

# FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

## HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

December 4 – 5, 2008

Richland, WA

### Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary.....	1
Welcome, Introductions and Announcements .....	2
Confirm September Meeting Summary Adoption.....	3
Hanford Site Contracts .....	3
Tank Waste System Plan .....	10
Advanced Mixed Waste Processing Facility .....	12
Baseline Workshop.....	13
FY 2009 Site Funding and Missed TPA Milestones .....	15
HAB Issue Manager Training.....	17
Agency Updates .....	19
Strategic Public Involvement Planning Workshop.....	24
Committee Reports.....	25
Public Comment .....	27
Board Business .....	27

*This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.*

### **Executive Summary**

#### **Board Action**

The Board adopted three pieces of advice regarding: 1) Tank waste system planning and integration, 2) Hanford baselines and baseline workshop, and 3) Fiscal Year 2009 funding and missed milestones.

#### **Board Business**

The Board received typical updates, including Tri-Party Agreement agency updates and committee updates. The Board will have committee calls and meetings in December and January and will meet in February. There is a Committee of the Whole meeting on budgets and baselines on December 11.

#### **Hanford Site Contractors**

The Board heard presentations from CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company and Washington River Protection Solutions about work scopes, priorities, integration plans, and safety program implementations.

#### **Advanced Mixed Waste Processing Facility**

The Board learned about Idaho's Advanced Mixed Waste Processing Facility and potential effects on Hanford waste treatment and disposal.

#### **Public Involvement Strategic Planning Workshop**

The Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) described the public involvement strategic planning workshop and next steps.

#### **Public comment**

No public comment was given.

## **HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

*December 4-5, 2008 Richland, WA*

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force) and Board Chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) to order. The meeting was open to the public and offered ongoing opportunities for public comment.

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are members of the public.

Three seats were not represented: Hanford Workforce (Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council), Regional Environmental/Citizen (Columbia Riverkeeper), and Ex-Officio (Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation).

### **Welcome, Introductions and Announcements**

Susan welcomed the Board to Richland and noted that the meeting was moved from November to December to accommodate the development of advice.

Paula Call is the new Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) federal coordinator to the Board. Susan Avery, DOE-RL, is the new HAB travel coordinator. Steve Pfaff is the new co-designated deputy federal official for the Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP).

Steve said he is happy to have the opportunity to work with the Board. He noted yesterday DOE issued a Preliminary Notice of Violation to Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI) for nuclear safety violations at Hanford. Steve said the violations occurred during the procurement and fabrication of piping and the development of project specifications. The proposed penalty is \$385,000, which is based on the significance of the violations and considers mitigation efforts toward correction. More information is available on the DOE website ([www.hanford.gov](http://www.hanford.gov)).

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), introduced Karen Bowman, a new alternate for Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Susan confirmed the HAB 2009 meeting schedule.

### **2009 HAB meeting schedule**

February 5-6, 2009	Kennewick, Washington
April 2-3, 2009	Portland, Oregon
June 4-5, 2009	Tri-Cities, Washington
September 3-4, 2009	Seattle, Washington
November 5-6, 2009	Tri-Cities, Washington

Susan also mentioned a Committee of the Whole meeting on budgets and baselines is scheduled for December 11.

Board meeting goals include:

- Receive a briefing from the CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) and Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) on their scope of work, priorities, integration plans and safety program implementation.
- Discuss draft advice on tank waste system planning and integration from the Tank Waste Committee (TWC).
- Discuss draft advice on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 funding and missed Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones from the Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC).
- Discuss draft advice regarding the baseline workshop.
- Receive a presentation on the Advanced Mixed Waste Processing Facility in Idaho.

- Debrief the Strategic Planning Workshop by the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC).
- Conduct HAB issue manager training.

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

### **Confirm September Meeting Summary Adoption**

Board members did not submit any substantive changes to the September meeting summary. The September meeting summary was finalized and adopted over email within the new charter requirement of 45 days after the meeting. Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, reported the process seemed to be working, but asked Board members to contact EnviroIssues if there are ways to improve.

The adopted September summary was confirmed.

### **Hanford Site Contracts**

#### ***Vic Pizzuto, CHPRC chief operating officer***

Vic presented information on CHPRC contract scope and FY 2009 planned accomplishments.

CHPRC's project mission is to decommission and remediate the Central Plateau, 100 K Area, and site groundwater, including:

- 100 K Area remediation, sludge treatment and reactor interim safe storage
- Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) closure
- Groundwater/vadose zone remediation project
- Groundwater, soil, and facility regulatory decision/other documents
- Facility, waste site, and canyon remediation
- Transuranic (TRU) waste retrieval, treatment and disposal, and fuels management
- Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) near-term shutdown activities
- Facility and waste site minimum-safe/surveillance and maintenance

Vic said CHPRC created priorities after listening to as many people as possible from DOE, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), Oregon and more. Vic quickly reviewed a list of priorities that support DOE's 2015 Vision, not in ranked order:

- Sludge treatment project
- Groundwater remediation
- 100 K Area remediation
- PFP decommissioning
- Zone closures and canyons decommissioning
- Waste sites and soils remediation
- Facility decommissioning and mortgage reduction
- FFTF surveillance and maintenance
- Low-level mixed waste treatment
- TRU waste retrieval

Vic described CHPRC's fundamental tenets that support priorities. Safety and compliance is essential, and Vic said management in the field is important to CHPRC. He said they are moving hundreds of people from Richland to the field. Vic said it is important to challenge the status quo, be innovative and test other approaches.

Vic emphasized CHPRC must partner with DOE and the regulators. With DOE and the regulators, CHPRC will establish site-decision strategies, streamline regulatory document process, and create the critical elements of the Central Plateau end state vision. For groundwater, CHPRC has a process optimization tool that matches technologies to cleanup problems to identify an optimal technology. In addition, Vic said CHPRC will:

- Remove special nuclear material
- Use an integrated approach to zone closure for canyon facilities, soils and groundwater
- Apply lessons learned from Europe to point of generation waste management
- Integrate with other site contractors to achieve site-wide river protection goals and objects; Vic said CHPRC knows they are not alone, and will integrate with River Corridor work, tank farms and interface with the Mission Support Contract (MSC) contractor

Vic said CHPRC's regulatory strategy includes building consensus around a Central Plateau short-term and end state vision. Vic said there has been a lot of characterization and they would like to proceed with remediation. CHPRC will also standardize and integrate decisions, which is important to avoid duplicate work. Vic said another key is the Central Plateau remediation decision approach; there are many choices and questions, such as should cleanup proceed based on risk or geographic area. He said they want to identify a process.

CHPRC safety programs:

- Maintain Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) flags and support 100K area assessment
- Integrated Safety Management Systems (ISMS) Phase I verification and Phase II preparations (on track for Phase I ISMS verification this year)
- Obtain ISO-14000 Certification ready by 2010 (starting process this year)
- Implement new processes:
  - Safety Analysis Center (complete) – example: daily morning manager's call
  - Executive Safety Review Board (complete)
  - Hazard Review Board (complete) – project level, chaired by a vice-president
  - Technical Response Team (complete) – employees can call any time and expect a response
- Consolidate processes and procedures
  - Centralize
  - Streamline
- Revise safety basis documents within 12 months

Vic went through a number of detailed slides on FY 2009 planned accomplishments.

PPF:

- Maintain surveillance and maintenance
- Complete 3013 and Hanford un-irradiated fuel package (HUFP) shipments
- Ready slightly irradiated fuel for transfer to Canister Storage Building (CSB)
- Finalize source and standards disposition plan
- Ramp up decontamination and decommissioning (D&D)
  - Close laboratory and initiate deactivation
  - Document and execute D&D strategy
  - Procure D&D equipment
  - Decontaminate, dismantle and remove glove boxes
- Finalize HVAC and utilities back-out plan
  - CHPRC knows how to do this well and sequence with activities below. Vic said the sequence is key to maintaining safety and getting the job done well.
- Finalize holdup/material disposition plan
- Finalize cold and dark process development
- Finalize chemical characterization and initiate reduction

100K project:

- Maintain surveillance and maintenance
- Facility operations to support sludge treatment project (will sample this year)
- Establish cold and dark program
- Perform K West Basin debris removal
- Perform deactivation
  - One sedimentation basin, hose-in-hose
- Complete K East Basin substructure demolition (ongoing)

- Complete structure demolition
  - 1706KE/KER/KEL, eight mobile offices (already took down one building, seven left)
- Initiate K East Basin substructure waste site remediation
  - 116KE-3, UPR-100K-1
- Initiate K East Reactor interim safe storage (ISS)

Waste fuels and management; projects to meet DOE, CHPRC and site needs:

- Canister Storage Building security upgrades
  - Complete construction of security upgrades and commence implementation of Interim Storage Area activities for PFP fuels
- Mixed low-level waste treatment
  - 7800 cubic meters cumulative shipped of mixed low-level waste
  - 7600 cubic meters cumulative treatment/disposition of mixed low-level waste
  - 600 cubic meters cumulative shipped of large and remote-handled mixed low-level waste
  - 450 cubic meters cumulative treatment/disposition
  - 130 cubic meters of mixed low-level waste
- CHPRC waste retrieval operations
  - 10700 cubic meters cumulative
- Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Certification
- Complete characterization of 200 cubic meters TRU waste
  - Prepare drums for possible future shipment to Idaho (1000 drums are ready to ship to Idaho in case WIPP does not open)
  - Repackage TRU waste at T Plant
  - Place Waste Receiving and Processing Facility (WRAP) into shipping-ready status

Soil and water remediation – groundwater and vadose zone:

- River Corridor remediation pump and treat/expansion (KR-4 , NR-2, HR-3)
- River Corridor Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) work plans
- ZP-1 and soil vapor extraction remediation (for carbon tetrachloride)
- Drilling and monitoring to support reporting, investigation, and expansions
- Deep vadose zone treatability test
- Modutank replacement/closure

Decontamination and decommissioning (D&D):

- Maintain surveillance and maintenance for waste sites and facilities
- U Zone closure – Vic said they will focus on U Plant until it is done
  - Procure D&D/remediation equipment
  - D&D U Plant ancillary structures
  - U Plant Cell 30 tank contents removal design/procurement
- Facility D&D/remediation
  - 272/277W facilities demolition (start 272 soon)
  - Other facilities D&D
  - Asbestos abatement
- 200 North Facilities D&D and waste site sampling
- 200 N waste sites characterization/closeout
- Waste disposal
- Plan/construct on-site construction and debris landfill
- Closure services
- Vic noted they are waiting on final plan for other D&D activities

Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF):

- Maintain surveillance and maintenance for FFTF complex; Vic noted they have only 10 people working at FFTF
- Transition FFTF
  - Install surveillance and maintenance electrical systems
  - Remove and disposition remaining PCB transformers
  - Upgrade fire detection panels

- Shutdown balance of FFTF systems and transfer custody of FFTF facilities
- Shutdown FFTF support buildings
- Transfer custody of FFTF facilities
- Prepare FFTF surveillance and maintenance plan

Engineering, procurement and construction projects:

- Sludge treatment project
  - Selected alternative and established a new baseline – Vic briefly described the “poster child” conference held with EPA, Ecology, Department of Defense, DOE and more. He said it is a huge step to now have a chosen path, given the huge intellectual and emotional investment
  - Sampling containerized sludge complete
  - Start retrieval of settler sludge
  - Knock out pot retrieval design completed
  - Cold vacuum drying facility in hot standby
- Interim storage area upgrade construction complete
- Out-year line item projects reviewed and alternatives analysis started
- Groundwater projects identified and base-lined
- General plant projects identified and controlled

***Bill Johnson, WRPS president***

Bill said he was happy to talk with the Board again about WRPS contract scope, FY 2009 work plans, integration activities and safety program implementation. WRPS is a company formed between URS and Energy Solutions with Areva as an integrated subcontractor.

The overall WRPS contract is \$7.1 billion over ten years (a five-year base period with options to extend up to another five years). The total includes Hanford and legacy benefits/pension costs. FY 2009 continuing resolution funding for the entire tank farm project is \$288 million. Of that, WRPS has \$247 million for FY 2009. Bill said they prioritized additional FY 2009 work should additional funding become available.

Bill said WRPS is focused on risk elimination and reduction.

The contract scope is divided into six major areas:

1. Base operations (includes project support)
2. Single-shell tank retrieval and closure
3. WTP support
  - Bill said WTP support primarily involves integration activities, looking at waste sites and the ultimate destination at WTP and beyond. As they transfer waste from tank to tank, they evaluate the waste mixture that WTP will have to process.
4. Supplemental treatment (not yet part of FY 2009 activities)
5. Early Low Activity Waste (LAW) facility startup (not yet part of FY 2009 activities)
6. Pension and welfare plans (managing legacy benefit plans from Rocky Flats)

Base operations contract scope:

- Safe, compliant operations (all efforts associated with retrieval and transfer of waste from single-shell tanks to double-shell tanks)
  - Maintenance/operations of farms, 242-A Evaporator and other infrastructure
  - Bill said this work ensures they maintain tank capacity and transfer correct volumes
- Analytical laboratory support (critical for other contractors, too)
  - Operation of 222-S Lab complex to support Hanford needs (Hanford’s primary lab)
- Project support
  - Environmental safety, health, and quality assurance (ESH&Q), engineering, workforce resources, project integration, business operations

Base operations FY 2009 work plan:

- Double-shell tank waste management
  - Two evaporator campaigns (will expand to three campaigns)

- Series of waste transfers
  - Space evaluation
- Single-shell and double-shell tank integrity
  - Expert panel
- Facility/tank farms upgrades
  - 222-S, 242-A
- ISMS Phase 1 and 2 verification
- Surveillance, monitoring and preventive maintenance activities to ensure tank farms are maintained safely
  - Bill said WRPS managers are in the field with the workforce, a strategic decision designed to better ensure a safer workforce.

Single-shell tank retrieval and closure contract scope:

- Retrieval and transfer of waste from single-shell tanks to double-shell tanks or treatment systems
  - Bill said there are 149 single-shell tanks containing a mixture of liquid, sludge and salt cake. He said liquid has been removed and they are looking at new technologies to assist retrievals.
- Waste management area closure activities in accordance with site integrated closure strategies and regulatory commitments
  - Managing cold test facility
  - Working on vadose zone including sampling (with CHPRC)

Single-shell tank retrieval and closure FY 2009 work plan:

- Complete retrieval of tank C-110; initiate retrieval of tank C-104; initiate design of tank C-111
  - Bill said they will resume work on C-110 in January and complete it in early to mid-summer 2009; they will work on C-104 when C110 is done
- Design and begin procurement of robotic arm
  - Robotic arm will be used in conjunction with multiple technologies and allow tank work without the need to go in and out of tanks. It should be ready at the beginning of fall 2009; Bill noted that C-111 will be the first tank to use the robotic arm.
  - The arm can aid in bulk waste retrieval and sluicing (tanks C-110 and C-104), potential hard heel removal and mechanical and chemical cleaning (C-111), and post-retrieval sampling and analysis
  - Bill noted that low liquid usage protects the environment, and aids in inventory management and feed material preparation
- Continue vadose zone work for barrier sites in TY and SX tank farms
- Remove hose-in-hose transfer lines
- Remove liquids from 244-CR Vault and UX-302A Catch Tank

WTP support and contract scope:

- Treatment planning, waste feed delivery and preparing for WTP transition
  - Looking forward to integrated system planning for DOE-ORP mission and delivery of waste feed to WTP
  - Bill said they are “building the workforce of the future”
- WTP operational readiness
  - Verify readiness for safe and efficient turnover of completed WTP facilities
  - Building workforce capability so WTP is ready to operate
- Immobilized high-level waste storage and shipping facility construction

WTP support FY 2009 work plan:

- Re-establish Hanford Tank Waste Operation Simulator model configuration management and update system
  - Bill said it is a rigorous model validation, and they need to increase the efficiency of the model’s operation; it should be complete by the end of the year
- Update River Protection Project System Plan
- Develop Strategic Management Plan for waste feed delivery and double-shell tank upgrades
- Update waste transfer plan to support base operations (to fit into overall integrated schedule)

Bill described FY 2009 progress-to-date:

- Completed AN-106 pump collar mock-up to support C-110 retrieval
- Completed electrical preventive maintenance outages (across entire tank farm)
- Ramped up C-104 project team (design activities in place; will follow C-110 retrieval)
- Reduced Hanford Tank Waste Operations Simulator runtime by half (completed verification and validation and have improved efficiency)
- Nearing completion of 242-A Evaporator condenser room decontamination
  - Bill said they collaborated with the workforce and came to the conclusion to perform decontamination before starting other campaigns (start overall campaigns in spring 2009)

Integration with other Hanford contractors:

- Stronger commitment to more efficient and effective integration and interface management
  - Each new contract has common set of interface requirements focused on cost-effectiveness; Bill said they have clear points of contact for each contractor
- Welding services (common welding programs)
- Hoisting and rigging services [working with Project Hanford Management Contract (PHMC)]
- Contaminated equipment disposal [working with Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) and the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility (ERDF) to expand capability]
- Dosimetry services [working with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL)]
- Biological controls (working with PRC, PHMC, and the River Corridor Project; Bill said there are legacy contamination issues)
- Vadose zone and ground water (integrated with CHPRC)

Bill reviewed WRPS' safety efforts:

- WRPS will continue to focus on tank vapors
  - Support Hanford Concerns Council independent expert panel review of recent data
  - Refocus Chemical Vapors Solution Team
  - Apply new information and communicate extensively to employees; encourage worker involvement
- ISMS verification
- Safety Basis improvements (updating Safety Basis documentation and administrative controls)
- VPP and Safety Assurance Plan activities (will maintain commitment to VPP Star Status)
- Site-wide lockout/tagout and beryllium program implementation (e.g. at tank farms)
- Worker involvement in safety initiatives (principle thrust: "want people going home safely")
- 1.2 million hours without a lost-time injury (testament to the workforce)

### *Discussion*

Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), asked Bill what major challenges WRPS has faced and what they need help with. He said he heard from the workforce that there is less overtime available, which is a point of discontent. He asked if WRPS planned to hire more people. Bill said their primary challenge was to lay out the overall implementation plan for the scope and establish a baseline. They will continue to refine the baseline with all FY 2009 delivery schedules by the end of the month. Regarding overtime, Bill said there was a lot of work at the end of the prior contract and they knew to expect a transition period. He said overtime worked its way up to high levels during the end of the last contract and management knew transition would take a toll on people. Bill said they wanted to reduce the level of overtime to ensure no ground was lost in safety. He said they are now looking at reasonable, sustainable and manageable levels of overtime.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), commented that congressional delegations are working to increase DOE-Environmental Management (DOE-EM) funding as part of the economic stimulus package. She asked for more detail about what they would do if they received additional funding in the next couple months. Bill said all of WRPS' effort will focus on tank retrieval and closure. Vic said CHPRC would use additional funding on waste site remediation first. After that, they would restore full operations for TRU waste retrieval, then groundwater wells and new technologies, and more PFP crews.

Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, asked about the total project scope of \$7.1 billion and the annual budget of \$288 million – how bad is the budget shortfall? Bill said the \$288 million does not include the legacy

pension and benefits costs (~\$100 million) from Rocky Flats. Bill also noted that the 10-year, \$7.1 billion profile was always an increasing budget per year, particularly as integration between tank farms and WTP happens as a result of WTP completion and readiness; the \$7.1 billion is “back-end loaded” in the last five years of the contract.

Mike said he was glad to see the WTP operational readiness review. He encouraged WRPS to examine the procurement process and functional requirements for equipment (e.g. functional requirements and lifetimes of components for pumps). Bill thought that was a good observation that speaks to the importance of integration between design and operation activities.

Mike said a systems approach is very important; he is interested in more information on the criteria applied to systems for selection process, especially considering the impacts from secondary waste streams. Mike also said a full blood test is needed for all people who work with beryllium; beryllium allergies are fatal to the 3% who are allergic to it.

Mike asked for more information on the chosen alternative for sludge treatment. Vic clarified that CHPRC has a preferred recommendation that it still has to submit to DOE, who will approve or disapprove early next year. He thinks there is conceptual agreement, but no treatment alternative has been selected yet. Doug Shoop, DOE-RL, added that DOE would like to talk with the Board about that in more detail soon.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), said the Board has been supportive of new technology development and it sounds like there is now a broad “tool belt” for retrieving sludge and saltcake from Hanford’s tanks. Are there still types of waste that do not have good retrieval technology? Bill said they are getting to a full suite of technology capabilities, with the development of over a dozen new technologies over the past decade. He said they are to a point where the effectiveness of some of those technologies has diminished. He is hopeful that the technologies they are preparing to deploy will round out the suite. Bill noted that is the benefit of the robotic arm – it is easy to add focused technology capability with a single delivery system.

Doug Mercer, University of Washington (University), asked how CHPRC’s approach toward cleaning up the 100 Area and Central Plateau is different from previous approaches. He asked for more information on optimizing groundwater remediation methods. Doug also asked how trustees are incorporated into decisions and what it means to approach Central Plateau remediation based on risk or geography.

Moses Jaraysi, CHPRC environmental programs and regulatory management, said their approach to the decision process on the Central Plateau is changing because work on the Central Plateau is transitioning from a characterization phase to a decision-making process, and CHPRC will look at the site in general. Instead of looking at operable units that grouped sites by type and are scattered all over the plateau, DOE is looking at remediating on a geographic basis because it could make more sense, operationally. He noted a zone structure will help dissect the plateau into logical areas so they can start closing sites. He said the first zone will be the U Zone (U Plant). In terms of how they achieve risk assessment integration, Moses said they will not only create a geographically-based system, but they will need to integrate decisions in each zone. For example, Moses said they will have to look at source units and groundwater to ensure they do not make isolated decisions. Regarding Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) and the trustees, Moses said CHPRC is meeting with different stakeholders and tribal nations, but have not visited with all of them yet. Moses said they have to take stakeholder and tribal values into account when they make decisions.

Doug asked if DOE has to make a NRDA decision before CHPRC is able to work with the trustees. Doug Shoop said DOE is committed to working with the trustees and anticipates complete injury assessments by 2015. He said it is challenging because they cannot stop remediation while they figure out what site restoration looks like. Doug thought it might be justifiable to go forward with remediation options without full understanding of restoration so that it may lead to greater restoration and cost. He thought DOE needs to think about potential costs and liabilities under NRDA. Doug Shoop said that is why injury assessment is so important.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen) hoped contractors and DOE will come prepared to the Committee of the Whole meeting to discuss how contracts and work scopes are incentivized and prioritized. He said it is hard to see how the enormous amounts of work stacks up against

missed milestones, and how DOE chooses which milestones to fund and which not to fund. Gerry said he wants to hear more about why Hanford cleanup funds are being spent on Rocky Flats legacy costs. He said the rest of the country will think those dollars are going to Hanford cleanup. Steve Pfaff said the Rocky Flats and Mound legacy costs do not come out of river protection funding. Gerry said he wants to see more information on how it is appropriated and managed. He also wants to see more information about contractor management costs and if project management funding could be better used to fund cleanup to meet milestones.

Susan Kreid, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked what kind of management tools the contractors will use to “keep their heads up” and re-strategize and re-prioritize if necessary. She said often urgent issues end up taking precedence over what may be more important in the long run. Bill said WRPS brings management experience from around the DOE complex and the world, and has experience making sure the urgent does not exclude the important. They also integrate the work at Hanford with work elsewhere in the world, including Savannah River, Idaho, the United Kingdom and France (e.g. technology exchange). Vic added CHPRC made commitments as long as five years and intends to honor those commitments. He said they work with many people to develop and re-analyze their priorities.

Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, said Inez Triay, DOE-EM principal assistant secretary, stated DOE prioritized “reconnecting” laboratories to sites and integrating basic science and technology needs. Laboratory work should inform risk evaluations and disposition. She said it was unclear how that happens. Shelley said Jim Rispoli, former DOE-EM assistant secretary, said there would be the opportunity to engage in Site Technology Coordination Groups (STCGs), but she has not seen any progress. Moses said they are working with PNNL to integrate their risk assessments and technology needs, feasibility studies (FS) and test plants.

Susan Leckband thought the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) could help frame up a discussion on lab, contractor and DOE integration. Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), said it is on the RAP work plan.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), commented that the robotic arm does not appear to be able to reach the walls of some of the larger tanks. Bill said the arm they are developing will be able to reach the full radius of any tank. Bill said he could bring an animated model of the arm to the next TWC meeting.

### **Tank Waste System Plan**

Ken Gasper, Benton County (Local Government), introduced draft advice from TWC on the tank waste system plan and integration. Ken said TWC worked with the agencies over the past year on the River Protection Plan System Plan Revision 3. He said after continued studies, emerging technical issues and funding delays, the system plan is out of date already and needs to be updated again. Ken said DOE-ORP and its contractor already plan to do an updated system plan. He explained that Revision 3 focused on DOE’s baseline and did not explore any options or consider TPA milestones. As the Board has talked about FY 2009 budget shortfalls and FY 2010 needs, Ken said TWC expanded what it wants to see in the plan. The system plan should go beyond DOE’s simple baseline case. TWC wants the updated system plan to consider not only a base case, but cases achievable with technology and funding. Ken said TWC is asking for a broader and more supportive system plan than the draft Revision 3 they saw a year ago. The advice also advises updating the system plan annually and making it available to the public.

#### *Agency perspective*

Steve Pfaff said DOE consciously added a system plan annual revision to the Tank Operations Contract (TOC) request for proposal (RFP). He agreed that Revision 3 was already out of date when it was issued. Steve said they are working on three different scenarios for Revision 4: a baseline case, a regulatory-based case and an unconstrained funding case. DOE intends to analyze the cases using the Hanford Tank Operations simulator. Steve said WRPS is bringing new software from Savannah River to see if they can move through options analysis more quickly. DOE needs an updated system plan for baseline development efforts. WRPS has an interim FY 2009 baseline, but they still have to produce a lifecycle baseline for FY

2009. Steve said Revision 4 will be available in the April 2009 timeframe. He said in the end, it is a document that needs to be updated every year.

Ed Fredenburg, Ecology, said Ecology supports the idea of updating the system plan annually, and the addition of a case study analysis linked to funding. He said they met with DOE-ORP and the contractor twice to develop assumptions for Revision 4. Ecology's goal is to minimize risk and get waste out of single-shell tanks as soon as possible. To that end, Ed said Ecology is focused on getting efficient feed to WTP. Ed noted the three cases again: the baseline (constrained funding) case; an enhanced funding case with early LAW startup and interim pretreatment systems that adds and changes cost profiles in early years; and a regulatory case (unconstrained funding). Ed said they will continue to meet with DOE-ORP and the contractor to find assumptions for the regulatory case. Ecology recommended that the tank farm contractor work closely with BNI and share information so waste feed delivery optimizes WTP operation (e.g. sequence of retrieval). Ecology also recommends designating two or three more double-shell tanks to serve as receiver tanks. Ed said there are concerns about incidental blending, but they can also optimize blending to improve waste loading and WTP efficiency. He said it will take time to improve the model, which might have to wait until Revision 5. Ed said Ecology is supportive of the advice and will continue to work with DOE and the contractor to minimize impacts to environment and human health.

### *Discussion*

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked about the difference between the system plan and the single-shell retrieval sequence and double-shell tank space document that is produced every two years. He asked which provides more information. Steve Pfaff said the system plan is more holistic and analyzes retrievals, transfers, treatment capabilities in progress and end stream waste forms. He said the sequence document is concerned more with tank sequencing, including analyzing double-shell tank work necessary to carry out a retrieval sequence. Steve said the TPA requires the sequence document every two years and agency interaction about whether or not to build more double-shell tanks. Steve said they required the contractor to develop single-shell tank planning and double-shell tank transfer planning and will have to integrate it all into the system plan. Steve said DOE will have to work on how to integrate them; he would like to see no difference between the sequence document and the system plan. He said they will have to see if it makes sense to have them both. If the system plan is kept up to date, Steve said DOE may see if it will fulfill the TPA requirement. He offered to get more information for Jeff.

Jeff asked if DOE will be able to revise the more comprehensive system plan in one year if it takes two years to revise the sequence document. Steve said it is hard to say; revising the system plan will be iterative and they will continue to find ways to make the process faster. He said DOE has to produce Revision 4 in the next few months to do the lifecycle baseline. Steve said they will have to turn it around faster than two years to make it meaningful.

Ken Niles pointed out that TPA negotiations are not moving forward and references to TPA negotiations should be removed from the advice. Susan Kreid clarified that the advice will say the Board wants a system plan regardless of whether or not it is tied to the TPA. Jim Trombold said the Board has always supported TPA milestones. He agreed about not commenting on TPA negotiations themselves, but thought the Board should always support adequate funding to comply with milestones of the currently existing TPA. The Board agreed.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), said the advice should request a clearly defined technical, programmatic path forward so technology can be developed, and to reduce the chance of orphan waste streams. He said the second issue is DOE may have a plan, but no funding.

Tom Carpenter wanted a sharper focus on the people who conduct the work. He said there are different regulations for workers, and workers are not necessarily the basis for protecting "human health." He asked the advice to include a basis for reducing worker exposure to chemical vapors.

Mike Korenko said a true system engineering approach is a total system view. He would like to make sure the criteria behind system engineering are agreed upon. DOE can use the criteria before it selects a solution.

*Using the system plan as a basis to communicate and garner support for funding*

Maynard asked for clarification on the advice bullet saying the system plan should be a basis for garnering broad regional and national support to ensure continued funding. Ken explained the system plan should be a publicly available document that regulators or advocates can use for obtaining public support for Hanford cleanup and funding. It can show what would happen if Hanford does or does not get adequate funding.

Pam agreed that having information available about funding and tank farm operations to run different scenarios is important. She said it takes a big effort to help Congress understand Hanford cleanup. She thought the system plan could be an important and useful tool.

#### *System plan baseline case*

Gerry said it seems that the system plan containing multiple cases and baselines should be developed with Board and regulator input. The final baseline would come out after all of that early work and collaboration.

Gerry asked if the advice would benefit from relating it to the baseline workshop advice. He said the baseline presented at the workshop was out of date, adopted without regulator or public input, and needs to be redone. He thought it would be beneficial to use the system plan as the basis for its revision.

Ken Gasper said the system plan contains multiple cases. Gerry said the system plan should be the precursor to a selected and approved baseline; DOE-ORP ultimately just needs just one baseline. Ken clarified that this piece of advice advises analyzing and reviewing multiple cases in the system plan, including the baseline case.

Jeff clarified that the advice says DOE should model certain cases, and how those cases are developed is a topic for a separate piece of advice. The purpose of the advice is to tell DOE to ensure they model and look at not only their baseline case, but the regulator's case and other cases as well. Jeff said historically, DOE has only modeled its own case.

Gerry proposed saying that the system plan should develop a certain number and type of cases; out of those, one should be presented as the new baseline. Gerry proposed saying consistent with needing a new baseline, the new baseline should be based upon system plan work and analysis of the alternatives. Ken and the Board agreed to add language that makes the two pieces of advice consistent.

The advice was revised and Ken Gasper explained that agreement was reached to not contain any discussion of how the baseline is arrived at. It recognizes that DOE has a baseline at a given point in time and whatever that is, the Board wants included in the system plan. Ken said the system plan should always use DOE's baseline as one of its cases.

Jeff suggested being clear about "retrieve, treat and immobilize" instead of just "closure."

The Board revised many of the advice bullets and reached agreement on the language and purpose of each bullet.

Susan Leckband asked the Board to follow its process of making major conceptual and structural changes to advice on Thursday and Thursday night. Advice discussion on Friday is for minor language and grammatical changes and finalization.

The advice was adopted.

#### **Advanced Mixed Waste Processing Facility**

Pam shared information about and photos of the DOE Advanced Mixed Waste Processing Facility in Idaho. The project is committed to safely and compliantly retrieve, characterize, process, and package 65,000 cubic meters of TRU waste and mixed low-level waste for shipment to permanent disposal sites outside of Idaho.

Pam said she learned at the Intergovernmental Meeting in Utah that TRU waste is not being shipped to WIPP right now and Hanford waste is not scheduled to ship there for five years. Some Hanford waste may

go to the Idaho facility, which has a more sophisticated compactor. Pam said it will help alleviate some of Idaho's overhead costs if they are able to process Hanford waste.

More than 26,800 cubic meters of TRU and mixed low-level waste have been shipped from the facility since 2002. As of September 10, 2008, there are approximately 38,000 cubic meters left to ship. A settlement agreement directs DOE to ship all TRU waste out of Idaho by 2015 (target date; 2018 compliance deadline). Pam noted in Idaho, "TRU is TRU." There is no distinction between "pre-1970s TRU" waste and post-1970 TRU waste. Hanford does not have the same agreement. Pam showed a map showing how TRU waste travels around the country; as of August 25, 2008, there have been 6,851 shipments of TRU waste. Pam said a new Idaho EIS covers Hanford waste and waste transport.

The facility consists of many components: one treatment facility, two retrieval facilities, three storage buildings, four characterization locations, five payload and six shipping areas. Processing at the facility flows from retrieval to characterization and then to either direct shipping to WIPP, or super-compacting and then sending to WIPP. Some waste is repackaged before undergoing super-compaction.

Pam showed photos of workers monitoring waste containers buried in soil, waste drums and boxes stacked in the retrieval enclosure, real-time radiography x-ray of a drum, drum coring glovebox, treatment facility, super-compactor, and the loading and shipping of a TRUPACT II container. She noted that the compactor applies 4 million pounds of pressure to compact a barrel.

Pam wanted to share information about the facility with the Board so it understands the facility's capabilities to deal with Hanford TRU waste, and the Board can have a dialogue about what it means to the community. She said the Board should think about if it should advocate for a compactor at Hanford to process its own waste before shipping to WIPP. Pam thought Hanford has a third of the volume of TRU waste Idaho has, and reiterated that Idaho classifies all TRU as TRU. She said EPA is optimistic that Hanford post-1970 TRU will go to WIPP, but Hanford does not have a way to ship remote-handled TRU.

### **Baseline Workshop**

Gerry shared findings and impressions from the baseline workshop and introduced the draft advice. He said it was a successful workshop and a great introduction to baselines, what they do, what is in the DOE-RL and DOE-ORP baselines, and the critical role assumptions play in baselines. Gerry said a baseline, not the TPA, is the schedule and cost profile DOE uses to determine what work will be done and how to scope new contracts. Gerry said it is critical for the Board to understand the disconnects. Gerry said in the past, the Board discussed how scopes relate to the TPA, but it really needed to know how scopes relate to baselines. He thanked DOE-RL and DOE-ORP for their work and Jon Peschong, DOE-RL, for his great presentation.

At the workshop, Gerry said they looked at four examples (e.g. groundwater units and tank retrieval) and identified assumptions, how they line up with regulators, tribes and the public, and how baselines are formed. They discussed how realistic assumptions are, how they play into end-states, and regulator and public buy-in to end-state discussions.

Gerry said DOE-ORP's baseline was outdated when it was approved in January 2007. In addition to other issues, he said it did not include the cost profile for WTP.

Gerry said the fundamental point of the advice is that baselines need to have public, tribal, regulator and Board input. Assumptions need to be clear and accessible in order for the baseline to be credible and for contracts and scopes to be accurate. The advice requests a timeline for baseline review and regulator input so a baseline is not adopted as "The Baseline" before it reflects values and priorities of the region and regulators.

Susan noted there will be more baseline discussions at the Committee of the Whole meeting on December 11.

*Agency perspective*

Doug Shoop thanked Jon and everyone at DOE-RL and DOE-ORP for their hard work putting together the workshop. He said baselines are big and complex, and are good management tools for DOE. Doug said baselines are no better than the data they have. They do not have data for all decisions and DOE relies on assumptions that may or may not be correct. Doug said fewer assumptions will be necessary when final Records of Decision (RODs) are in place – they will know what remedial actions are needed and those actions will have had public and regulatory input. He agreed that assumptions can change drastically changing the outcome of baselines. Jon agreed that it is important to understand the planning and mechanics of planning.

Ben Harp, DOE-ORP, thought the workshop was very valuable. He heard a lot of interest in assumptions and how they are made. Other interests were in risk management (e.g. facility age) and system planning. Ben said the system plan has taken so long to generate, update and communicate to the public, it looks like baselines are years old. He said they are fixing that process to update the system plan on a yearly basis. Ben said DOE communicated this to the committees and will continue to keep them updated. Ben said the baseline is critical to keeping system plans up to date and maintained.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, said EPA has pushed for a baseline workshop for several years because regulators, DOE and stakeholders all need a baseline to support. He thought the workshop was great. He noted the “compliance case” and the need to ensure it includes the “right things” (e.g. final reactor disposition along the river). He said EPA and DOE need to come to agreement on cost and schedules to meet non-tank farm operable unit, soil, groundwater and building cleanup milestones. Dennis said the 200 PW-1, 3 and 6 operable unit includes pre-1970 TRU waste; the baseline assumes capping the operable units. Dennis agreed knowing the assumptions helps make the baseline more credible.

Ron Skinnarland, Ecology, agreed the workshop was quite good. He agreed there should be an integrated cleanup plan, meaning an enforceable schedule (TPA), a baseline plan, and ensuring the budget requests meet the work. He said the new contractors will work on baselines for several months and Ecology will help identify how the Board can continue to be involved during their development. Ron thought everyone needs to “be smarter” about baselines and making the best use of funding they can.

#### *Discussion*

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said it was a clear and well-written piece of advice.

Susan Kreid asked if DOE-ORP and DOE-RL set priorities for Hanford – not DOE-HQ? Doug Shoop said the local offices set the priorities, which come from multiple sources including Board advice.

Shelley asked about a presentation given by Merle Sykes, DOE-EM deputy assistant secretary for program planning and budget, that described outyear lifecycle costs and new analytical building blocks DOE can “rack and stack.” Shelley asked how much input local DOE offices have in the process. Jon said building blocks are important to their planning. Local DOE offices submit a budget based on building blocks that they defined. Local DOE offices have some site authority, but make recommendations to DOE-HQ who has authority to make modifications. Jon said they are able to participate in the “re-racking” of building blocks and priorities and make recommendations for every dollar.

Pam noted she worked with Merle in preparation for the Intergovernmental Meeting in November; people around the country were happy with the process and transparency. She said they also worked on white papers for the new transition team and tried to explain the value of the system. Pam said she looks forward to how the Board can provide input into priorities.

Jeff clarified “institutional mechanism” as meaning there should be an institutional mechanism for regulatory and public review, not a specific regulation for the requirement of a mechanism.

The advice was adopted.

## **FY 2009 Site Funding and Missed TPA Milestones**

Harold introduced the draft advice on FY 2009 site funding and missed TPA milestones. Harold said BCC developed the advice because FY 2009 funding is on continuing resolution. He said Congress will probably pass a single omnibus bill, which provides an opportunity to request additional funding to address shortfalls. Harold said DOE-RL is missing 23 milestones on Central Plateau cleanup, which relate to policy decisions made some time ago to emphasize work along the river. BCC intends the advice to go to DOE and copy the congressional offices. The advice itemizes where the Board believes additional funding should be directed in DOE-RL and DOE-ORP, a total of about \$222 million.

Susan noted the dollar figures were taken from budget advice adopted in the spring (Advice #205).

### *Agency perspective*

Doug Shoop noted that Harold referenced the November 6 letter DOE-RL sent EPA and Ecology that indicated there are a number of milestones DOE-RL believes it will miss (based on current funding). He said DOE still has to meet with the regulators, review the milestones in question, and figure out what to do.

Steve Pfaff said DOE-ORP will not miss any near-term milestones because of funding shortfalls. They have talked to DOE-HQ about obtaining additional funding and intend to use it for retrievals.

Dennis noted that the TPA is still enforceable because it has not yet been revised. EPA responded to DOE-RL's letter.

Ron said Ecology is working with EPA and DOE about what work is at risk and what the new contractor can do. He said it is hard to make milestones without an overall plan, and unclear how much funding is left after focusing on the river and tanks. He hopes Washington's congressional delegation will be supportive. Ron also noted they need to look forward to 2010.

### *Discussion*

Al Boldt, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), thought the advice should be clear that additional money will not fix the overall budget problem. The advice should emphasize that Hanford is still \$690 short.

### *Process for asking for additional funding*

Mike Korenko said he was curious about the process for advocating for funding – can DOE and its contractors lobby Congress for more money? What are the correct channels? Doug Shoop said the local DOE offices submit requests to DOE-HQ, which is sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). He said DOE federal employees cannot solicit Congress or try to get additional funds by hitting the streets and talking to people. Doug said that does not prevent contractors from letting congressional representatives know what they could do with additional funding. Doug said the contractor keeps them informed of their activities, but it is on their initiative.

Susan Kreid questioned the purpose of the advice: If DOE cannot lobby for additional funding, what is the point? How does Hanford get additional funding? Doug said DOE-RL puts forth its best effort to get funding, but once Congress and the president establish the budget, that budget stands. Doug thought representatives like Doc Hastings are the answer, rather than DOE. He said DOE-RL asked for enough funding to be TPA-compliant. Susan Kreid asked if the letter should go to Doc Hastings; Susan Leckband said the Board can only advise the agencies and copy the delegations.

Gerry said DOE-HQ can ask Congress for more money and how to spend it; the local DOE offices cannot.

### *Tying the advice to milestones*

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), thought the advice should say how additional money will help meet milestones. He said the budget needs to be tied to milestones.

Pam said she would normally agree, but she did not think the Board should pin the advice's dollar figures to milestones when milestones are about to change. She said TPA negotiations have been successful and there is a package all agree to in concept, but there is a hold-up at the Department of Justice.

Maynard said the advice will provide documentation and support for more funding. He agreed that once a budget is approved, the local DOE offices cannot go back and say it is wrong. Maynard said normally they would tie budget to milestones, but he did not think this was the time or the advice to do so.

Harold thought the advice is adequately and appropriately tied to TPA milestones.

Doug Mercer asked how DOE communicates the consequences of missed milestones to Congress; how does DOE stay within the purview of its technical mandate but still communicate the risk to human health and the environment? He thought the Board could advise DOE to produce a one-page statement about missed milestones in plain language and the hazards they pose in the short and long run. He thought something like that could be used for public involvement, the HAB, the state and the public. Susan Leckband thought Doug could work with PIC on developing a communication piece with DOE.

#### *Specific funding figures*

Dennis thought the advice might be better received without tying it to specific numbers. He suggested tying it to the November 6 DOE-RL letter notifying Ecology and EPA that an additional 23 TPA milestones will not be met due to funding limitations. Jeff wanted to make sure the advice addressed all necessary milestones.

Paige agreed and said specific dollar figures do not paint a good picture for Congress. She noted that individual Board members can take advice to their own representatives and work with them as individuals or through an organization other than the Board. Susan Kreid agreed the advice should tell a story about funding and risk.

Maynard thought it might be confusing to have specific numbers in the advice if the Congress is working a budget at the same time. Gerry said the advice is a follow-up to detailed Advice #205 and should better reference past advice. He said they heard in the spring that \$200 million was a good goal to request, and thought DOE should be reminded where the Board wants that money to go. He said the Board has not seen DOE's priority list; if it is the same, the advice is simply reinforcing it. He did not think they should take out the dollar figures.

Harold said people are working on restoring funding and need help defining what level of funding and in what areas it will be useful. He thought the level of detail was good. He said the advice is time-sensitive because Congress will take action in February.

Pam noted that the numbers in the advice were based on the president's budget request. She said since that time, DOE-RL restored some funding to the River Corridor. Pam did not think the figures are still accurate and thought the Board should double-check.

Steve Pfaff pointed out that the dollar figures were not consistent with Advice #205. Pam said she did not think the advice should be picky about who pays for nuclear materials stabilization and disposal. Pam asked if DOE-RL can find out what the shortfall is between the president's budget and what Hanford received. She said she could live with using dollar figures from Advice #205 if the Board cannot get an updated figure.

The Board made the advice consistent with Advice #205, corrected the funding requests, and identified only the total needed for each office, rather than tying specific dollar amounts to specific activities. The advice requested an additional \$144 million for DOE-RL and \$90 million for DOE-ORP. The specific activities were not listed in order of priority.

The advice was adopted.

## **HAB Issue Manager Training**

Susan Leckband reviewed issue manager, chair and vice-chair responsibilities. She said the Board established a list of responsibilities in 2002 and the Board Process Manual describes “how the Board works,” including issue manager work, how issues are identified and how issue managers coordinate with the agencies.

### Issue managers:

- Are self-identified
- Identify policy affect by and/or tied to the issue
- Research and track issues to frame and act as issue lead for committee
- Are aware of current status of issue by asking the right questions (facilitators can help frame questions)
- Serve as communication point-of-contact and work with federal coordinators, regulating agencies, committees and other Board members to ensure committee/Board time is used effectively and efficiently
- Identify presenters knowledgeable of the issues to federal coordinators. Presenters could be agencies staff, Board members or other experts
  - Board members should always work with federal coordinators
- Actively share issue-related work and information gathered from agencies and other sources, with the committee
  - Issue managers need to ensure they follow their committee’s direction
- Facilitate useful committee/Board presentations by ensuring presenters understand the expectations of the committee and can provide the appropriate information
- Ensure that identified issue needs are being met by the presenters at meetings
- Present issues/advice to full Board after committee consensus has been reached

### Committee chairs and vice-chairs:

- Facilitate issue manager work
  - Chairs and vice-chairs need to make sure issue managers stay on track
- Lead committee discussions regarding the committee work plan and track progress on issues via the plan
- Are aware of issues that agencies requested the Board to work on and which of those issues relate to his/her committee
  - Copies of agency priorities are available
- Facilitate framing of committee issues for full Board
- Ensure issue managers actively share issue-related work and information gathered from agencies and other sources, with the entire committee
- Ensure issue managers develop issues considered appropriately through the committee process (e.g. Is it a policy issue? Is it timely? Who are the issue managers and what are they doing?)
- Ensure issue managers work with federal coordinators to obtain information and set up any additional issue manager meetings involving federal, regulator or contractor staff
- Ensure draft advice brought to full Board represents committee consensus
- Maintain open and ongoing communication with appropriate committee chairs to avoid duplicative efforts (e.g. issue assignment, joint committee meetings)
- Develop meeting times and agendas in consultation with committee, facilitation team and applicable agency representative
- Listen, elicit and reflect perspectives of committee members for the committee’s benefit
- Maintain open lines of communication with committee members
- Facilitate useful committee/Board presentations by ensuring presenters understand committee expectations and are able to provide the appropriate information
- Participate in Board leadership activities representing his/her committee (e.g. Leadership Retreat)

Susan noted EnviroIssues can help track issues, too. She encouraged open communication – if issue managers have questions, they should ask their chair or vice-chair or bring it up at a committee meetings. She said 2009 will be a busy year and asked all Board members to become more active in committees.

Susan said there will be new Board member orientation in February.

#### *Facilitator perspective*

Penny described how issue managers navigate the “triangle of communication” between committee chairs and vice-chairs, EnviroIssues and federal coordinators. She said EnviroIssues is not contracted to facilitate or take meeting notes for issue manager meetings, but noted that issue managers should consider if particular work should be done at a committee meeting (i.e. if a lot of people need to be involved). She said EnviroIssues is an arbiter of information, and Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues’ Board administrator, can help Board members with anything they need to know. Cathy McCague, Susan Hayman, and Penny Mabie are facilitators and follow the issues substantively; not only do they know Board process but they follow technical issues enough to provide assistance if an issue manager is struggling with identifying technical and/or policy issues. Penny said the facilitators can help identify what technical details mean at the broader policy level. In addition, the facilitators and Tammie can help organize meetings and conference calls. EnviroIssues can also help research past advice and any other HAB documentation, as well as work with the agencies to arrange presentations.

Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP’s federal coordinator to the Board, said DOE-ORP has had several meetings with TWC issue managers. She thought they have been successful and hopes they satisfy issue manager needs. She can help bring in subject matter experts, and asked issue managers to work with federal coordinators, and not contact DOE-ORP or contractor staff directly. If federal coordinators are in the loop, they can help track questions and facilitate responses faster. She said it is helpful to clearly identify policy issues and questions. Lori asked for feedback from issue managers and the Board if there are any ways she can improve.

Paula Call, DOE-RL’s federal coordinator to the Board, said she and Lori’s job is to help inform issue managers and the Board so the Board can produce the highest quality policy-level advice possible. She said they can help gather background information from other stakeholders and agencies as long as it is of public record, and can help arrange field trips.

Dennis Faulk, EPA’s liaison to the Board, said EPA follows PIC, RAP and BCC work, but not TWC because EPA does not regulate tank farms. He noted EPA currently has only six staff people and their responsiveness may be limited, but encouraged Board members and issue managers to call him any time and he can put them in contact with the right people. He also noted that EPA can help put issue managers in touch with the right DOE people. Dennis said issue manager work is critical – the better the issue manager work, the better the advice. He reiterated that issue managers should always try to bring advice up to policy level.

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said Sharon Braswell is Ecology’s public involvement representative. Nolan or Sharon can help direct issue managers to appropriate technical contacts. Nolan said the clearer issue managers are about their needs, the better Ecology can help. Nolan said feedback is important and encouraged Board members to let him know if there are ways they can improve.

#### *Discussion*

As a somewhat new member, Larry said he sometimes struggles with what is policy level advice and what is technical. He thought the committees tend to get a little too technical, and finding the policy level is the most difficult thing for Board members to do. Larry said they really try, but it is always a struggle.

Susan Leckband said it is not black and white; the Board has to “get in the weeds” to build a foundation for policy level advice. She said part of the Board’s work is simply learning and having a dialogue with the TPA agencies; advice is not always produced. She encouraged Board members to ask EnviroIssues if they need help.

Penny said EnviroIssues can help “ask the right questions.” She encouraged Board members to utilize subject matter experts that are on the Board. Penny noted there are many ways the Board communicates with the agencies, including letters, white papers, and Sounding Boards. Nolan added that communication tool reviews are helpful for the agencies. He said the power of the Board is in the diversity of its seats.

Dennis said even though some advice is time-critical, ideal, long-lived advice takes time to develop (e.g. the groundwater flowchart).

Vince Panesko, City of Richland (Local Government), wanted more of a process for issue managers. He thought people are reluctant to become issue managers, and felt that issue managers do not get the support they need. What is the first step an issue manager should take? Call EnviroIssues? Call a DOE federal coordinator? He said he volunteered for tracking PFP and its ventilation problems and discovered he was not supposed to talk with contractors. He thought perhaps the first step should be to meet with the committee vice-chair, a federal coordinator and EnviroIssues so there are a handful of people who can help the issue manager. He said they could develop a strategy and expectations of who issue managers can talk to and when. Can an issue manager call a federal coordinator any time? Susan Leckband said yes, and she will work with EnviroIssues to develop a “Step 1” process. Penny said they could talk about it at new member orientation and incorporate a process into the HAB Process Manual.

Shelley agreed that the Board should lay out clear issue manager protocols and suggested a “buddy system” for new issue managers.

Ken Gasper said joint committees are very helpful. Sometimes issue managers from RAP and TWC work on issues with similar policy implications and may not know it. He said joint committee meetings are very effective communication tools. He also said the Events-at-a-Glance email updates are very helpful for ensuring issue manager work is prepared in a timely fashion for committee meetings and/or calls. Ken thought issue managers should utilize committee chairs’ ability to bring requests to the Executive Issues Committee.

Pam said committee meetings are very educational, and thought the Board misses an opportunity to invite the community to them. She thought it could be a valuable information-sharing public involvement opportunity.

Doug Mercer asked why and when the Board produces a white paper. Susan Leckband said committees develop white papers to capture in detail how the Board feels about a particular issue. White papers delve deeply into a particular subject. For example, PIC wrote a white paper to identify public involvement goals and values. PIC brought the idea to the Board and the Board agreed for PIC to develop it; it was then brought back to the Board for adoption.

Doug asked how white papers are used and referenced after submission, and if regulators and DOE find them useful. Susan said she uses them as an example of how the Board feels on a particular subject and she directs people to them for reference. Unlike advice, agencies do not have an obligation to respond to white papers. Dennis said the regulators refer to white papers; the PIC white paper was foundational and contained many key principles. Nolan said he uses them as “vehicles for understanding.” Paula said DOE keeps white papers as tools for program managers and distributes them to contractors, too.

Maynard agreed that issue manager work should be vetted through the committee, and issue managers should not circumvent federal coordinators by going straight to contractors.

Maxine Hines, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), noted it is helpful to sit next to and ask questions of experienced Board members during meetings.

Susan Kreid appreciated the clear list of responsibilities Susan Leckband provided, and agreed it would be nice to have a clear issue manager process.

EnviroIssues will work with Board leadership to develop a tutorial on how to navigate the HAB website, create additional issue manager guidelines, and update the HAB Process Manual.

### **Agency Updates**

The agencies are looking for feedback on agency updates; Board members should provide Susan Leckband with any suggestions.

## ***DOE-ORP***

Steve Pfaff reviewed current safety statistics:

- WRPS achieved 1 million hours worked without lost time injuries on October 31, 2008
- CH2M Hill achieved 1 million hours worked without lost time injuries on July 11, 2008
- BNI achieved 6.68 million hours worked without lost time injuries on November 30, 2008 (355 days)

Steve said the injury rate (not lost time injuries) was small and the injuries minor (e.g. cutting hand on lunch can).

Work at WTP is progressing. Overall percent complete:

- LAW facility: 71%
- Balance of facilities: 51%
- LAB: 43%
- Pretreatment facility: 39%
- High-level waste facility: 43% (substantial construction work remains)

Steve said it will be a challenge to factor in an additional 2 million engineering hours. The current plan is to complete WTP on schedule and within the \$12.26 billion estimate, but additional engineering will impact construction progress.

Steve said DOE-ORP continues to resolve External Flowsheet Review Team (EFRT) issues:

- 31 issues identified by independent, external team
- 28 of 31 EFRT issues are closed
- Three EFRT issues remain open
  - Inadequate mixing system design, undemonstrated leaching, undemonstrated sampling system
- All but one will be done by March 9; all are scheduled to be closed by October 2009

Steve showed a slide for the pretreatment engineering platform (PEP), which is a quarter-scale mockup of pretreatment processes to prove leaching and process filters work. Steve said they are entering the simulant testing phase; it is about seven weeks behind schedule, but they intend to complete it this year.

Steve said the 242-A Evaporator is now in operation and has saved 26 million gallons of waste space in double-shell tanks. He showed a photo of the evaporator and workers decontaminating the condenser room, which they had to do after normal ventilation was interrupted during facility ventilation upgrades.

Regarding safety, Steve said in the past there have been problems with falling objects at WTP. DOE-ORP is dealing with it more aggressively and contractors go through a process after an incident to identify exactly what happened. DOE-ORP made a major corrective action by barricading off certain areas. At tank farms, Steve said there have been no direct, imminent hazards, but they have to make sure equipment meets quality standards.

### *Discussion*

Mike Korenko said workers should be encouraged to report injuries. He said at Rocky Flats, they implemented “bump caps” to prevent injuries from falling objects. Mike asked if extra engineering hours and costs are burning up “contingency” funding. Will contingency and overall costs increase? Steve did not know the monetary cost, but it will use up about seven months of schedule contingency.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), noted that bump caps are not a good solution for this situation, and thought site safety people should handle injury-prevention planning.

Ken Niles asked if they had problems fitting the first melter through a doorway. Steve said the melters were designed so they could process as much waste as possible; it was large but is expected to end up fitting through the doorway with about an inch clearance.

Norma Jean noted the Board heard there is difficulty in obtaining good quality and nuclear-grade materials, and in a timely fashion. She asked if this problem has slowed work. Steve referred to the problem with BNI's piping, and said changes were required at vendor sites and at Hanford. He did not have current information, but offered to set up a briefing.

Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), asked for an update on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). Steve said DOE-ORP will finish its internal review this month. He offered a briefing once they are further along.

Dick asked about plugging problems at PEP; Steve heard that food-coloring injections caused some problems during water testing; those problems were resolved and PEP is moving into the simulant testing period. Steve said so far, nothing has come up at PEP that they have not been able to fix.

Rob asked if DOE could send the monthly WTP newsletter to the Board; Steve said he would check.

Jeff asked how Steve will get back to the Board with answers to some of the previous questions; Susan Leckband said they will go to TWC, who will bring them back to the Board. Jeff wanted to make sure those questions did not get lost.

### ***DOE-RL***

Doug Shoop offered to take the Board on a site tour. He noted DOE-RL is putting together a public document showing the big picture of Hanford cleanup in simple terms. Doug thought it will be a helpful communication tool and plans to have it ready by the end of December or early January. He would like Board ideas and comments on it.

Doug said they are moving ahead with the 2015 Vision and risk assessments. He and Dave Brockman, DOE-RL manager, have meetings scheduled with tribal councils to develop a tribal land-use scenario. He anticipates completing meetings in mid-February and will use the information in the risk assessment for the River Corridor. He said DOE wants the cleanup done in a way to allow tribes to continue traditional use of the site.

Doug noted DOE-RL is working with CH2M Hill on performance incentives; they need to be approved by DOE-HQ, and then Doug will share them with the Board. He said they are consistent with Board advice, TPA priorities and the 2015 Vision.

Doug said there will be a ROD for each of the six geographic areas. DOE-RL is developing schedules for Remedial Action/Feasibility Studies (RI/FS), reports, RODs, remedial design and remedial action plans, and will share the schedules with the Board and get its input.

### ***River Corridor***

DOE-RL is looking at geographic areas in the River Corridor and how to plan cleanup to avoid the cost of contractor mobilization and demobilization. Doug said the idea is to move from one geographic area to the next. Doug showed a video of workers in the 300 Area preparing a glovebox for D&D. There are about 53 gloveboxes in the 308 Facility; gloveboxes containing low-level waste go to ERDF and ones containing TRU waste will go to WIPP. Doug said they are knocking down 300 Area buildings; remaining ones pose big challenges.

Doug described the 618-7 burial ground where workers uncovered pressurized gas cylinders; past records show there was a high chance that they contained phosgene gas. WCH hired a subcontractor with expertise in handling and treating hazardous chemicals. A lot of work went into planning and neutralizing any hazardous agents to ensure they were safe. The process was successful, and Doug said nothing ended up being in the cylinders. He said 618-7 cleanup is a success story in general and they expect to meet the TPA milestone for completing the work at the end of the year.

### ***K Basins***

K East Basin superstructure was demolished and the contractor is preparing ion exchange materials and sand filters that are fairly radioactive for ERDF. Doug said they also removed a foot of soil around the

substructure to make sure there was no asbestos. The contractor will now remove about ten feet of soil from around the basin to allow substructure demolition.

Crews packaged and moved the last of the fuel out of K West Basin. Doug said they had to make sure they separated the sludge from spent nuclear fuel, which goes to WIPP and Yucca Mountain, respectively. Doug said they want to treat the sludge and get it off the river as soon as possible. DOE-RL is looking at one preferred option for treating sludge to send to WIPP; he will continue to brief the Board on sludge analysis work.

#### *200-ZP-1 operable unit*

Doug said the 200-ZP-1 operable unit ROD was finalized and DOE-RL is currently working on the Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plan to implement it. The work plan is due to EPA on March 31, 2009. Selected remedies combine pump and treat systems, monitored natural attenuation, flow path control and institutional controls.

#### *PFM*

Doug said it has been a challenge to get nuclear-quality materials for plutonium shipment packaging. DOE-RL selected two vendors to ensure they get the best quality 9975 containers, but both have quality problems. He said they originally wanted to complete all plutonium 9975 container shipments by the end of the year, but only about half has been shipped. He thought shipments will be complete in June 2009. Despite quality assurance issues, they are still making good progress. Another issue at PFM is producing packaging for unirradiated fuel shipments offsite. The contractor is now fabricating containers and watching closely for quality assurance problems. Some D&D activities are underway at PFM and a glovebox was successfully decontaminated and will be sent to ERDF.

#### *FFTF*

Doug showed a graph illustrating all activities that need to be done to take FFTF to long-term surveillance and maintenance. FFTF and support facilities will be taken to the ultimate end-state through decontamination, decommissioning, and demolition; work is about 64% complete.

Doug said 29,000 tons of soil was removed from the BC control area and taken to ERDF; DOE is in the process of re-vegetating the area.

Solid waste stabilization and disposition is not one of DOE-RL's priorities right now given funding constraints; they are focusing on the River Corridor. However, they will work on the following in FY 2009:

- Retrieve 1000 cubic meters
- Repackage in T Plant
- Prepare 1000 over-pack drums for potential shipment
- Build inventory for future shipping campaigns

Doug said DOE-RL's contractors have had a good safety record for the beginning of FY 2009, and are pursuing VPP and other safety programs and certifications.

#### *Discussion*

Jeff commended Hanford's safety record; workers deal with dangerous waste and do a good job staying safe.

Shelley asked what type of material will be shipped from PFM in 9975 containers. Doug said unirradiated fuel, a different kind of special nuclear material, will ultimately go to Savannah River. He said they will also ship uranium-239 drums, which require different packaging.

Larry asked if the public Hanford cleanup information piece will be comprehensive. Doug said yes, it will cover DOE-RL and DOE-ORP activities, focusing on the River Corridor, Central Plateau and tank farms.

Larry commented that PFM plutonium is moving from "our backyard to Savannah River's backyard." He said cleanup should be planned on a national basis. He asked if it will go to the Mixed Oxide Fuel (MOX) facility. Doug said he will find out.

Julie Jones, City of West Richland (Local Government), asked what will happen to workers after PFP is decommissioned. Will workers lose their jobs or be transferred? Doug said he hoped they will not lose their jobs. He said DOE-ORP would like to work with the unions so worker classifications can be broad enough to allow easy transfers. He said they will collaborate with HAMTC and did not anticipate big fluctuations.

Jeff noted that Hanford workers are tasked with “working themselves out of a job.” He said the whole point is to close the site, and that unfortunately means people lose jobs.

Pam asked if the 200-ZP-1 operable unit pump and treat system will start in 2009. Dennis said the interim action system is still running and will until the new system is in place (scheduled for December 2011). Material retrieved will be treated and sent offsite or to ERDF for disposal. Pam asked if there will be another acquisition; Dennis said yes, DOE is working on an RFP.

Norma Jean asked if work was planned for the soil around PFP. Doug said PFP will be reduced to slab-on-grade and then they will treat contamination in the ground. He expects a fair amount of remediation. Dennis said the soil vapor extraction system is and will be operational for a number of years.

Bob Parks said many shipping containers at K Basins were fabricated on site. He asked if Hanford could fabricate the 9975 containers. Doug said the 9975 containers are fabricated for use around the nation. He thought Hanford could probably make them, but they already have what they need. Bob thought that was fair and commented that Hanford welders are some of the most talented in the country and should be utilized.

Bob Parks asked if the sodium has been drained out of FFTF. Doug said yes, the majority has been drained. Bob asked if it could be restarted; Doug said perhaps, but with significant costs. Bob asked if it could be sold as an asset to a private corporation; Doug said no, they are maintaining it because it is not a high risk.

### ***Ecology***

Jane Hedges said a week ago, the governor and attorney general gave notice to DOE that the State of Washington intended to sue, and on Wednesday a suit was filed in federal court because the federal government missed TPA milestones. She said the federal government has sixty days to respond to the litigation and a court date schedule will be issued in the next ninety days. The lawsuit focuses on retrieval and treatment, including supplemental treatment. Jane said the governor has always said that negotiations needed to be resolved during the current administration because the state believes it was that administration that failed to meet the TPA. Jane said Ecology, DOE and EPA have a path forward, but the state always felt it needed a judicial consent decree, and the state and the federal government could not agree on consent decree terms. Information on the lawsuit was available at the Board meeting.

Jane said Washington is facing severe budget problems and issued a hiring freeze and a ban on out-of-state travel. She noted it could affect Ecology’s ability to travel and meet with groups outside the state, but will try to make use of modern technology for meetings (e.g. phone links, webcams).

Jane said the comment period on the WTP 2+2 melter permit modification is open until Monday. She noted that Ecology permitted the original WTP melter configuration, but the design changed, which required changing the permit. She said PIC discussed the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Site-Wide Permit. Jane said it is a huge effort, and Ecology developed helpful Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).

Jane thanked Board members for attending the State of the Site meetings that were held in October. She said Ecology finds them useful and thanked the Board and its organizations for their effort. Jane said DOE did a great job with the baseline workshop, too.

### ***EPA***

Dennis said EPA is undergoing some staffing changes: Nick Ceto left EPA and took a job with DOE, and Alicia Boyd (300 Area project manager) is leaving at the end of the month. Dennis said Larry Gadbois will take over the 300 Area work and Rod Lobos will take on his work in K Area. EPA will hire a new manager in the spring of 2009.

## *Discussion*

Ken Niles asked if EPA and Ecology support DOE's 2015 Vision. Will it be formalized? Dennis said EPA has been talking with DOE about the 2015 Vision. He said ultimately, what they do is led by TPA change packages. He said there is a lot of work, including a tentative agreement to complete a change package for K Basins in mid-January. Dennis said they also have agreement in principle to negotiate building cleanup in the Central Plateau, which requires them to complete negotiations by the end of April. Dennis said DOE is working on a schedule for the final RI/FS process along the Columbia River. Dennis said the final piece will be formalizing how to holistically clean up the Central Plateau. He said the Board should be engaged in site cleanup visioning between February and April. Dennis said EPA has not endorsed the 2015 Vision, but it is consistent with where they have been in the past and where they will go in the future.

Jane agreed and said there are some things about the 2015 Vision Ecology wants to talk with DOE about, but they agree that shrinking Hanford's footprint and getting off the river is essential. Ecology has not officially endorsed the Vision, but is not saying it does not endorse it.

Shelley asked if the Board should have a workshop or Committee of the Whole meeting to discuss the 2015 Vision. Susan Leckband said they can discuss it on the next EIC call.

Doug Mercer asked how much flexibility will be built into the ROD and feasibility studies. Dennis said RODs have specific directions and deliverables, but are developed so DOE and its contractors can plan work in the most efficient manner. He said the need for milestones and flexibility is a constant balance. Doug Shoop said if a remedial action is not protective, DOE is responsible for implementing a different one. There will be long-term monitoring to ensure remedial actions are effective.

Shelly asked if the agencies are discussing what to do with TRU waste that was disposed prior to 1970. Dennis said they are, and that the magnitude of the decision is huge.

Susan Leckband noted that the Board has long been on record stating that the TPA is the backbone of cleanup. It has also supported the renegotiation of milestones in the past, which has happened many times. She was glad to hear that the TPA agencies agree on a path forward, but disheartened that it was not quite enough and ended up in a lawsuit. She reiterated that the agencies should work together and use the TPA to guide cleanup.

## **Strategic Public Involvement Planning Workshop**

Steve Hudson said the public involvement strategic planning workshop held yesterday was a success. Ken Niles presented a summary of responses to an informal public involvement survey. Respondents included Board members, their organizations, and the agencies. Steve said the survey helped identify disconnects of how and why people go about public involvement. Steve said public involvement and communication is important for building public trust and moving cleanup forward.

Steve said PIC decided to have a workshop after DOE requested that the Board become more proactive with public involvement, clarify public involvement goals, identify new public involvement strategies and ensure public involvement activities meet the multiple purposes and needs of the agencies and the public. He said the entire Board needs to be more proactive with public involvement, not just PIC. He encouraged more people to join PIC and/or attend its meetings.

Steve said it was clear that PIC and the Board need to be as informed as possible about Hanford issues (e.g. RCRA Site-Wide Permit) in order to engage the public and obtain public input. The agencies asked PIC for help on rolling out the RCRA Site-Wide Permit and the TC&WM EIS. PIC thinks it may be worthwhile to have a Board tutorial agenda item for educating the public.

PIC action items include:

- Prepare advice for the February Board meeting about the TC&WM EIS comment period and public policy questions that should be addressed (advise a comment period longer than the currently planned 60 days)

- Prepare advice for the February Board meeting to revise the Community Relations Plan (CRP) and provide recommendations on how PIC and the Board can help
- Help update the CRP (last revision was in 2001; revision process takes about a year)
- Help design a TC&WM EIS workshop immediately after its release
- Work on materials prior to the TC&WM EIS release to “jumpstart” the public
- Design a public involvement flowchart (i.e. ideal public involvement activities are needed for a particular issue) to encourage successful public involvement activities and strategies
- Respond to Ecology’s request for public involvement input on how to make the RCRA Site-Wide Permit accessible and understandable, and help describe the role of the permit in the Hanford cleanup process
- Recommend workshop topics that could be integrated into Board agendas instead (e.g. tutorials at Board meetings)

The survey, HAB public involvement white paper, TPA agencies strategic communications plan, CRP and Gerry Pollet’s memo about public involvement goals were available at the Board meeting.

#### *Agency perspective*

##### *Ecology*

Nolan thanked Steve, Ken Niles, and other PIC issue managers and participants. He said there was a good exchange of ideas and discussion of policy level issues that Ecology found useful. He said Ecology has a plan for rolling out the RCRA Site-Wide Permit, and the input from the workshop will help sharpen that plan and how Ecology develops the permit itself. He hoped the discussions will continue.

##### *EPA*

Dennis thought it was a productive workshop and he recommended everyone review the responses to the informal survey. He said it is telling how different organizations and agencies view the role of public involvement. Dennis said transparency is essential to ensure a sustainable Hanford cleanup. The workshop structure provided time to work on policy issues focusing on the TC&WM EIS and RCRA Site-Wide Permit, and it was a springboard for thinking about updating the TPA Agencies Strategic Communications Plan.

##### *DOE-ORP*

Lori thought it was a good workshop and thanked the planners and presenters. She said there is a lot of public involvement work coming up and she looks forward to working with PIC and the Board.

##### *DOE-RL*

Paula said she is glad to hear that PIC will work on updating the CRP. She said getting that right will be valuable for years to come because the CRP drives public involvement. She looked forward to identifying a process and schedule for working on the CRP with PIC.

#### *Discussion*

Susan Leckband noted that several issues the agencies asked the Board to work on in FY 2009 have major public involvement components. She said PIC will need help.

Ken Niles said it was a good workshop; PIC needs to keep going and carve out additional time to continue the progress.

### **Committee Reports**

#### ***PIC***

Steve thanked Board members for their reports on the State of the Site meetings, and said people appreciated Jane Hedges “look back, look forward” statements. Steve said some people thought DOE-RL’s presentation was too long, but some thought it provided useful background information.

PIC will have a conference call in December to prioritize its action items.

### ***HSEP***

Cathy said HSEP is working on the plutonium toxicity issue and may have a joint committee meeting with RAP in January.

### ***RAP***

Maynard said in January, RAP wants to discuss the Office of Science and Technology Roadmap with PNNL and DOE-RL and DOE-ORP. RAP is considering a white paper on institutional controls (Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large, is the issue manager). Maynard said in January, RAP will work with HSEP on the plutonium toxicity issue and make sure it is not duplicative of Washington Department of Health and Ecology efforts. RAP will discuss the status of TRU waste and K Basins, and will follow up on the baseline workshop and overall Central Plateau strategy.

RAP will have a conference call in December.

### ***TWC***

Larry said TWC is working on five issues:

- 242-A Evaporator upgrades, modifications and its long-term mission
- Advanced remediation technologies (DOE-EM); currently DOE-HQ is evaluating an advanced scale study with simulants and actual Hanford waste (DOE-ORP will follow up with TWC)
- U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission final report was presented via telephone conference
- Potential advice on low activity waste and treatment path forward
- Single-shell tank integrity expert review panel (Rob Davis is the issue manager); TWC is working on draft advice and will ask DOE-ORP to invite the contractor to the February Board meeting for an update.
  - Rob said the single-shell tank integrity study is critical to a number of activities. He said there has not been a thorough study of the structural integrity of single-shell tanks in a while. TWC had a workshop in October and brainstormed issues the integrity study could consider. He said TWC will work on the draft advice in January and expects to bring it to the full Board in February.
  - The single-shell tank integrity expert review panel will have a workshop in the Tri-Cities on January 26 – 28. An entrance interview will be open to the public and there will be time for public comments and questions about single-shell tank integrity.

In January, TWC will also discuss secondary waste mass balance, and has a request in to DOE-ORP to hear a BNI independent study (Mike Korenko is the issue manager). TWC has a request to DOE-ORP to follow up on the secondary waste roadmap and a presentation on mission change analysis. TWC will also discuss a mobile evaporator being considered for tank farms, and DOE-EM's final decision on steam reforming path forward.

TWC will have a conference call in December and a meeting in January.

### ***BCC***

Harold said BCC will discuss future budget requirements and priorities during a Committee of the Whole meeting on December 11. Gerry prepared framing questions and will send them out prior to the meeting. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) did a report on DOE project management systems and BCC will discuss the report. Other topics BCC will address include future DOE-RL and DOE-ORP baselines, new contract work scopes and integration, and routine budget reviews.

BCC may need a conference call in December and a meeting in January. Conference calls and meetings will be confirmed after the Committee of the Whole meeting.

### ***National involvement***

Susan Leckband said the recent Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting was very good. Christine Gelles gave a good waste management presentation, and a Weapons Complex manager shared information on the politics of cleanup. Susan said it was Jim Rispoli's last meeting. Susan said they again heard that Hanford's pre-1970 TRU waste is not considered TRU waste. There is a new advisory board in the DOE complex, the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant; Susan provided them with the HAB Process Manual and other resources to help get their advisory board on track.

Susan said all SSAB presentations are available on their website (EnviroIssues will email the web address to Board members). Susan thought HAB presentations should be available on the HAB website, too.

Shelley shared information from around the DOE complex and ways the Board has been involved nationally:

- There are many candidates for the Secretary of Energy position.
- 14 people are on the administration transition team, headed by L.G. Holstein (a senior advisor to the Obama campaign). Shelley said many people on the transition team have backgrounds in renewable energy.
- Shelley attended the RadWaste Summit in Las Vegas. She said it was billed as a dialogue between the government and industry to improve radiological waste management. She said the dynamic has changed with the acknowledgement that more public vetting is necessary for progress. There are a number of uncertainties, including resources and waste projections.
  - Shelley said DOE hopes Yucca Mountain will open in 2020; all of its space is already reserved, and DOE needs to start a siting process for another site or change the requirements to increase Yucca Mountain capacity. She said there is uncertainty around the disposal pathway of Class B and C waste.
  - Shelley noted that a waste control specialist firm in Texas is working on a draft license to open a low-level radiological waste site. It is a compact site and will be limited to waste from Texas and Vermont. She said the Nevada Test Site is accepting low-level waste until 2010. Shelley said there is a big question about where future waste streams will go.
  - Shelley said the U.S. is thinking about the international transfer of waste. There is a proposal to bring 20,000 tons of waste from Italy to a commercial treatment facility in Tennessee, for final disposal in Utah. The Northwest Interstate Compact on Low-level Radioactive Waste has challenged that proposal, saying it requires the Compact's approval. Shelley said Christine Gelles is getting calls about the potential for private licensees to gain access to DOE sites for low-level wastes disposal. Shelley said the Board needs to keep that issue on its radar.
- Shelley attended the Intergovernmental Conference in Utah, along with a couple Board members, the Energy Communities Alliance, attorneys general, state legislatures, tribal government working groups, and many more. Inez Triay (via phone) said she is focusing on site cleanup, becoming a resource through trained workers, and business return on investment. DOE is also looking at additional funding for national labs to drive cleanup progress. Frank Marcinkowski, director of DOE's Office of Regulatory Compliance, said NRDA assessments should be performed at the beginning of cleanup. Shelley said Merle Sykes will spearhead revamping the budget department and how they "rack and stack" cleanup activities. Shelley said they are working on a 2010 narrative for a fully compliant budget, but Hanford will not see any information until the new administration is in place.

Shelley will share more information and work through RAP to communicate larger issues to the Board.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment was given.

### **Board Business**

Susan Leckband was re-affirmed as HAB chair for 2009.

Mike Korenko asked how advice is tracked. Cathy said issue managers are responsible for tracking advice and bringing back information to the committee chair and vice-chair. Advice and responses are available online.

Maxine noted it may be less redundant and time-consuming if advice authors spend a little less time introducing advice.

Susan Leckband is working with DOE to improve the HAB website. Committee and Board meeting/call schedules are available online.

Potential February Board meeting topics include:

- Board self-evaluation
- Revise and update HAB Process Manual
- TC&WM EIS and RCRA Site-Wide Permit workshop
- PIC advice on 1) TC&WM EIS and its comment period, and 2) CRP revision
- Committee of the Whole potential action/update on budgets and baselines
- TWC draft advice on single-shell tank integrity expert panel review
- DOE-RL 2015 Vision
- RAP advice on K Area cleanup and white paper on institutional controls

Other upcoming events/actions:

- Committee of the Whole budgets and baselines workshop on December 11
- EnviroIssues will email information about the single-shell tank integrity expert review panel and public comment opportunities (Tri-Cities, January 26 – 28)
- December calls: PIC, RAP, TWC and EIC
  - EIC topics include discussing potential Board review/action on DOE-RL 2015 Vision
- EnviroIssues will email the SSAB website address to Board members
- EnviroIssues will work with Board leadership to develop a tutorial on how to navigate the HAB website, create additional issue manager guidelines, and update the HAB Process Manual.

**Attendees**

**HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**

Tom Carpenter, Member	Bob Parks, Member	Floyd Hodges, Alternate
Rob Davis, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate
Earl Fordham, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Gene Schreckhise, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Gwen Luper, Alternate
Julie Jones, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	John Martell, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Debra McBaugh, Alternate
Susan Kreid, Member		Emmett Moore, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Al Boldt, Alternate	Laura Mueller, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Karen Bowman, Alternate	Vince Panesko, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Gary Peterson, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Doug Mercer, Member	Sam Dechter, Alternate	Dave Rowland, Alternate
Ken Niles, Member	Ken Gasper, Alternate	Dick Smith, Alternate
Bob Parazin, Member	Maxine Hines, Alternate	John Stanfill, Alternate
		Art Tackett, Alternate

**AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF**

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL		Bill Johnson, WRPS
Paula Call, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	John Britton, WRPS
Doug Shoop, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Scott Sax, WRPS
Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL	Ed Fredenburg, Ecology	Janice Williams, CHPRC
Jon Peschong, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Vic Pizzuto, CHPRC
		Moses Jaraysi, CHPRC
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnerland, Ecology	Peter Bengston, WCH
Ben Harp, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	
Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP		Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues
	Mike Priddy, WDOH	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Dimple Patel, DOE	Gail Laros, RAES WDOH	Penny Mable, EnviroIssues
Susan Avery, DOE	Janet Roth, BNI	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Ellwood Glossbrenner, DOE	Suzanne Heart, BNI	Michele Gerber, Fluor Hanford
		Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Beverly Penny, CTUIR – DOSE	Judith Moses, CTUIR – DOSE	Tom Bailor, CTUIR
Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald		