>2</sup>*

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

Q. Has vertical expansion at ERDF begun?

*R. U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office [DOE-RL] The process of staging equipment for the vertical expansion of ERDF has begun, in order to allow for a smooth transition of bringing waste there.*

Q. Is there a requirement for the public to provide input on the topic of vertical expansion? If not, will there be an opportunity for the public to provide input, even if plans for the vertical expansion are already in place?

*R. [DOE-RL] It is standard process of any government project for the public to provide their input, at any point in time during the project.*

C. Some of the statements under “Proposed Questions for Further Development of this Topic” in the background document are opinions, rather than questions. The section should reflect questions the RAP committee has, not provide comments or assumptions about aspects of ERDF’s vertical expansion.

C. This is a good opportunity for DOE-RL to explain logistics regarding the vertical expansion, including environmental impacts and the proposed timeline. With modifications, potential advice on this subject should move forward.

Q. The liner used for ERDF is designed to last 1,000 years. Will low-level waste at ERDF decay within 1,000 years?

*R. The liner will be present at ERDF while the landfill is actively used. The long-term protection is the facility’s cap.*

---

**Attachment 1:** Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility Background Document (3/15/16, issue manager Liz Mattson)

**Attachment 2:** Transcribed flipchart notes

*R. After water has stopped infiltrating into the landfill and after the cap is placed on top, there will no longer be a need for the liner. The cap is designed to prevent water from infiltrating.*

*R. Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) held a workshop and discussed the types of barriers used at different landfill facilities. The evapotranspiration (ET) liner used at ERDF will last more than 30-40 years, but it is not designed to keep water from infiltrating into the landfill. Ecology explained that water often seeps through the liner and enters the landfill, allowing the materials in the landfill to decay. However, for a landfill such as ERDF, containing radioactive materials, infiltrated water will not assist in material degradation. The ET liner is not a good idea to use at ERDF.*

C. The ERDF Record of Decision (ROD) needs to be re-examined in order to place the conversation regarding vertical expansion into context.

*R. [DOE-RL] As confirmed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), vertical expansion of ERDF meets the requirements stipulated in the ROD, complying with DOE Order 435.1, and is within the bounds of the ERDF Performance Assessment.*

C. ERDF is required to meet the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs). If the cap or the liner used for vertical expansion meets ARAR, then there is nothing further to be done.

C. Vertical expansion at ERDF provides an opportunity for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) to engage the public and be transparent about the work at the Hanford Site. ERDF is designed to be a long-term facility and it will impact future generations.

Q. Are there immediate or short-term issues regarding the vertical expansion of ERDF that require advice or does the Board need to study the corresponding ROD?

*R. The RAP committee should provide potential advice regarding remaining questions the Board has about the vertical expansion of ERDF, as well as look at the information in the ROD #264.*

Q. DOE-RL states that expanding ERDF vertically will result in a savings of \$30 million, but it will also cost money to build the vertical infrastructure. Is the cost estimate for vertical expansion included in the \$30 million savings estimate?

*R. At the February 2016 Board Meeting, DOE-RL explained that the cost of building a new cell to dispose waste into would cost approximately \$30 million.*

C. ERDF has been in use for twenty years and is one of the few places on the Hanford Site where long-term data is collected. It would be a good opportunity for DOE-RL to present a performance assessment of ERDF, outlining if ERDF is meeting the goals and objectives that the models projected.

*C. In addition, a presentation about the long-term impacts of ERDF and its significance would be helpful, especially for new members of the RAP committee.*

Q. Is there a mechanism for the Board to use if agencies do not want to provide public engagement materials for vertical expansion of ERDF?

*R. The purpose in creating advice that requests public involvement is to ensure that the Board, the public, and other stakeholders understand the history and the impacts of ERDF. In the future, there may be an opportunity to modify designs, plans, or ARARs based on the feedback received during public engagement opportunities. Agencies are not legally required to listen to the HAB but the goal is to provide agencies with information and thoughts from the Board and their constituents.*

The RAP committee framed questions for a potential future agency ERDF presentation<sup>2</sup>. In addition, the RAP committee agreed to review draft advice for potential introduction at the April Board meeting, requesting that the HAB assist DOE-RL in developing public involvement materials and hosting a public workshop on ERDF's vertical expansion. The RAP committee will review the draft advice and determine next steps during the RAP committee phone call on March 22, 2016.

## **Committee Business**

### *Leadership Selection*

Pam Larsen was voted chair of the RAP committee and Jan Catrell was voted vice chair of the RAP committee. Pam and Jan will be seated during the April Board meeting.

### *Fiscal Year 2016 Six-Month Accomplishments Review<sup>3</sup>*

The RAP committee reviewed the HAB Fiscal Year 2016 Work Plan table and provided status updates on future committee topics, context, and potential actions or products.

### *RAP 3-Month Work Plan<sup>4</sup>*

The RAP committee will hold a phone call on March 22, 2016 at 1:30pm to discuss draft advice, regarding public involvement around ERDF's vertical expansion.

The RAP committee will plan to hold a half-day committee meeting in April 2016 that will tentatively include the following topics:

- Receive an agency presentation by Tom Taynor (DOE-RL) regarding an update on the Plutonium Finishing Plant demolition progress<sup>2</sup>.

---

**Attachment 2:** Transcribed flipchart notes

**Attachment 3:** Fiscal Year 2016 Six-Month Accomplishments

**Attachment 4:** RAP 3-Month Work Plan

- Receive an agency presentation by Jon Peschong (DOE-RL) regarding an update on 200-PW 1/3/6<sup>2</sup>.
- Determine RAP work plan priorities.
- Prepare for the Leadership Workshop in May 2016.

In May 2016, RAP will tentatively plan to meet and discuss an update on the 300-FF-5 uranium sequestration results, an update on ERDF, and a discussion of RAP's perspective on safety culture for preparation of the Sounding Board in June 2016.

In June 2016, RAP will tentatively plan to meet and discuss an update on the Solid Waste Operations Complex Dangerous Waste Permit Modifications, including comments received during the public comment period.

**Attachments**

**Attachment 1:** Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility Background Document

**Attachment 2:** Transcribed flipchart notes

**Attachment 3:** Fiscal Year 2016 6-Month Accomplishments

**Attachment 4:** RAP 3-Month Work Plan

## Attendees

Board members and alternates:

Don Bouchey	Steve Hudson	Ed Revell
Jan Catrell	Alex Klementiev	Dick Smith (phone)
Shelley Cimon	Pam Larsen	Bob Suyama
Shannon Cram (phone)	Susan Leckband	Jean Vanni (phone)
Sam Dechter	Liz Mattson (phone)	Dawn Wellman
Dale Engstrom (phone)	Emmett Moore	Helen Wheatley
Gary Garnant	Jerry Peltier	
Becky Holland	Emily Peterson (phone)	

Others:

Kristen Holmes, DOR-RL	Dieter Bohrman, Ecology	Alex Nazarali, CTUIR
Alex Teimouri, DOE-EM	Nina Menard, Ecology	Samantha Herman, EnviroIssues
	Tom Rogers, WDOH	Ryan Orth, EnviroIssues
		Jen Colburn, MSA
		Jen Copeland, MSA
		Katherine Bittinger, WSU