

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
BUDGETS AND CONTRACTS COMMITTEE MEETING
January 20, 2009
Richland, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Baseline Assumptions and Integrated Priority Lists 1
Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 and Funding Priorities..... 9
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

Gerry Pollet, Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) Chair, welcomed the committee, introductions were made, and the committee adopted the December 11, 2008 Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting summary.

Baseline Assumptions and Integrated Priority Lists

Matt McCormick, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) gave a presentation on how assumptions are used to build project baseline summaries (PBS) and baselines. Matt said baseline costs and schedules are independently reviewed and certified by the Office of Engineering and Construction Management (OECM), in accordance with U.S. Department of Energy Headquarters (DOE-HQ) policy. OECM certifies the near-term baseline, which covers the five-year period from fiscal year (FY) 2009 to FY 2013, as well as the baseline for out-years, which covers the period from FY 2014 on. Matt said the out-years baseline is less detailed, and is evaluated on the basis of whether its costs, schedules and scope of work are reasonable. Assumptions facilitate building cost and schedule estimates by providing a technical basis to account for unknown factors in a project.

Ben Harp, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) added that risk-management plans outline mitigating actions to protect project assumptions, such as the assumption that Yucca Mountain will open in 2016. An unfunded contingency of approximately \$18 million exists to protect assumptions for expense-funded projects.

Matt reviewed the assumptions¹ for each of the seven cleanup projects managed by DOE-RL.

- For Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) closure, assumptions include that plutonium will be shipped offsite by the baseline deadline of September 2009; the costs of transporting materials will be borne by the DOE's National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); and spent fuel will be shipped to the canister storage building (CSB) in FY 2010, which will require certification of the containers by DOE Office of Environmental Management Headquarters (EM-HQ).
- Assumptions for K Basin closure address removing two old fuel basins, spent fuel storage basins and the sludge contained in these basins; moving sludge from the K-West basin to the Central Plateau; removing the substructure of K-East basin by July 2009; and sending 99 percent of sludge to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) as transuranic (TRU) waste. Matt said a small fraction of sludge does not meet WIPP acceptance criteria, and will be handled as spent fuel.
- Solid waste assumptions include that WIPP will remain operational; shipping containers and resources will be provided; the T Plant will be used to package remote handled (RH) waste; and the Yucca Mountain repository will open on time and be able to accept cesium and strontium capsules without treatment. Matt said these assumptions include treatment and disposal of the 15,000 cubic meters of potentially TRU legacy waste that has been stored at Hanford since 1970 and dealing with the backlog of 10,000 cubic meters of mixed low-level waste.
- Matt said the first assumption for the Groundwater Remediation Project (GRP), that no extensive remediation of deep vadose zone contamination on the Central Plateau will occur, is based on the lack of technical information available to approach remediation. When the breadth and depth of contamination in the vadose zone is understood, the baseline will be modified to include that remediation effort. Additional assumptions are that no new regulatory requirements will be imposed; groundwater remediation will be complete by 2024; and GRP activities and facilities will be expense-funded.
- For the Central Plateau, assumptions include demolishing buildings on the Central Plateau, with the exception of the PFP complex; that there will be no useful groundwater in the foreseeable future; that the site will be under federal control indefinitely; and active institutional control will be maintained through 2150. Additionally, Central Plateau assumptions account for infrastructure needs and list three remediation solutions for burial grounds: remove, treat and dispose (RTD); leave in place under monitored natural attenuation (MNA); or cover with an engineered barrier. Matt said the baseline will be changed once a decision is made, and the assumptions do not represent DOE's preferred alternative.
- River Corridor Closure Project (RCCP) assumptions include that the final records of decision (RODs) will confirm cleanup levels established in the mid-1990s by

¹ The list of DOE-RL assumptions was provided in a handout to the meeting participants. This same handout was previously provided to participants at the January 9, 2009 River and Plateau Committee meeting)

interim RODs; all reactors will be completed; and that most waste will meet Environmental Remediation Disposal Facility (ERDA) acceptance criteria.

- Assumptions for the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) include deactivation of the facility; and that the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC & WM EIS) will designate entombment as the end state for the FFTF.

Ben said DOE-ORP is currently re-evaluating its assumptions with its new contractor in terms of its system plan. Currently DOE-ORP has a one-year interim baseline in place. He said assumptions on supplemental treatment have changed, and the project execution plan (PEP) and assumptions will be revised as part of estimating and schedule development. The new system plan is underway, and the assumption set is being finalized.

Ben gave a presentation on DOE-ORP's FY 2010 Integrated Priority List (IPL), which reflects the approved baseline. He distributed a list of FY 2010 IPLs and a list of performance-based incentives for FY 2009, which he said is similar in scope to FY 2010. Tank operations, including the evaporator campaign, as well as maintenance and upgrades, are listed as DOE-ORP's top priorities. Ben said this correlates with the first incentivized item: reducing double shell tank (DST) volume through the operation of the 242-A Evaporator.

Ben reviewed the list of performance-based incentives (PBIs). The first six incentives relate to evaporator campaigns, and include double shell tank (DST) initiatives, upgrades to base operations, integrated safety management, and meeting state environmental requirements. The second set of PBIs, items 7 through 15, lists retrieval incentives such as C-100, which will start this week; creating a path forward for C-108 and C-109; removing hose-in-hose transfer lines; finishing and installing vadose zone barriers in Y Farm and X Farm; identifying a disposition path and risks for pipelines and tanks; and developing technology, including a robotic arm for C-111, ion-exchange testing and pretreatment technology. Ben said the retrieval incentives indicate a base incentive and a stretch incentive, which would require the project to receive additional funding.

Regulator Perspectives on Integrated Priority Lists

- Ron Skinnarland, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said Ben's statement about retrieving tanks efficiently by being able to begin a new retrieval as soon as the previous retrieval is complete is consistent with the technical staff's view. Ron said more money is needed, and he estimated an additional \$20 million per year for the next couple of years could help the program and keep crews working steadily throughout the retrieval process. Ron said Ecology's other priorities are operational-readiness testing for the vitrification facilities, safe storage of tank waste, incentivizing contractors to lower base operations costs, upgrading the tanks system for efficient feed to the vitrification plant, and identifying a preferred option for supplemental treatment technology. He said Ecology supports continuing to work with DOE to refine the IPL.

- Ron said regulators are focusing on finishing the river and making sure cleanup is finished by 2015. Items that still need to be addressed include K Basin sludge, decontamination and decommissioning (D & D) of PFP, continuing progress on soil sites, finishing TRU waste retrieval and shipments to WIPP, finding a solution for RH waste, starting remediation on the Central Plateau, and dealing with the backlog of TRU and mixed waste requiring treatment.
- Ron said for FY 2010 it would be helpful to have the budget broken down to ensure items such as infrastructure, tank contaminants, and compliance actions like hose-in-hose transfer lines are taken care of. Ecology is finishing a budget letter to DOE-RL, which will include four or five regulatory priorities for DOE-RL and DOE-ORP. Ron said he thinks it would be beneficial to have an IPL at the site that breaks projects into \$5, \$10 or \$20 million funding segments that could be started if funding were available.

Committee Discussion

- Susan Leckband asked how often risk-management plans are reviewed. Ben said these are reviewed quarterly.
- Keith Smith asked how partially irradiated fuel is produced, as defined in the PFP assumptions. Matt said this is fuel that was inside low-power fuel reactors and can be contact handled. Some of this is from FFTF and some is from various labs, but it is all spent fuel as defined by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA), and must go to Yucca Mountain. Pam Larsen said she thought FFTF fuel was going to Idaho. Matt said the material going to Idaho is not spent fuel, but sodium-bonded fuel that never went inside a reactor.
- Gerry asked whether full D & D is set to begin by FY 2011. Matt said the shipments to Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) and the ramp up of D & D workers is on schedule.
- Gerry said the PFP assumptions mention irradiated fuel and plutonium, and asked how the storage and treatment of mixed TRU or other waste generated as a result of these ties into the assumptions. Since the IPL shows \$63 million is unfunded for treatment of mixed waste in FY 2010, Gerry asked if this work would add to a major backlog of mixed waste. Matt said this would not add to a backlog because each project is responsible for treating and packaging its waste to meet acceptance criteria or disposal requirements. The cost for treatment of waste is included in each project. Gerry asked if assumptions for how much waste will be generated and the cost for treating are built into IPLs. Matt said there are estimates built into baselines to account for this.
- Bob Suyama asked where PFP falls in funding for FY 2010. Matt said most of it is funded within target for the 2010 budget, and some D & D is above target. He said he would like to do more D & D if funds are available.
- Gerry said DOE-RL's IPL shows that PFP program management is fully funded, D & D is near the cutoff, and necessary funding for D-4 activities is below the funding

line. He asked if DOE-RL will meet this milestone without additional funding. Matt said yes, they are on track to meet this milestone. The baseline was created two or three years ago and was conservative in its estimate. He said new efficiencies and the proposal from the plateau remediation contractor have reduced the project's costs.

- Regarding the K Basin closure assumptions, Maynard Plahuta asked whether T Plant has been determined to be technically feasible. Matt said T Plant has been analyzed for storage of sludge, and the baseline assumes there will be no technical issues that prevent it from being stored there. He said knock-out pot (KOP) sludge would probably be stored at the CSB with other spent fuel. Maynard asked the timeframe for K Basin being emptied, and Matt said this has not been determined, and an alternative analysis for meeting WIPP acceptance criteria is the next step for this project. Maynard asked whether T Plant could be modified to treat sludge. Matt said this is a possibility, depending on the size of the containers and the size of T Plant's receiving doors.
- Al Boldt said the K Basin assumptions infer sludge can go to WIPP without treatment, and asked why treatment and storage of sludge are being considered. Matt said the assumption is that sludge will be treated to meet WIPP acceptance criteria, as it needs to be a dry material. Al asked if there is a TPA milestone on this, and Matt said a series of milestones cover removal of sludge and treatment.
- Susan asked what the risk is for the solid waste assumption that Yucca Mountain will be able to accept cesium and strontium capsules for disposal. Matt said a performance assessment was conducted by Yucca Mountain three to four years ago, and the results were technically favorable. Susan asked whether the uncertainty of whether Yucca Mountain will open is assessed as a risk. Matt said there is a risk in the assumptions. Ben said the mitigation of this was assessed, as it created a higher cost due to building additional onsite storage.
- Gerry asked if solid waste needs to be in dry storage, and Matt said that it does.
- Pam said in the Tank Remediation System EIS the path forward for cesium and strontium was vitrification, and she asked if this assumption has been removed. Ben said the assumption is that WTP maintains the ability to process these materials if this is required.
- Al asked what treatment capacity would be available to handle solid waste. Matt said there is a small volume of mixed low-level waste that right now there is no capacity to treat. Al asked if this excludes N Reactor fuel, which may or may not be accepted by the repository. Matt said N reactor fuel makes up 80 percent of DOE's spent fuel inventory, and is in the EIS for Yucca Mountain under the assumption it will be disposed of there.
- Al said the integrated disposal facility (IDF) will open for the disposal of offsite waste, and asked if this can be modified depending on the forthcoming EIS. Matt said if the decision is made to accept offsite waste it would go to IDF no earlier than 2017, which should be clarified in this assumption. Gerry said the permit condition casts doubt on whether offsite waste can be accepted in the near future. He said a risk budget based on waste that would be generated on site would need to be completed.

- Maynard asked if the solid waste risk assessments have considered a situation in which pre-1970 waste would be addressed in the form of disposal. Matt said this is covered in the Central Plateau assumptions, as waste site remediation falls in RL-40's scope of work.
- Harold Heacock asked if there is a simple summary of what waste is going to stay on site and what will be shipped offsite. Matt said this is part of this project description, with spent fuel and high-level waste going to Yucca Mountain and TRU and low-level waste going to WIPP. Harold asked if this includes the assumption that no action will be taken on pre-1970 waste, and Matt said the assumption is that low-level burial grounds and their waste will remain disposed of.
- Maynard asked if any of the GRP assumptions relate to EM 20 funding and looking at new technologies. Matt said funding of new technology is not included in the assumptions.
- Pam asked if the assumption is that material removed from pump-and-treats will be grouted and buried. Matt said it is required that any waste that is generated is disposed of in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.
- Wade Riggsbee said now that the groundwater program for the Central Plateau has been launched, it seems that the 2024 completion date is a stretch. From a technical standpoint, 2-West seems underestimated, and a more realistic look may be required. Matt said this is possible, and assumptions can be changed based on information that is gathered during the next several years.
- Susan asked how often assumptions are reviewed and, since they are part of the PEP, whether some sections are reviewed more often. Matt said there is no formality in timing for reviewing assumptions, rather, it is done based on events. Ben used the example that supplemental treatment assumed bulk vitrification would be used, and the baseline assumptions will be looked at while doing the baseline change proposal for this.
- Gerry asked why the GRP included the assumption that a treatment facility would be expense funded, as this would avoid project management reviews and reporting, rather than capital funded. Gerry said this issue was brought up when discussing the demonstration bulk vitrification plant as being expense funded without the oversight of the project management system. Matt said expense funding lends flexibility. If GRP is appropriated by Congress as a separate project, it will have a set amount of money. Projects that are expense funded still go through same critical decision (CD) process to ensure design alternatives are evaluated before construction starts. Ben said DOE-ORP now goes through the same process for expense-funded projects, after bulk vitrification, to come up with decision points with the contractor. Matt said when the EM program began in the 1990s, the legislation said remediation projects could not be done with capital dollars. Susan said one positive aspect of having GRP expense funded is that it allows for flexibility of criteria that will be in place for aspects of the project such as the volume of materials

- Shelley Cimon asked what assumptions are tied to waste sites on top of deep vadose zone contamination. Matt said remediation of those waste sites is captured in RL-40, the Central Plateau assumptions.
- Gerry said having 20 waste sites undergoing remediation treatment and disposal on the Central Plateau creates a large budget liability. Matt said there is a contingency in the baseline to cover these remediation risks as part of the assumptions. Gerry said if a certain amount of funding by a certain time is necessary to meet the milestone, this results in a huge amount of contingency that needs to be funded. He asked whether this will be added into baselines when the process advances to Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) RODs. Matt said if a different remedy than the current assumptions is needed, the baseline will be modified to address impacts to budget, schedule and the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA).
- Maynard asked if infrastructure needs have to be capital funded. Matt said the amount of funding needed drives the approval process, and right now no infrastructure needs are large enough to be capital. Maynard asked if this is captured in a specific line item or whether it ends up as an overall emphasis. Matt said upgrades to infrastructure are covered by infrastructure reliability, and there is also a cost associated with infrastructure functions. Maynard said it seems like the flexibility of expense funding would be advantageous for some projects. He asked whether capital expenditures are included in RL-40, or whether it is all expense funding. Matt said capital funding is not factored into RL-40. For example, if a new fire station is needed, the budget would be changed and would need to be approved by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO).
- Keith said he is glad to see infrastructure in the Central Plateau assumptions, and, since reliability is a large issue, he asked whether assessments of infrastructure reliability are conducted. Matt said infrastructure is part of the mission support contract (MSC), and a major portion of that scope of work is to analyze infrastructure and determine needs to support cleanup.
- Gerry asked whether there is a contingency set that considers the cost of delaying major projects due to infrastructure malfunctioning, such as a water line breaking. Matt said he does not remember that detail in terms of risk contingency. He said the assumptions do not assume failure, as they are for factors outside of DOE's control, and projects should be managed to avoid failure.
- Pam asked whether RL-40 maintains funding for the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) Training Facility, what the status is for the continuing resolution for funding for HAMMER, and how the needs for 2010 are being evaluated. Matt said approximately the same amount is being spent on HAMMER in 2008 as in 2009. For 2010, he said he is not sure of the exact numbers, but the same funding level for activities like support effort and training is being maintained.
- For the RCCP assumption that final RODs will confirm interim RODs, Al asked whether this excludes reactors, as these will be studied later and a separate decision

will be made. Matt said this is correct. Al suggested this be clarified in the assumption.

- Maynard referred to the RCCP assumption that no new technologies will be required to execute the project work scope, and asked for this to be clarified. Matt said in terms of removing waste sites and burial grounds and demolishing facilities, current technologies will continue to work. Maynard asked if this meant new technologies would not be applied. Matt said new technologies will be applied, but their application will not be required.
- Pam asked which PBS includes D & D of buildings on Rattlesnake Mountain. Matt said this is captured in RL-40. There is not an assumption on this, because it is in the baseline to remove those facilities.
- Wade said Natural Resource Damage Assessments (NRDA) should be factored into the assumption list. Matt said he did not think this was an assumption one way or the other. Shelley said there has been talk at a national level of doing these assessments at the beginning of the process. Matt said these assessments are conducted under DOE-RL, but the costs for damages are not under any baseline. Gerry said that is a policy issue that needs to be flagged. Matt said he thinks this is an EM liability in terms of potential government liability. He said he is unsure how to capture this legal requirement in a baseline. Shelley suggested putting it in the baseline as ways to address topics to fulfill this.
- Gerry asked if the assumption that no regulatory requirements requiring additional activities was done before the 300 Area CERCLA five-year review. Matt said this was done at about the same time as the review, and he does not know if there were any changes as a result.
- Regarding the FFTF assumptions, Al asked whether DOE-ORP will accept sodium hydroxide the way it is produced. He asked if DOE-RL and DOE-ORP are working together to determine how much volume will be generated. Matt said he does not know if this has been decided. Ben said the two options were Idaho and Hanford, and the assumption for cost and schedule purposes is that Hanford will take it. Matt said he will have to follow up with the committee members on the WTP baseline.
- Gerry asked if the TWC can look at DOE-ORP's new system plan and assumptions. Ben said this has been done in the past.
- Al said it appears the tank farm schedule has been driven by the retrieval schedule, and these assumptions are driving the schedule past 2050. He said these should be delineated well enough to show whether a different set of assumptions could accelerate the schedule. Ben said retrieval is what drove the duration last time because of technological considerations.
- Gerry asked whether C-104 on DOE-RL's priority list for FY 2009 is not funded to completion unless additional funding is provided, and Ben said this is correct. Gerry asked what additional funding would be needed. Ben said he could provide the estimated dollars. Gerry said he is not sure how the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) can create funding recommendations if it is not clear how much more is

needed. Ben said DOE-ORP is in the middle of putting together the one-year baseline for FY 2010.

- Maynard asked if completing the retrieval of C-104 is included in the FY 2010 budget, and Ben confirmed that it is. Maynard asked how much money is needed per tank. Ben said \$15 to \$20 million is needed for each retrieval. Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP, said it is not just a money question for C-104, as work needs to be done on tank farms to enable retrieval. He said incentives are structured so the contractor can get the work done more cheaply and more quickly, but there is no guarantee that additional funding will get C-104 done this year. C-111 is the next tank, and the technological development for the mechanical arm that will be used for this is already being funded.
- Maynard asked what additional funding for tank retrieval could be used for. Ben said there are infrastructure problems when there are too many tanks pumping at the same time, but extra money could go toward procurement, which would set up the next retrieval.
- Keith said retrieval seems to depend on the amount of materials that can be put into DSTs. He asked what the progress is on this issue. Ben said all of the C Farm tanks can be retrieved with the current amount of DST space, but the tanks after that need to be considered. Keith asked what engineering and activity costs are required to ensure the safety of DSTs. Ben said the hydrogen models are too conservative, and by proving that it is possible to add to the liquid ratio, space will be gained.
- Keith said it would be helpful to know how much of the total cost of cleanup would be saved if additional funding were available immediately. Maynard commented that moving forward with cleanup projects would greatly reduce base operations costs.

Fiscal Year 2010 and Funding Priorities

Pam reviewed the list of funding priorities identified by the TWC at its January 7, 2009 meeting.

Primary TWC funding priorities are:

- Creating a strategic systems engineering model, which refers to a high-level, overarching capstone process to look at Hanford as a system and identify efficiencies.
- Solving the issue of sodium resolution of waste streams and its impact on the WTP's functioning.
- The retrieval of at least two tanks per year.
- Starting the WTP, including the CSB and Hanford Shipping Facility (HSF). A shipping facility for high-level vitrified glass will be needed, as these materials must be shipped to Yucca Mountain by rail. The previous plan was to put this glass in the two unfinished bays of CSB, but the cost of building a new facility with shipping capabilities and the capacity for long-term storage is close to the cost of finishing CSB.
- Increasing evaporator capacity, which is critical to all tank farm operations.

- Evaluating the Interim Pretreatment System (IPS) and starting early low-activity waste (LAW) treatment. TWC believes further analysis of interim pretreatment capabilities is needed, and the committee is concerned a secondary law plant would be late.
- Beginning the authorization process for supplemental treatment options, including treatment of secondary waste.

Secondary priorities identified by TWC are:

- Increasing in additional funding, if available, through locked and loaded contingency options).
- Increasing DST space.
- Upgrading infrastructure.
- Upgrading evaporators.

The committee also reviewed funding priorities identified by the River and Plateau committee (RAP) at its January 8, 2009 meeting. Maynard clarified that the list of specific funding priorities was generated through a brainstorming exercise, and that before the committee finished this, they decided instead to develop a list of general priority funding principles. Therefore, the list of specific projects should not be considered complete.

RAP funding priorities are:

- Supporting the resumption of full TRU retrieval and treatment to meet TPA milestone (M) 91-42.
- Supporting RH capability to address 618-10 and 618-11.
- Packaging, treatment and size reduction of RH TRU waste to meet M 91.
- Preventing infrastructure – rail, roads, etc. – that is already in place from further deterioration to maintain a viable system.
- Supporting complete funding of NRDA, ensuring it is not separated or split between funded and non-funded areas.
- ZP-1 pump-and-treat system.
- Groundwater and vadose zone characterization.

RAP also identified a list of more general priority funding principles, which are:

- Retrieve and treat all TRU waste.
- Get off the river.
- Avoid a bias for action by funding projects that get things done on the ground.
- Maintain infrastructure to support all site functions.

Regulator Perspectives

- Ron said a multi-year IPL is needed to help guide the discussion of priorities. In addition, he said the goal of a stimulus package is to fund work that can be instantly completed, and the priorities should emphasize on-the-ground cleanup work.

Committee Discussion

- Pam said she has no idea how much resolving the technical issue of sodium would cost. Gerry asked if this is currently being funded, and whether recommending funding could be put forward as advice. Ben said a sodium-management strategy through 2011 is currently being funded as part of a pretreatment engineering platform that came out of the expert panel.
- Harold recommended drafting broad advice that does not assign specific dollar amounts to priorities. Gerry said he feels the Board should provide justification for the funding request, which he said would need an initial estimate of what could be purchased for a set amount of money. Al said it is also important to state the result of additional funding, such as an earlier completion date or a broader scope of work, and the Board should recommend what should be accelerated.
- Maynard said concentrating on priorities, such as recommending that projects be started earlier, would be beneficial since the goal is to complete the cleanup as soon as possible. He does not think the Board has enough information to include specifics. Gerry said he feels the Board should give a specific dollar amount. Pam suggested also indicating how many jobs additional funding would create.
- Gerry asked whether RAP identified ZP-1 pump-and-treat because it was a missed milestone for 2009-2010. Maynard said RAP did not look exclusively at missed milestones.
- Pam said priorities for DOE-RL should be to clean up the river and accelerate cleanup of the Central Plateau. She identified preparing for WTP startup and retrieving tank waste as DOE-ORP priorities, and she recommended the Board provide general priorities, as it is not in a position to validate the details.
- Gerry suggested issuing advice on the need for a multi-year IPL, as the Board's ability to give advice on priorities is limited without one. Ben said DOE-ORP's IPL does not align with its priorities because these are captured in out-years. He said the baseline in place has legitimate estimates, and he can provide the cost of specific priorities.
- Pam asked if DOE-HQ had asked for information it could use in the event it received additional funding. Ben said yes, but this document is in its infancy and he cannot share it with the committee. He gave a general list of items included in this document, including: upgrades to infrastructure, job creation, additional retrieval, evaporator upgrades, laboratory upgrades, and evaluating mixing capacities and mixing systems that need upgrades for feed delivery to WTP. He said this document will go to DOE-HQ for review, so these priorities are tentative. Keith asked if evaporator upgrades would create additional capacity. Ben said the upgrades would focus on maintenance issues such as ventilation and sanitary drain problems.
- Gerry said funding for sodium resolution through 2011 is a priority that could be recommended. Keith said no technology has been selected for this. Gerry agreed, but said a system will need to be implemented for this issue. Ben said the size of the supplemental treatment plant will be based on the amount of sodium, and DOE will

need to understand capacity needs so it does not oversize the plant. Pam asked if improving waste loading could be included in the sodium resolution recommendation. Ben said waste loading is a separate activity, and DOE is currently funding Catholic University to study this. He said a plan has been developed for EM 20 cooperation, and he can find out whether this can be released.

- Pam suggested calling the advice economic stimulus advice, rather than 2010 advice. Gerry said it should also be included that this ties in with DOE's proposal to shrink the footprint.
- Shelley said the advice should address the issue of reducing uncertainty by better understanding issues such as sodium, as this is a way to ensure success.
- Pam said the Board's recommendations should also address protecting the Columbia River. Gerry said many of RAP's recommendations go a step beyond protecting the river by also focusing on stopping groundwater contamination.
- Gerry brought up the issue of highly contaminated facilities, which can cost \$50 million each year to maintain. Harold suggested prioritizing cleanup of highly contaminated facilities such as PFP to save money and reduce risk.
- Shelley said advancing scientific understanding and addressing engineering solutions should also be priorities. She suggested starting with principles, then asking Ben to provide dollar amounts for specific projects.
- Gerry asked if the list of incentives is based only on one year. Steve said during the transition Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) made a one-year baseline, and the incentives are based on this and DOE-ORP's priorities. He said a system plan, the technical basis for a lifecycle baseline, will be completed in March, and the lifecycle baseline should be completed by the end of June. The plateau remediation schedule has a similar timeframe.
- The following principles for the draft advice were captured on flip chart and will be incorporated by Harold as he prepares the first draft of the advice.

Advice Principles – 2010-2012

- Priorities if additional funding becomes available
 - ORP/RL
 - \$5,\$10 or \$20 million chunks by activity areas
- Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) doesn't have the detail to go here.
- Identify if activities are being started earlier than planned, and the potential benefits of this.
- Identify, generally, what "they" would get for the money.
- Reinforces the need for a multi-year IPL with specific dollar amounts.
- "Beyond our 2009 funding advice, if additional funding should become available through economic stimulus, here is what we think should be funded..."
 - Also fits with the proposal to shrink the footprint.
 - Protect the Columbia River.
 - Stop the spread of Groundwater contamination.

- Decontaminate and remove contaminated facilities to save funding and reduce risk (e.g., PFP).
- Accelerate cleanup to reduce long-term cost (surveillance and maintenance costs).
- Advance scientific understanding and address engineering solutions.

Gerry asked Ben to identify where he would prioritize additional funding for ORP if it were to materialize. Ben offered the following general project areas:

- Upgrades to infrastructure
- Additional retrieval
- Evaporator upgrades (corrective)
- Laboratory upgrades
- Accelerate feed delivery systems

Action Items / Commitments

- Harold will write a first draft of the advice by January 23. Susan will distribute it to the committee.
- A call was schedule for Monday January 26 at 11 a.m., including BCC and HAB members who attended the January 20 meeting.
- Following the call, Susan will send a revised draft to the committee, with the goal of finalizing the advice by Wednesday, January 28.
- Harold was assigned as the Issue Manager. He will present the advice to the Full Board, along with RAP and TWC representatives
- Future topics:
 - Contractor work plans, tentatively available in June.
 - Review of President's budget. (March)

Handouts

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

- Project Assumptions, DOE-RL, November 2007.
- BCC Framing Questions on Baseline Assumptions, Keith Smith, January 20, 2009.
- TWC and RAP Funding Priorities, January 20, 2009.
- FY 2011 Budget Timeline, DOE-EM, January 20, 2009.
- DOE-ORP incentive list, DOE-ORP, January 20, 2009.
- River Protection Priority List: FY 2010, DOE-RL, January 20, 2009.
- Priorities for Cleanup, DOE-ORP, January 20, 2009.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Pam Larsen	Gerry Pollet
Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Wade Riggsbee
Harold Heacock	Maynard Plahuta	Bob Suyama

Others

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Ed Reverb, City of Richland
Matt McCormick, DOE-RL	Annette Carlsen, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Pete Furlong, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Molly Jensen, EnviroIssues
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP		Michelle Gerber, Flour Hanford
Ben Harp, DOE-ORP		Earl Fordham, Washington State Department of Health
Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP		