

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**

*August 16, 2007
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
 Committee Work and Institutional Controls..... 1
 Committee Discussion on *Politics of Cleanup* by Energy Communities Alliance..... 5
 Committee Discussion on the Groundwater and Vadose Zone Management Plan 7
 River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA)..... 8
 Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) 9
 RCBRA continued 9
 Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) 11
 Update from Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)..... 12
 Committee Work Planning and Committee Business..... 13
 Handouts 14
 Attendees..... 14

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

Welcome and Introductions

Jerry Peltier, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair, asked for introductions and provided a brief introduction to the days topics.

The June committee meeting summary was adopted with the changes from Rick Bond and Dennis Faulk.

Committee Work and Institutional Controls

Pam Larsen said RAP has looked at Institutional Controls (ICs) in the past but it has always been as a future issue. With a Record of Decision (ROD) coming soon, Pam said outside experts can share lessons learned and provide ideas about how to effectively plan for long term stewardship (LTS) with the committee.

Jay Pendergrass, a senior attorney with the Environmental Law Institute who has worked on ICs for twenty years, provided an overview. He started by saying that LTS and ICs need to have clear objectives to operate as long as the contamination remains on site and is seen as a risk to human health and the environment. He has found that it is good to examine a variety of ICs operating in different segments of the population since no IC is a silver bullet. Jay mentioned four items needed for successful implementation of ICs.

- Good record keeping system that is backed up and made publicly available.
- Legally binding restrictions on the property including the groundwater and contamination.
- Agency responsibility for monitoring and enforcement.
- Stable funding for implementation and long term maintenance.

Jay then shared lessons learned of what has and has not worked by first reviewing property that is transferred outside of federal ownership. Zoning is one way to control future land use but it is not iron clad and depends on local governments with authority over zoning. Jay said in general there are two types of zoning: exclusionary and inclusionary. Jay said exclusionary is more amenable to ICs because it only allows one use at a site.

Another tool Jay described was property law basis and deed restrictions. This involves putting restrictions in the deed that outline what you are trying to exclude or what you want to see happen with the site. Washington State recently implemented a Uniform Environmental Covenants Act (UECA) which will help to make sure property regulations do not hamper ICs on a piece of land. It provides a formal process of entering the IC onto the deed and designates a regulator to enforce it. It can only be removed with the approval of the environmental agency. Jay said Hanford is starting from a good position for regulating in Washington with the implementation of this law. In other states Jay said he would question whether property based controls could work. Washington adopted a discretionary provision to the law about record keeping that requires DOE to keep records on what is in the deed so you do not have to look through the deeds to get the information.

Mike Bellot, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), spoke on how ICs interact with the Superfund law. Mike explained how they start their IC evaluation by asking if the approach will get the right information to the right person at the right time. Their perspective is to be proactive rather than reactive. They have different objectives and multiple levels of ICs to protect human health, resources or the remedy selected making it necessary sometimes to put an IC on a site that is not contaminated to protect something else. Mike explained that at the remedy decision stage it is necessary to compartmentalize the relationship between the media, the end of the remedy and the immediate objective. For example, if you are concerned about people digging at a site and contaminating themselves and you use the UECA it probably will not affect the right person because people do not look at the records before they dig.

Mike said you have to know enough about the record of decision (ROD) to be sure the IC chosen is possible to implement by asking better questions about its effectiveness. Such questions include: What are the performance standards for the IC, how do you test the hypothesis about providing the right information to the right person at the right time and how will you mitigate it if it does not do this? After answering these questions, Mike said often a gap becomes apparent and you need to add an IC instead of revising an existing IC.

If the IC becomes ineffective in the long term, it is important to think about how the media, the objective and the instrument work together to be effective. Mike noted how dealing with local government can present new problems and explained four ICs. The first IC Mike discussed was propriety. Local governments only use a few policies that deal with land users and owners often excluding excavators. The second IC is local government permit for zoning, excavating and drilling. Mike said sometimes it is necessary to change the code in order to implement an IC. He also mentioned that you can not protect human health and the environment with a code that was not meant to do that. You need the financial backing and a willingness from the local agencies to make it effective.

The third IC is EPA enforcement devices such as consent decrees and permits. EPA uses these most regularly with federal facilities. Mike noted, however, that they are tricky and have complications with federal facility agreements and RODs.

The fourth IC Mike reviewed was informational devices such as a deed notice. Mike said you can not take a deed notice and apply it legally. Since it is primarily informational, it would be preferable to have something enforceable. Mike next explained new EPA tools for ICs including the call before you dig system which is heavily used by excavators who do not want to hit a gas line. Mike said they did a pilot project in California on eighteen sites. He said there were over 1000 calls in one month for excavations. Twenty of the 1000 would have resulted in a breach of the IC or in exposure.

Regulator Perspectives

- Brenda Jentzen, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said they are just coming up to speed on the UECA and have people from headquarters (HQ) coming over to discuss it. Brenda said she looked into Hanford land use regulations and found if the land is in Benton County then the parcels are recorded at the county office so Brenda thought it would be possible to implement. Brenda will check to see if the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) members can come to the meeting with HQ to discuss ICs.

Committee Discussion

- *Jerry asked Jay to address home building covenants, and what authority the jurisdictions have over the covenant.* Jay said that was a formal mechanism under property law. It was called a restrictive covenant and was only enforceable in chain of title. Local owners and regulators could not enforce the covenant and it specifically says that the local government has an interest. It does not say they have to be on the deed but that they should be notified.
- *Pam asked Jay to provide examples of ICs failing or succeeding.* Jay said they did a study of EPA Superfund sites and how they were being implemented. Failure to record the deed was a common problem. If they do not record it and the property sells, the new owner does not have to follow the IC. There have been instances that the property is sold without the buyer knowing about the ICs and then changes the

use of the site. For example, at the Oak Ridge golf course everyone thought there was a restriction on the groundwater use in the deed. At some point after the transfer, a DOE employee saw them irrigating on-site and found they were pumping the groundwater. The deed said the city was required to hook up to city water supply but did not outline the contamination. They had not hooked up for irrigation purposes and the wording in the deed was not adequate for what they were trying to accomplish. However, the contamination they were talking about was an organic compound that was remediated by being sprayed. Jay said educational campaigns were only partially successful. When the IC worked it was because they were using a combination of good record keeping, education and precise language that defined the risk in the deed.

- Jay said it is important that the IC be coordinated with the remedy. ICs fail when they are initiated while the ROD is being discussed. They need to plan ahead and study what they are and how they will work. DOE and EPA have greatly improved their practice over the last ten years and Jay found success where people specified there should be zoning controls put in place.
- *Pam asked if the study on Los Alamos includes information on the stakeholders involved with ICs.* Jay said they have suggested that it is important to have local government involvement when considering what the ICs will be. They will be the first responder and need to know the hazards. Frequently they are a part of implementation, because zoning may be a part of the IC along with property restrictions. Jay said Mound is a good example where they included local government and some element of public participation; the report is available on the web.
- *Maynard Plahuta said hypothetically if there is industrial use at a site and later the community would like to change that, what are the tools to change the use and who is responsible with the cost of doing additional remediation?* Jay said if it was a private site the later user that is proposing the land use change would do the clean up, but it may be different with federal government due to the provisions in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). Jay has seen a federal agency assert that when they finish remedial action and the controls are in place any changes are the responsibility of the new user. Maynard asked what if the site is turned over to the county. Jay said this is another reason why it would be useful to have a study of ICs costs that are likely to be implemented. The Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RIFS) will likely not report this. It is important to consider what the differential cost is of the planned cleanup and one that remediates it to the highest use: comparing long term care of ICs with up front costs of cleanup.
- *Dirk Dunning asked how you ensure continued funding with the federal government to keep ICs in place.* Jay said the funding is from the appropriations process, and a part of the site cleanup agreement. For other sources, there have been cases of creating a trust or using other mechanisms to put money in to draw on it. A few organizations are set up to try to do that; you pay them a fee to make sure cleanup happens. Jay said his caveat with those is that the government can not really turn over all of their responsibilities nor should they want to particularly the oversight.

Committee Discussion on *Politics of Cleanup* by Energy Communities Alliance

Pam said the Energy Communities Alliance, who produced the *Politics of Cleanup*, is an alliance of cities and counties adjacent to sites around the country. Pam thought it would be good to hear lessons learned from Environmental Management (EM) sites around the nation. Shelley Cimon, national liaison to the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB), has asked the HAB to provide comments on this report.

Seth Kirshenber, one of the authors of the report, said this report is intended to respond to a Senate request on closure sites. They tried to identify what made cleanup successful at closed sites and at active sites. Stepping back from one particular site or issue they were able to see the politics and partnerships that go into the cleanup. Seth explained how different sites worked together to achieve cleanup. Doing the minimum legal requirements would not have achieved cleanup. What made cleanup successful was collaborating, developing goals and identifying future uses of a site, working on actions, communicating, and building trust.

Seth shared some lessons learned from his report. Trust was built through ongoing relationships between the community enabling DOE to share information. Seth said conflict resolution and having a process for dealing with conflict was important because conflicts will arise. Ensuring everyone knows the rules to participate in the process and understands the agencies' budget and decision making processes. The community needs to come together to reach agreement and make goals and make their values understood. Last, education is essential as people change

Congress has made it a priority to cleanup these sites and is aware of the sites' activities. Seth noted that without goals for moving forward, trust and accountability was hard to achieve. The principal of "no surprises" was important and sharing bad news build trust. Successful cleanup requires parties to resolve conflicts that arise and engage each other regularly to build trust. Seth also said the report lays out how the budget process works in Washington and at the site level which is an important process to understand.

Committee Discussion

- *Jerry asked if Seth has found that Congress continues to provide funding for ICs at the sites in his report.* Seth said Rocky Flats has a post cleanup group that works on implementation strategies for ICs and stewardship. They have been successful at implementing funds on an annual basis. They have had failures too such as the hunters killing and eating deer meat that might be contaminated. At Oak Ridge, the group is looking at controls at sites where cleanup is finished. ICs still happen on a yearly basis and can be trumped by federal work. Seth said it is important to get the key political people to focus on it.
- *Rob Davis said once parts of the site turn over to ICs, ICs are not within EM. What if something is left behind?* Seth said he would like to get the committee the example of what they are doing at Rocky Flats. A lot of EM staff moved to the new organization to continue working on ICs. At a site level it has to continue to be watched and the

priority is still on the cleanup actions and not the longer term stewardship. The House looked at moving the long term stewardship to EM. Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, clarified at Rocky Flats they turned the site over but it was still EM's requirement to cleanup left contamination.

- *Vince Panesko said he does not see the politics within EM and the political discussion that goes on within the department included in this report. The funding that is not there is the really important message to get out of this.* Seth said in section one they talk about what happens in EM with political and congressional support and their budgeting over the past nine years. He focused on the community aspects based on a Senate request. Seth interviewed DOE staff and the community at the end of the cleanup and both commented that working together was successful. When Seth reminded them about the conflicts, the community said they learned to resolve conflicts and obtain funding through budgeting. Seth said the report identifies useful tools for DOE and the communities moving forward.
- *Harold Heacock said right now Hanford is one of the big dollar parts of the cleanup program and it will be 2050 before the tank farms are cleaned up. The other sites will be out of the picture in the next few years. How do you keep the momentum and support to get money into Hanford?* Seth said working with other sites that still have ongoing requirements and working with a larger delegation to lobby for the funding can be helpful. Washington does a good job of having their Congressional staff obtain funding, but as those people change you could lose that support. You have to continue to engage delegations to get the support and funding.
- *Dennis asked if the report touches on the change in administration.* Seth said each EM office creates its own sales pitch to obtain funding each year. The pitch is the political discussion about funding. This has shifted when the administration changed and they changed to legacy management. Seth agreed that it is the focus of the leadership and the internal political issues that get it supported.
- *Shelley Cimon said she is concerned about the lens through which this report is written. She felt it is written through the lens of local government knowing best instead of bringing together a diverse representation of stakeholders. It skews the use of the document by the Board to get everyone on the same page and work correctively. Shelley said she is concerned about Jim Rispoli's interest in this document and its narrow focus.* Seth said he tried to identify those disagreements between the local government and the communities. However, he found this helped create solutions to reach an agreement on cleanup. His intent was to not mislead Shelley or others that they did not support the SSABs. Seth felt this report says that all the parties should work together and be a part of the cleanup.
- *Vince said he thought the document's seventeen recommendations do not apply to Hanford.* Pam said they did not study Hanford. Seth explained that the recommendation of working together came from case studies of people not being able to come together and work. The report describes how to create a process to resolve conflicts and provides examples on how that happened. Seth said these are simple recommendations, but they are things the HAB should strive for.

- Cathy McCague asked that committee members provide comments to Susan and Shelley. The report is available on the web and hardcopies can be made available.

Committee Discussion on the Groundwater and Vadose Zone Management Plan

Shelley reviewed a letter she drafted regarding the Groundwater and Vadose Zone Management Plan. Jerry explained that there was a consensus amongst the issue managers that there was not enough information for advice but that the Board should comment on it.

Shelley said her intent was to say that the plan appears to be good, however, the committee needs more information. The letter recommends DOE to keep going forward, not loose track of funding, make it sustainable over time and keep it open to a public process. Shelley said it might be necessary to add a request for a public workshop to provide input.

Vince said DOE has been struggling with this for thirty plus years with money flowing in on different pipelines and groundwater was forgotten. In the 1990's DOE was going to integrate groundwater but Vince did not know what happened to that effort. Vince said the risk assessment for the 300 Area showed the disconnect between what happens on the surface and in the groundwater and there is no integration. There is a plan to do integration but it remains unclear how it will work.

Dennis addressed Vince's remarks. He thought DOE has made major strides on integration in the past few years and in the 1990's it was more of a concept than a real program. Dennis said when the groundwater Feasibility Study focuses attention on tank farms and surface soils. Dennis felt that if this plan does not come out and articulate that then the committee should address that.

Vince said it would be interesting to know more about the teams, not necessarily in the plan. John Sands, DOE-RL, said the groundwater integration efforts from the 1990's are being carried forward. John said they had problems with how they were contracted and sited. Under the last contract, they delineated the responsibilities to make integration easier. Structurally, tank farms were separated: they had a contractor that did the groundwater and a separate one to do the rest of the site. John said they are working on collaborating and integrating the team's daily processes. John offered to come back and report to the committee on this topic.

Shelley said there is language that she would have been worded differently in the plan, but the intent was great and she felt the point was not to pick at the details. Maynard agreed and said the committee can give specific comments as individuals, but as a Board he liked this approach.

Dick Smith said he spent a lot of time reading before he got to the actual plan. Dick was not sure all the historical stuff was necessary and felt frustrated about all the extra

information in it. John asked Dick to write down those comments to improve the readability of the document.

Dib Goswami, Ecology, said the groundwater and vadose zone integration are happening at a faster pace and it will be Ecology's responsibility to follow it. He foresees that in the next few years it will be a focus and recommends that RAP have it on every agenda.

Harold recommended that Shelley be consistent with what the groundwater flow chart says and include it as an example. Dirk said the tone is great and integration is essential. He thought this is an immense problem and there are lots of approaches including how contractors share work has benefits and detriments. Dirk said the committee needs to look at how the work is divided up to make it is solve-able. Dirk said the soil is going to be a big challenge between groundwater and the top and encourages the committee should to keep that in mind.

Gerry Pollet said he thinks programs like this succeed and fail because no one sticks to it. Instead of updating a plan, DOE builds a whole new one. He said he likes that there is movement back to integration, but that the committee should advocate for sticking to a basic plan that has groundwater as a guiding force.

River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA)

Jerry said the comments received on the RCBRA report were tied to the executive summary. He said the problem is that the public cannot easily understand the executive summary and those who explained it at the RCBRA workshop were confused as well. . This lead to some issue managers crafting draft advice on how to write technical document summaries aimed at the public. .

Dick said this report does not do a good job of explaining information to the public. He believes it is important that documents produced are available for non-technical individuals to consume and understand. Maynard explained that Dick came up with this method of giving advice not to the overall risk assessment, but to the process with which they provide information. Maynard said they had discussions with contractors and DOE who are receptive about getting informational material through the system.

Jerri Main said she thinks that this is a great issue and the reports mean nothing if folks can not understand them. Vince said that Dick rewrote the summary from 38 pages to 8 pages. Karen said she would like to see the summary re-write and the template Dick used.

The committee agreed that this should move forward as advice. Harold said he agreed with the advice but had some language changes to suggest. Jerry asked committee members to submit their comments/changes to Dick so they can get the final to Cathy for the Board packet.

Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA)

Pam Larsen provided a review of the NRDA workshop. Pam said NRDA is part of CERCLA and many times occurs at the end of cleanup to determine if the cleanup was adequate and what damage was done to the environment. The Natural Resource Trustees can file for compensation for any damage done. DOE has agreed to start this process early before RODs and before cleanup ends. She said the process examines natural resource issues and how many days these resources were lost and what the value is per day to the public. The agencies involved have a lot of experience doing this particularly the Department of Interior. The trustees would like to have discussions on how the process proceeds as it is discretionary. Pam thought it would be useful for this committee to stay informed about the progress.

Barbara Harper, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation (CTUIR), said that she thought Pam presented a good perspective and it is good she saw that it is a methodical process. Barbara said there is an introductory course and training that is open to the public if anyone is interested. Next week there is a key meeting in Portland. Barbara said they are working on a new way of being collaborative and next week will be the first test on how it works. She said the junior trustees are the legally recognized trustees. They first attempt to work out the technical questions and if they can not they will move it up to the seniors. The goal is to restore the site and recover the quality habitat and preserve it. Barbara said they still need to address the typical trustee response to leave the contamination there but to pay CTUIR for it.

Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL, said the decision to move forward with NRDA does not mean DOE will do this by itself. They will do it in concert with the CERCLA process so this committee will inevitably hear about the progress.

Al Hawkins, DOE-RL, said this is a really interesting time to provide input on a statement of work for path forward. Al's involvement includes making sure DOE resources are coordinated. Al commented that the documents going back to the early 1990s are still germane. These documents normally have a three or four year half life. Al was delighted that the HAB is interested and said these meetings are all open but if you want to attend please let the facilitator know.

Pam said she raised a question about public involvement because the process does not include this. Al said they agreed to work on a communications plan per Dave Brockman's request. Gerry suggested the State should have a communication plan not DOE. Gerry said the HAB should push for input as the trustee to the resource. Jamie said they have gone through the pre assessment phase and are now going through the assessment phase which will produce a document that will be available for public review.

RCBRA continued

Jerry presented to the committee a draft document listing policy comments from the issue managers about the RCBRA. He suggested that the committee select a few high level

policy comments on the RCBRA to be put forward to the full Board. Jerry said individuals can submit their personal comments on their own and this discussion should be focused on what the Board will submit. .

Vince read through the comments and explained the issues that each comment is intended to highlight. Vince identified three comments he felt the Board should put forward.

1. The Executive Summary needs to be re-written to reflect the purpose of this document. The summary needs to explain what is good, what is bad and what is important.
2. The name of the report needs to be changed to reflect that it is not an overall risk assessment.
3. The risk assessment needs to include a discussion of the significance that the cancer risk numbers are essentially at background levels.

Steve Weiss, DOE-RL, said he understands the committees concerns with this document. He said this is a big yet really good document, and he commended Bechtel Hanford for completing it. Steve explained that because the RCBRA had a milestone on it, it was not possible to make it perfect. As hundreds of thousands of data points were added together, the team reviewed each one as it came up. As such, this is not a focused risk assessment but a review of all the contaminants. Steve said it quickly became an 800 page document and it was drafted as best it could. They will continue to revise it so they can understand Hanford's contribution and use it on-site. The schedule is to wrap up all of the other risk assessments that go into this by 2009.

Regulator Perspectives

- Dennis commented that the document went through no internal or regulatory reviews and there are problems with how the document was put together. The question for the committee is, is it effective to see an early draft of a document like this? Dennis said by the time the committee sees a document it has been scrubbed, but they are not as amenable to change it. In this case however, the committee got an early product that has not been reviewed and revised as much. Once the regulators review this they will catch some of the issues the committee discussed.
- Dennis also commented that it is interesting how different committee members can look at the data and come up with different risks. He encouraged the committee to think about that and how risk can be portrayed because it is an individual interpretation.

Committee Discussion

- Dirk said the point at which the committee wants to see a document depends on who is looking at the document. Dirk also wanted to discuss what it means to be background. He said Potassium is background because it was not produced at Hanford. There are other investigations in other documents that try to sort that out.

- John Stanfill thought it was better to see a document too early than too late. It should just be stated that it is an early document and is not finished.
- Maynard was not sure there is a flat answer about when the committee wants to get documents. He felt earlier is better, but if it requires regulatory review he would like it to go through that process first. Maynard said the risk assessment is so big and broad it might have been better to wait a little longer.
- Barbara said the trustee council likes to see documents early because they have been involved in the process and understand that it is raw before they see it.
- Gerry suggested the decision makers need to know Hanford's increment risk. What is Hanford's contribution to risk from contamination? This question needs to be addressed in the risk assessment.
- Dick said one difficult task ahead is risk communication and if the inside people who attend the workshops can help make the risk understandable to affected communities.
- Jerry will take the lead to prepare this draft letter for the September Board meeting. The comments that were left out will be submitted by individuals.

Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD)

Dennis said several committee meetings ago he talked about an ESD for cleanup of the 118 B-1 Burial Ground. He reminded the committee that it is a large eight acre burial ground where they found tritium at depth in one corner of the 100 Area. DOE put a bore hole in and found different amounts of contamination all the way to groundwater. The RODs in the 100 Area have balancing factors. The Tri-Party Agencies have only used them one other time, and plans to use them here to let nature takes its course. The ICs will control the risk since tritium has a short half life of thirteen years. Dennis said it would take eleven percent of an Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) cell if removed and would cost \$17 million to dig out all the way to groundwater. Therefore, the agencies think it is worth leaving and will move ahead with that decision provided the public supports it.

Committee Discussion

- Pam said she attended a presentation at the City of Richland by Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) on this topic and thought it was very informative. She said from the perspective of Hanford Communities, they support this balanced approach. The amount of work it would take to dig it out is not worth it.
- *Dirk asked how they found the tritium.* Dennis said it was left over from the thousands of pieces of contaminated material in the B 10 project in Area 1. Dennis said they did some verification sampling after removal and found tritium in low levels in the soil. EPA dug test pits and found higher amounts because they had not accounted for the evaporation at the surface. Borehole lateral and vertical samples supported this scenario. EPA plans to put in more wells around the area for long term monitoring.

- *Dirk asked if the source was from the plume that went across the site a few years ago. Dennis said that it could be; they have three sources up there. This burial ground is one, C reactor is another, and B Area is the third. Dirk recommended that Dennis look into whether there is a plume coming from another area to this site and co-mingling.*
- *Gerry asked what the contribution is to the risk along the shoreline. Dennis said it is not going to get worse because they are going to revegetate the area. He said Dirk's point was well taken because there could be other sources coming in. Gerry asked what the risks are for bringing roads and excavators into the area. Dennis noted the fact sheet should provide that information. He said they have controls today but what happens in the future is still unknown and those are good questions to ask.*

Update from Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)

Kevin Leary, DOE-RL, described the July 9th raw water line failure in the 200 West Area. He said initially the water increase was thought to be from filling water trucks but when the flow did not decrease after fifteen minutes they contacted the operator to initiate the search for the leak. Approximately 460,000 gallons of raw water leaked into the surround ground (less than two acres) from a 12" raw water line. Kevin said they are sampling the area and most of the tests have come back with no surprises. The hole in the pipe is 3 ½ feet long and they had to replace a twenty foot section. Kevin said there is 25-30 miles of pipes so it is important to understand what happened to cause this failure. This pipe was one that was lined previously to mitigate the corrosion build up. The lining was not a structural fix to the pipe so if it had structural flaws it would not have corrected that. DOE-RL sent a camera through after they lined the pipes to detect any suspect pipes to replace. At this point Kevin said they are unsure why this pipe broke.

Committee Discussion

- *Maynard said the cameras miss little flaws, but it may be worthwhile for someone to look at the earlier pass through of the camera to see if they missed something. Kevin said that is a good idea and it may be a good lesson learned for other sites as well. Kevin clarified that they only sent the cameras down the pipes they mortar lined which is about 10-15 percent of the pipes. Kevin said he has asked Fluor Hanford to evaluate if any sites need to be re-contoured to support the infrastructure. Kevin said it took them a year to complete the Industrial Safety pipeline study and he would like to present the results of that to the committee at some point. It is a complex project because there are many miles of different pipelines and characterizing and choosing remediation for all of it is complicated.*
- *Jerry said a lot of jurisdictions are replacing their steel lines. Why are you repairing instead of replacing? Kevin said they have projects to replace them but it is a matter of funding and it has gotten pushed out.*
- *Shelley suggested that work will be going on in the 200 Area for a long time and there needs to be an assessment of the water lines. There are a lot of issues with this broken water line. She said this site does not have to claim a release for raw water*

and that begs the question of how this site will transfer the information about this leak. DJ Ortiz, DOE-RL said he conducted a report and put all of the details of the leak in the administrative record so it remains in history. Kevin said he agrees that as their work has gotten pushed out from funding shortfalls, water lines have been ignored. The message that he wanted to bring to the committee is that this is an opportunity to look at an infiltration experiment. If they can secure the funding they could do some boreholes and see where the water went and track its movement to understand the vadose zone better. Dick said the post incident investigation might be interesting if they look at lateral flow on the terrain it could be useful for future analysis.

- *Shelley said another issue is if the water lines are needed long term. Shelley suggested that you can not put water lines under a cap if capping is a chosen alternative.* Kevin said if there are decisions to cap an area and there are water pipelines they will consider berming. These pipelines will eventually be decommissioned. As a part of another site, DOE-RL did re-route water lines in response to the potential for the cap.
- Maynard said infrastructure always comes at the bottom of the line based on his experience. At DOE-HQ, Kevin Mahoney fought to get the money to do improvements. Maynard thought the committee needs to issue advice since there is a greater need to secure additional funding for infrastructure
- *Vince asked if there is a funding delay the committee can influence.* Kevin said there is a limited amount of money and they look at risk when distributing it. Funding infrastructure is too far down on the list and there is no one at DOE-HQ whose responsibility is to focus on infrastructure. Kevin said as their timeline has been pushed out they will need to re-address this issue based on new projected dates. Kevin suggested if this report shows a higher risk with corrosion then it could move infrastructure up the ladder for funding.
- Harold said the Hanford site only gets so much money, and did not think money should be diverted from the cleanup to replace all the pipes.
- Mark French, DOE-RL announced the Notice of Intent for Greater than Class C has been released. They are looking at a number of national sites including Hanford and there will be two scoping sessions. Pam said she is working on setting up a meeting with Christine Gelles from DOE-HQ. She will be in Red Lion in Richland prior to the hearing and encouraged committee members to attend to discuss waste dispositions responsibilities. Pam said Christine mentioned that the Nevada test site has a limit on the volume of waste that can be submitted and a timeframe for not allowing more waste. Pam said Hanford does not have this but could add it to the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement.

Committee Work Planning and Committee Business

Committee Leadership selection was conducted. Jerri Main was selected for Vice Chair and Jerry Peltier for Chair.

Action Items:

- Shelley said the technology road map is now being implemented and felt the committee needs a presentation on it. The three projects going forward at Hanford are the Tech 99 deep vadose zone, chlorinated organics in the vadose zone, and numerical model develops for high risk contaminants.
- The committee needs to follow up on the response to Advice 197. Jerry asked the committee to review the response to determine if it needs to be carried forward on the next conference call
- Gerry mentioned that the Budget and Contracts Committee is drafting advice on the Request for Proposals (RFPs). Gerry said the committees proposed advice states that the decisions about remediating waste sites need to wait for regulating authority's cleanup determination. Gerry suggested the discussion of the response to the advice might be a joint committee item.
- Karen said the agencies would like the committee to ask questions about the RFPs via the website and they will post answers for everyone to access. Karen said they are working on a summary on how HAB advice over the past twelve years has been incorporated into the RFPs.
- Other agenda items include: an update on plutonium cribs, an update on groundwater update, results of the data quality objectives on pipelines, and a presentation on the cleanup verification packages.

Handouts

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

- Advice regarding Clarity and Readability of DOE Reports, Dick Smith, August 2007.
- Advice, August 14, 2007, (Rev. 2) – Shelley Cimon, Subject: Integrated Groundwater and Vadose Zone Management Plan – June 2007, DRAFT.
- Changes to Hanford Cleanup Decisions for the 118-B-1 Burial Ground located in the Columbia River Corridor – DRAFT Fact Sheet, TPA Agencies, August 2007.
- Committee Comments on the RCBRA, Dirk Dunning et al, August 2007.
- Hanford Advisory Board River and Plateau Committee Meeting, DOE-RL Update of July 9th Raw Water Line Failure, DOE-EM, August 16, 2007.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Larry Lockrem	Mike Priddy
Rob Davis	Jerri Main	Dick Smith
Dirk Dunning	Vince Panesko	John Stanfill
Ken Gasper	Jerry Peltier	Bob Suyama

Harold Heacock	Maynard Plahuta	Gene Van Liew
Pam Larsen	Gerry Pollet	Steve White

Others

Mark French, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, Ecology	Barbara Harper, CTUIR
Al Hawkins, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Seth Kirshenber, Energy Communities Alliance
Kevin Leary, DOE-RL	Brenda Jentzen, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Beth Rochette, Ecology	Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
Jean Morse, DOE-RL	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Jay Pendergrass, Environmental Law Institute
DJ Ortiz, DOE-RL	Mike Bellot, EPA	Mark Triplett, PNNL
John Sands, DOE-RL	Alicia Boyd, EPA	Duane Jacques, WCH
Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Jeff Lerch, WCH
	Yvonne Mazurak, EPA	Steve Weiss, WCH
		Gail Laws, WDOH
		Debra McBaugh, WDOH
		Dave Rowland, Yakama Nation