

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD  
RIVE AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING  
October 16, 2007  
Richland, WA**

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions ..... 1  
Draft Advice on Clarity and Readability of Department of Energy (DOE) Reports..... 1  
Response to Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) Advice #197 Groundwater Values and  
Flow Chart ..... 2  
Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Update..... 4  
TPA Negotiations Workshop..... 5  
Committee Work Plan..... 7  
Supplement Analysis (SA) to Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP)..... 8  
Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation..... 9  
Groundwater and Central Plateau Waste Sites Cleanup Update ..... 11  
Action Items / Commitments ..... 13  
Handouts ..... 13  
Attendees..... 13

*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, welcomed committee members and asked for introductions. The August meeting summary was adopted by the committee.

Karen Lutz, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) made a few announcements. The River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) meeting on October 31<sup>st</sup> has been rescheduled because the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) is broadening its scope. Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) will hold a meeting on October 30<sup>th</sup> instead to talk about the new scope. Karen also announced that a new team member, Peter Bengtson, has joined the WCH team.

**Draft Advice on Clarity and Readability of Department of Energy (DOE) Reports**

Dick Smith said this advice is aimed at the executive summaries of DOE reports. Dick said the idea is to develop some guidelines that could be followed to improve the quality of these reports so they are easier for the public to read. Dick felt the executive summary should help people who do not want to read the whole document get to the point of the

material. There are documents beyond the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) that have similar issues and could benefit from this advice. Dick reminded committee members that they have reviewed an earlier draft of this advice. The changes in this draft are minor, the most significant change being a recommendation to show where the supporting documents are located.

### **Agency Perspectives**

- Wayne Johnson, WCH, said he understands where the committee is coming from with this advice and WCH is making an effort to work on this issue. Wayne said he appreciates the committee's efforts on this issue.
- Duane Jacques, WCH, said he is leading the effort to revise the RCBRA and will use the outline Dick provided. Duane agreed that there was a valid reason to offer this advice, and said they accept it.
- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), suggested breaking the second paragraph up into two paragraphs would make the advice more clear.

### **Committee Discussion**

- *Should the advice also request the executive summary indicate what decisions will be made in the document?* Paul Schaffer suggested the second sentence could be rewritten to clarify the regulatory basis for the report and the decisions it will support. Dick said he will work on incorporating that suggestion.
- Karen distributed a handout that was just issued by Fluor Hanford (FH) on the clarity of technical documents.
- Jerry expressed concern the RCBRA is used for the basis of decision making but only evaluates the ecological elements and leaves out the human elements. Jerry said he hopes t the human element is addressed in future versions.

## **Response to Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) Advice #197 Groundwater Values and Flow Chart**

Dennis Faulk explained EPA's request for a plume registry in their response to Advice #197. EPA feels they already have mechanisms in place, such as the annual groundwater report that highlights information about all of the plumes on site, and thought the registry would be redundant. The report is well written and easy for the public to use. Dennis said they also have the Hanford Environmental Information System (HIES) for the public to access groundwater and plume information. Karen said DOE's response was supportive of continuing the discussion on developing a user friendly link for groundwater.

Dib Goswami, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), explained that under the corporate technical development (CTD) process they tried to refine the annual groundwater report and make it more user friendly. Dib said the annual report is not a

TPA driver. The report must summarize the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) recommendation which is a change from the original requirement of the document.

### Committee Discussion

- The groundwater report has come a long way, but it is not perfect. There is not currently any way to go back and look at the reports from year to year to understand what they mean over time. The registry would be an institutional piece that everyone can access and would allow for the information to be tracked from year to year.
- *Will the report change when it is moved from Battelle and given to FH?* Dennis said he has a high level of confidence in the annual report because the same people working on it previously are just under a different contract now. Dib added that it is now a compliance document so it will continue to live.
- Wade Riggsbee commented that there are technical details in the groundwater program that need work, like how they sample the plumes and how future models are represented. Registry may not be the right term, but the focus on the evolution and migration of these documents is important.
- Jerri Main said the intent of the HIES was to address any number of questions a person might have, but this can be frustrating when looking for something specific.
- Susan Leckband felt that it is incumbent on this committee to connect the topics on Institutional Controls (IC) with groundwater. The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) has been asked to look at IC as DOE moves forward on decisions in the 200 Area. The Board needs to make connections between IC, long term stewardship, and groundwater to define a position.
- Jerry said RAP would like to share the lessons learned from last month's committee discussion with Jay Pendegrass, Environmental Law Institute, and Mike Bellot, EPA, to the Board in November. Dennis felt Hanford is different than the examples that Jay and Mike provided. One of the best ways Hanford controls access to waste sites is a site-wide excavation permit. Once the cleanup is done that mechanism will have to be replaced and funding will need to be provided to fulfill this change.
- Susan agreed it is time for the Board to get a tutorial on ICs and long term stewardship but suggested issue managers develop the topic before it is brought to the Board meeting. Susan said public meetings on long term stewardship were held some years ago and might be worthwhile again. She also suggested this could be a topic for a committee of the whole (COW).
- Greg deBruler said currently there is no method to make legally binding decisions where people and the environment are protected through IC and DOE has been deferring decisions on IC to a later date. Greg felt the HAB needs to write advice on this topic. Karen suggested that Greg speak with John Sands, DOE-RL, about this topic. Greg said he would like to talk with DOE and EPA about the process for ICs and would come back to the committee with the information.

- Sandra Lilligren, Nez Perce, said Nez Perce put out an end state vision that said the tribes have very little confidence in IC especially when talking about longer than 25 years.
- *Why are the IC documents missing the cost analysis?* Dennis explained that the cost analysis is done in the Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study (RIFS). Dennis said DOE and EPA used the long term IC costs for evaluating the 100 Area burial grounds and made the argument that it is cheaper to dig them up rather than leave and maintain them; it made for an easy decision for cleanup.

### **Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Update**

Ellen Mattlin, acting Federal Project Director DOE-RL, said a record of decision (ROD) amendment for plutonium (PU) shipment to Savannah River was issued on September 5. This included a 30 day notification from Congress to start shipment. Ellen said they are still on a continuing resolution but will be able to start shipment on October 6. Ellen said they are working to make sure they have the resources to do this. Ellen described the cans the PU is housed in and the work they are doing to prepare the cans in the shipping containers. Ellen said they are working closely with the Savannah Office of Transportation Technology and are on schedule to meet the September 2009 end date.

Ellen said while they were waiting for authorization to ship they directed the contractor to continue with decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) at PFP. Ellen said they finished all D&D except for a few glove boxes which they will finish as a part of the contract in 2008. Ellen said they took resources from D&D to start shipping but will continue with D&D as possible to meet the deadline. She said the big cost for next year is the procurement of shipping containers. Ellen said this milestone always felt like Groundhog Day and was never going to come, so her team is celebrating.

### **Committee Discussion**

- *Are all of the canisters in PFP being shipped?* Ellen confirmed everything would be shipped. She said her goal is to get everything off site so they can tear the protection down. Ellen said she thought they would not need guards anymore if they got to this point. The canister storage building (CSB) can hold anything that will not be transferred.
- *Will the waste be put in sealed containers before it is sent over to CSB?* Ellen said they are in big concrete vaults now, and those would be moved over and set down at CSB. They will be set down above ground and are still looking at the security issues with this. Ellen explained they do not want to make upgrades if they can ship to Idaho or another location. Ellen said as long as you have one container still security will be required.
- *Is there an opportunity for input if the decision is made to store PU on a temporary basis at Hanford like at CSB?* Ellen clarified that the 3013s, the smaller canisters, will never be put at CSB. The spent fuel is what they were talking about moving.

- *If for some reason it does not go to Savannah, it would be stored at PFP until it could be shipped offsite?* Ellen said it would be stored in tandem while D&D is happening.

### **TPA Negotiations Workshop**

Jerry asked for comments from the committee members who attended the TPA workshop.

Dick said the workshop was very interesting and useful because it touched on a whole set of topics. Dick said he would like DOE to look at possible alternatives to the backup treatment system they are planning. He thought DOE has been focused on glass melters and had not seriously considered alternative glass. This topic came up several times during the workshop.

Greg said the workshop was a good opportunity to interface with regulators. He felt that Ecology got the message that the delays are unacceptable. Greg reiterated that the delays proposed, not just for the vitrification plant, are not okay. Greg repeated a comment that Maynard made during the workshop that the charge of the Manhattan project needs to be replicated to get this job done. Greg said Gerry Pollet's advice really captures the need to get the cleanup done effectively and timely no matter the cost. Greg said someone at the meeting suggested building extra double shell tanks (DST) because the retrieval dates had been pushed so far out. Greg thought this was the perfect answer, but felt that this option was not on the table for negotiation. He said pre 1970 Transuranic (TRU) waste and 618 10 & 11 needed to be addressed and neither were included in the discussion.

Susan said all of the documents from the workshop are available on DOE's website if people are interested. Susan said one positive element from the workshop is that the groundwater dates have been advanced. Also, the agencies are negotiating a milestone to provide a life cycle cost schedule report date.

Ken Gasper said he agrees with what Dick, Greg, and Susan said. The meetings were very worthwhile. Ken said there are two important reports coming out: the life cycle system cost for all Hanford activities, and a single shell tanks (SST) safety assessment report. He said both of these reports are necessary to understand the impacts of the delays.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Dennis said that the suggestion of going ahead with the baseline expectations of alternatives does not jump out in this advice. Gerry said page 2 tried to highlight that but it could be made to stand out more. Dennis suggested linking it to the first advice so it is together.
- Ron Skinnarland, Ecology, said Ecology would like to see a draft of the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) issued to determine if their expectations are being met by including all of the alternatives.

### Committee Discussion

- *Were Ecology and EPA pushing back on the schedule delays?* Ken said it was clear that no agreements have been made, but no fight was made by Ecology or EPA on the dates. Greg confirmed that there was no showing of differences between the agencies but there was a disclaimer presented at the start of the meeting that the dates were not final and could still change.
- Paul Shaffer said the State of Oregon sent a letter to the TPA agencies expressing concerns about accelerating tank work. Paul said Oregon believes there is not an adequate understanding of the planning for groundwater efforts. The project is just getting into data quality objectives (DQO) planning for groundwater in the river corridor, and Paul felt to accelerate that was a bad idea.
- Gerry said the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) had a good discussion on the report DOE has proposed to study how fast they can accelerate the cleanup if there were no budget constraints. Gerry said BCC felt they should not negotiate milestones until this report comes out because it would be impossible to go back and change the dates again. The message in the advice is that the deadlines need to be based on technical justification, not on budget.
- *Since they are not freeing up tank space until the vitrification plant is online, is the delay due to not having capacity?* Gerry said that is something the TC&WM EIS will address. Gerry said DOE has not discussed early Low Activity Waste (LAW) or a third melter which would help empty tanks as well. Gerry felt the goal should be compliant storage, not just treating the waste.
- Susan suggested that this advice should be detailed but needs to separate the background from the advice. Gerry suggested that it might be worthwhile to recap the advice at the end with bullets. The committee supported this idea.
- *Is the information in the last paragraph accurate?* Gerry explained that every year except 1994, Congress has provided more money than DOE has requested and has never denied money for compliance milestones which is the only reason DOE should not meet those deadlines. Susan said the statement should address that Congress has demonstrated it will fund activities to meet TPA requirements when it is requested. Gerry explained that DOE does not request the money, but Congress funds it anyway. Greg suggested breaking the paragraph into two parts: one, DOE never asks for the full amount, and two, they have to ask for the money so the work can get done.
- Susan said the HAB was told that the budget request from the two offices was a compliant request. Karen confirmed that is correct, RL and the Office of River Protection (ORP) are required to request compliant funding. Karen said at the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting DOE remarked they will have valid baselines by January that will align with the five year plan. Gerry commented that the baseline is based on a budget which is five billion dollars under target.
- Susan asked if the baseline then does not meet TPA compliance. Karen confirmed the baseline does not. Dennis explained that RL and ORP request the money, but their

request goes to headquarters (HQ) who then adjusts the target with Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Gerry said it is HQ and OMB that decide how the money will be divided and give RL a target.

- Harold said this process is no different than any other federal agency's budget process; the forest service does this too. Most agencies never get the money they say they want. The official submission that goes in from the agencies has to comply with the guidelines, but that does not mean Congress will give them all the money they requested.
- Dennis said there are decisions that OMB and Congress make that are not privy to the agencies or to the HAB. Gerry agreed that it is understood what the request says when it leaves this site, but then it goes into a private debate and when it comes back it never includes all of the money. Congress has traditionally said if you asked for a billion, they will give you a billion plus because they are concerned about compliance.
- Gerry said the target budgets are \$5 billion short of meeting compliance requirements on the RL side until 2019. Dennis said the baseline shows that 2024 has not been moved, so the Richland work will need to meet that date. Harold said on the ORP side there is insufficient money for tanks over next 40 years. Harold thought the HAB should choose some items, tank closure and groundwater issues for example, and say the TPA negotiations are unacceptable and faster removal should be achieved. If these items can get it in the TPA negotiations then they can argue for funding.
- *Is bulk vitrification in the TPA?* Gerry said it is in the TPA proposal with a demonstration report due in 2014. Gerry felt that date limited the opportunity for doing early LAW. Gerry thought since bulk vitrification is a demonstration project it should be funded from science and technology money and should be taken out of TPA negotiations. Jerry said if bulk vitrification works they will reduce the need for LAW and tank space. Gerry felt that no money would be saved with bulk vitrification and DOE knows that LAW works.
- Gerry said he was thrilled to hear the groundwater date of 2024 was not being changed. Gerry asked how RAP would feel about recommending the schedule along the river should be based on 2018. Gerry said they have said previously that river corridor groundwater should be done by 2018. The committee did not have any objections to this.
- Gerry asked if committee members were comfortable with the list of items the TPA does not address that is included in the notes. Jerry suggested committee members should review the list and add missing items at tomorrow's joint meeting with the Tank Waste Committee. Jerry said he will work with Shelley Simon and Rob Davis to see if they need to add anything from a groundwater perspective to this advice.

### **Committee Work Plan**

Next, the committee reviewed their 2008 work plan which is below.

- TC&WM EIS – groundwater Shelley Cimon, Rob Davis, Pam Larsen and Jerry
- Groundwater EIS modeling – Dirk Dunning and Ken Gasper
- Central Plateau Waste Sites – Shelly and Dirk
- RCBRA –Greg deBruler
- Greater than Class C (GTCC) EIS – Gerry Pollet
- TRU waste and all pre 70 waste
- 61810&11 – Shelley
- Integration strategy
- Long term stewardship – Susan Kreid, Jerry
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) Five Year Review – Harold Heacock, Greg, Jerry
- Waste Disposition – Shelley
- K Basin sludge disposition – Harold
- 300 Area – Pam, Maynard Plahuta, Greg
- ICs – Jerry
- Purex Tunnels and characterization of pre 1970's TRU – Keith Smith, Harold
- U.S. Ecology landfill briefing, impacts & characterization plans – Gerry

### **Supplement Analysis (SA) to Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP)**

Bryan Foley, DOE-RL, said the CLUP EIS considered several land use alternatives and evaluated land use for the next 50 years. The purpose of the SA is to provide a concise narrative and to evaluate the ROD in the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use-Plan EIS. The SA will provide background, an analysis of different environmental disciplines, the overall policy changes, consistency with CERCLA & RCRA, and NEPA CFR 1021.314 implementation procedures. This information will help determine if a supplemental EIS, a new EIS, or neither is needed. Criteria for making those decisions will be made following DOE's implementing procedure. Bryan also mentioned a fact sheet will be coming out soon and will seek committee input on it.

Bryan said DOE wanted to know if there is something else, or another document, that they should consider as part of performing the SA. Bryan said the SA does not require a formal review, but DOE will allow an informal review of the draft in January. Bryan said they will hold an informational workshop to help people understand the document. During the workshop they will address the criteria used to make the determination. One of the findings might be that the implementing procedures in Chapter 6 need to be amended. Bryan offered to come back in November to discuss this further.

### **Committee Discussion**

- *Is the assumption that DOE will maintain ownership of all the land?* Bryan said from his perspective that is DOE's assumption. DOE still wants to shrink the footprint in terms of getting things remediated and rolled up.

- *Is there a connection between this study and the TC&WM EIS?* Bryan said Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, is part of this integrated project team. Bryan said there are members from HQ, ORP, RL and the Office of Science on the project team and they are keeping a close eye on the TC&WM EIS.
- *Once this document is complete, will it be reviewed every five years?* Bryan said DOE is committed to a review every five years. The ROD looked at the next 50 years, but beyond that Bryan was not sure what would happen. Bryan said they are looking at what the EIS covers, what are the significant changes, and do the different research areas warrant those changes.

### **Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP)**

Chuck Powers, CRESP, provided an overview of the mission, scope, and background of the organization. Their mission is to advance cost-effective, risk-informed management of the nation's nuclear waste and waste sites. Chuck said their studies are accessible via their website at [www.cresp.org](http://www.cresp.org).

Joanna Burger, CRESP, provided an overview of their work at the Amchitka site in Alaska. She said the process completely broke down at Amchitka; DOE said there was no risk and the community did not believe the data supported this. The land was under the Department of Fish and Wildlife and they wanted to give it back to the community. DOE wanted CRESP to come up with a science plan to assure stakeholders and regulators there was not a problem remaining at the site. Joanna said the plan CRESP developed determined what science needs to be done at the site to evaluate the risk. They interviewed effected stakeholders including children and elders to make sure what was proposed is what the community wanted which was the collection of foods to remain the same. . The data collected showed there was not any risk at the moment, but it had no bearing on future risk due to seismic or volcanic impacts. They created a bio-monitoring plan and suggested a long term stewardship plan including a five year monitoring plan to assure people would not be at risk in the future.

At the end, everyone was agreeable on a path forward even with increased costs. Joanna concluded this demonstrates you can start with complete disagreement on all sides and bring people together by developing an inclusive process and adhering to it throughout the process.

Joanna said it is clear that several groups of people are unhappy with the cleanup progress at Hanford. DOE-HQ is interested in defining further this problem and improving risk communication processes. They have asked CRESP to focus on the RCBRA and its assessment of contamination impacts on the Columbia River. CRESP's scope is open ended to allow for flexibility in listening to and finding out stakeholder concerns and what DOE can do better.

Chuck said the reliability and scientific credibility can be best achieved when stakeholders are involved. He said they were asked to come to Hanford because of their

record of successful involvement. Chuck said they would like to follow up with members of the HAB about communication processes at Hanford and how stakeholders and agencies work together. Chuck said the assessments that are being done right now will determine long term stewardship and need to be comprehensive and inclusive. CRESP has no stake in saying communications processes are working at the site or not; but they have heard that communication could be better. They will compile all information from those interviewed and report on their findings. They hope RL, ORP, and HQ will be able to use their findings as keeping communications processes moving smoothly is extremely important as cleanup continues.

### *Committee Discussion*

- *Jerry asked if Chuck and Joanna had reviewed HAB's draft advice on the consistency and readability of executive summaries and other DOE reports.* Joanna said she had seen the advice and thought it was great advice. Chuck said it is fundamental the HAB has the capacity to write advice like this; it is the basis for which stakeholders can impact decisions. Chuck said CRESP has a commitment that what they write anyone can understand. When you are assessing risk, stakeholders need to agree on the methods for evaluating the risk.
- *In order for you to collect enough data, will you interview individuals or group and over what period of time?* Chuck said to contact them if they would like to talk individually Chuck thought a small group format was more effective at getting feedback. Chuck said their job is to make sure stakeholders understand the process and are ready to move forward with remediation. Chuck emphasized that CRESP is a learning organization and did not start out knowing how to deal with a situation like Amchitka. They are looking for willingness from any stakeholders to participate, but also will evaluate in general on how DOE can provide better information.
- *What is your timeline?* Chuck said they will take as long as is necessary if people are willing to speak and will then assemble a product. They will provide feedback to everyone who participates when they provide feedback to DOE. Chuck anticipated that the first phase will be done by the end of the year and will share their findings as they are developed. Chuck said they are an open and transparent organization and do not want to hide any information.
- *What is your product?* Joanna said their findings will identify commonalities and differences in people's opinions about the way the process works at Hanford. Chuck added that they are looking at processes and evaluating what data is out there compared to what people tell them.
- *Is CRESP a contractor to DOE, and what was the instigator for this work?* Chuck said they were brought in to address a specific concern from the tribes about a possible adverse effect Hanford was having on a tribal community. This led into a larger topic of whether the information the agency is presenting is right. CRESP has survived while working for DOE over the last 12 years because the organization is truly independent. DOE has been happy with the product because CRESP helps identify solutions that everyone can live with.

- Chuck asked committee members if the RCBRA is the only problem that has been identified. Jerry explained an outside agency was hired to do the RCBRA and it was released before it was ready.
- Paul provided an example of a failed communication process. . Paul felt the DQO study decision process was flawed in how the document was developed. Stakeholders were invited early and often, but not listened to. There were concerns about detection limits that were not addressed. This resulted in non-detect issues when inferred values were put in and the model did not function correctly.
- Chuck asked if stakeholders should have understood the fact of non detection before moving forward. Paul said he was not part of that process but heard that it was raised at the beginning. Paul felt the implication of detection limits for the contaminants of concern should have been addressed early rather than later. Jerri Main explained that it was a communication and technical issue.
- Greg elaborated that the original project scope compared to the product are not the same. From a communications standpoint, DOE-RL needed to explain why the document was morphing to give justification for the product. The process was not going the way the agreement was initiated. Instead it was being driven by time, money and other factors.

### **Groundwater and Central Plateau Waste Sites Cleanup Update**

John Morse, DOE-RL, discussed the integrated groundwater team's work. As part of the effort to integrate, John said they wrote into the contract extensions for FH and CH2M Hill and created a memorandum of understanding for WCH. . They have teams working on issues in the BP-5 Area, the T Area, deep vadose zone, and river corridor.

The deep vadose zone team is in the process of completing a deep vadose zone treatment plan to examine those contaminants inaccessible with excavation in December to meet the TPA milestone. John said they are also working on how to do decision documents along the river and the in-between areas. The RODs will be done by reactor area. The RCBRA is being revised based on comments received and will incorporate groundwater risks to illustrate how these issues will be addressed.

The contractors will be working together until 2012 when the RODs come out. They have been working in the D Area where chromium is in the groundwater. They have also coordinated efforts between WCH digging and FH groundwater investigations to determine the source. John said they are also doing technology tests to clean groundwater and are investigating the contamination in the D and H Areas. The teams have been meeting every couple weeks and will try to report out more frequently. One of the products they have come up with is detailed schedules to look at the relationship on the Central Plateau between tanks and groundwater activities to identify areas of improvement.

### Committee Discussion

- *Where does Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL) fit in?* John said they are involved in technology demonstrations, and in the Central Plateau on uranium mobility.
- *How do you assure us, as the public that you can do the thorough work in the 200 Area given the shortfall in time?* John said they recognize they need more time. The original idea was to gather as much information as they could, do the ROD, and then confirm samples. They realized that more information was needed and went through a process to identify additional data needs. Based on this, they moved the dates out to 2011, and still anticipate post verification sampling will happen. They also said many sites are fairly easy to remove, treat, and dispose (RTD) are in a new operable unit a ROD can be done.
- *Who is informing the process of evaluating the models for their depth and breadth?* John said the tribes, State of Oregon, and stakeholders all receive copies of the documents and DOE-RL responds to the comments received and make modifications as applicable. Dib explained the TPA parties working on groundwater activities have been identifying the data gaps and are going through a DQO process. This is the first or second phase of the investigations and will take another year or two to complete the process.
- *Are the stakeholders satisfied that DOE will evaluate the data gaps?* Dib said uncertainty remains about the deep vadose zone and groundwater. However, they have a plan and are working on it. John said last year they drilled over 100 wells and borings. The work done over the last few years has resulted in significant contributions to groundwater activities. They will continue to do borings and evaluate whether they need to look at new techniques.
- *Does the 100 Area RCBRA address work in the vadose zone?* John said WCH is responsible for doing additional work to identify residual contaminants in the vadose zone. John said they will cover that in terms of surface contamination and sources.
- Craig Cameron, EPA, said a few years ago Ecology and EPA distributed a one page principles paper about their preferences for addressing cross cutting issues. They have expanded on that and now have a white paper out that they will send out later this year to stakeholders including the HAB after DOE has reviewed it. .
- John addressed the issue of a plume registry since he was not able to be at the meeting earlier. He said DOE already has a registry (the HIES database) and they put out a groundwater monitoring report. They are also doing a metrics presentation to look at groundwater remediation. John said they will be running a pump and treat system at the site until 2025 so it will be preserved until then, after that it becomes a records management issue.
- *Is HIES just for the active plumes?* John said it provides information on all groundwater plumes even if there is no action. John said they are working to make their web based tools easier to use to access documents.

## Action Items / Commitments

The following is a list of action items for the committee to track at upcoming meetings.

- Jerry asked committee members to submit comments to Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz on the HAB process manual.
- Path forward on advice response #197
- ICs
- SA CLUP
- Evaluation of the groundwater registry
- CRESP
- TPA advice
- Records management.
- Central Plateau Environmental Risk Assessment

The committee date for the November meeting is Wednesday, November 7.

## Handouts

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

- Information Bulletin, Clarity in Technical Documents is Critical, Fluor Hanford Inc., September 17, 2007.
- Response to HAB Advice #197, EPA, July 13, 2007.
- Response to HAB Advice #197, DOE, October 2, 2007.
- BCC draft Advice on Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Negotiations, October 10, 2007.
- Advice regarding Clarity and Readability of DOE Reports (version 4), Dick Smith (RAP), October 2007.
- GW/VZ Integration Teams Key FY-07 Accomplishments, DOE.
- Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement (HCP-EIS) Preferred Alternative Land Use Map (1999), DOE.
- Recommendations for the Supplemental Analysis Process, DOE, July 2005.
- Record of Decision: Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement (HCP EIS), DOE, 7/10/07.
- CRESP: The Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation 3, CRESP, October 16, 2007.
- Relevant CRESP Papers, CRESP.

---

## Attendees

### **HAB Members and Alternates**

Greg deBruler	Mike Priddy	Steve White
Ken Gasper	Gerry Pollet	
Susan Leckband	Wade Riggsbee	
Sandra Lilligen	Paul Shaffer	

Jerri Main	Dick Smith	
Jerry Peltier	Gene Van Liew	

**Others**

Bryan Foley, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Fred Mann, CH
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Beth Rochette, Ecology	Joanna Burger, CRESP
Ellen Mattlin, DOE-RL	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Chuck Powers, CRESP
John Morse, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, EPA	Ashleigh Wolf, CTUIR
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Craig Cameron, EPA	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
	Tom Post, EPA	Jeannette Hyalt, FH
		Janice Williams, FH
		Stan Sobczyk, Nez Perce ERWM
		Peter Bengtson, WCH
		Dale Bignell, WCH
		Larry Hulstrom, WCH
		Duane Jacques, WCH
		Wayne Johnson, WCH