

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

*June 7-8, 2012*

*Kennewick, WA*

**Topics in This Meeting Summary**

Executive Summary ..... 1  
Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements ..... 3  
Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Updates ..... 3  
Draft Advice: Safety Culture at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant ..... 8  
Draft Advice: Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement ..... 10  
Draft Advice: 300 Area RI/FS and Proposed Plan ..... 12  
Draft Advice: Employee Concerns Program ..... 13  
Committee Reports ..... 15  
Board Business..... 16  
Public Comment..... 20  
Closing Remarks ..... 20  
Attachments ..... 20  
Attendees..... 20

*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 four pieces of advice concerning:

- 300 Area RI/FS and Proposed Plan
- TC&WM EIS
- Safety Culture at WTP
- Employees Concern Program.

**Board business**

The Board will not hold committee meetings or committee calls in June. RAP will meet in July; BCC, EIC, HSEP, PIC, and TWC will hold committee calls in July. The Board discussed:

- Preliminary 2013 TPA Priorities
- Board membership/packets
- Board Chair selection process - Designation of the Nominating Committee
- Preliminary September Board meeting topics.

**Presentations and updates**

The Board heard and discussed presentations and updates on the following topics:

- Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Updates
- Committee reports.

**Public comment**

Public comment was provided.

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
*June 7-8, 2012 Kennewick, WA*

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters 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 periodic opportunities for public comment.

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

Four seats were not represented: Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Workforce), Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), and the University of Washington (University).

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

**Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements**

Susan Leckband welcomed everyone and reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda.

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, provided instructions for accessing GoToMeeting for those on the phone and reviewed Board ground rules. She reported that the April meeting summary was certified within 45 days and posted to the Hanford website.

Susan Leckband welcomed Barbara Harper, new liaison alternate for the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR).

Susan Leckband distributed copies of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific Advisory Board's (SSAB) letter for review. She asked Board members to review the letter before considering its approval on the second day of the Board meeting. The letter is provided as Attachment 1.

Dana Bryson, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), announced that Paula Call, DOE-RL, will no longer be DOE-RL's public involvement representative for the Board. Tiffany Nyugen, DOE-RL, will take over for Paula. The Board thanked Paula for her hard work and support to the Board.

**Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Updates**

*Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)*

Jane Hedges, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), provided an update on recent activities at Ecology; her presentation is provided as Attachment 2. In addition to her presentation, Jane specifically noted:

- Ecology appreciates the Board members who helped to organize and support the recent public hearings for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) Site-wide Permit.
- The Single-Shell Tank (SST) Permit will be released for public comment on July 1. Ecology anticipates hosting a workshop in July, followed by a public hearing in August.

- The Hanford Air Operating Permit is available for public review through August 3; the permit combines work completed by both Ecology and the Washington State Department of Health.
- The Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) Permit modification is available for review until July 20. The modifications allow construction of the WTP to continue while engineering designs are still being approved.

Jane spoke to the recent *Tri-City Herald* article that identified a delay in milestone completion for the 324 Building. Jane said Ecology has been aware of the delay due to high radiation for some time, but new dates for the milestone have not yet been negotiated. Interim milestones may be implemented to help reach completion, and the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies will begin negotiations in the near term.

*U.S. Department of Energy Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)*

Dana Bryson provided an update on recent activities and accomplishments for DOE-RL; his presentation is provided as Attachment 3. In addition to his presentation, Dana specifically noted:

- Remediation of the F Area is complete, but DOE will not claim footprint reduction for the area until re-vegetation is complete.
- DOE is making good progress in the N Area of the River Corridor; Dana showed a video demonstrating demolition, sequencing, and a drastic footprint reduction due to the demolition of many structures in the N Area.
- Work on the 618-11 Burial Ground will not begin until DOE has completed lessons learned from the 618-10 Burial Ground. The remediation of Vertical Pipe Units (VPUs) for 618-10 have been put on hold until DOE completes the burial ground's re-sequencing of work.
- The request for proposal process for the 324 Building B-Cell remediation has been tabled in order for DOE to concentrate on work in the River Corridor and 100 Area. A schedule for addressing the 324 Building contamination will be identified soon.
- An update on asbestos corrective actions is available on the Hanford website.

*U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)*

Stacy Charbonneau, DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), provided an update on recent accomplishments and activities for DOE-ORP; her presentation is provided as Attachment 4. In addition to the presentation, Stacy specifically noted:

- The Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board (DNFSB) recently commended DOE-ORP for their work to address safety issues at Hanford. The safety improvement program is an ongoing program led by Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP. Stacy noted an overall improvement in the safety culture awareness at DOE-ORP.
- The One System Team is a combination of contractor representatives from tank farms and WTP who are working to address integration across the two project areas. They will address technical and interface decisions.
- The Integrated Waste Feed Plan outlines an approach for feeding waste from the tank farms to the WTP; tank farms will receive that deliverable this week.

- Bulk retrieval of tank C-112 is complete; DOE-ORP anticipates implementing caustic and water strikes during the next phase to remove the remaining waste.
- The Pretreatment Facility is the focus of the re-baselining effort at WTP. DOE-ORP now understands the technical issues of the facility and will be moving forward with an action plan for resolution of the corrosion and erosion issues.
- Construction of the High Level Waste (HLW) Facility has slowed due to technical issues and budget constraints.
- DOE-ORP is leading an effort to better align the nuclear safety aspects of all facilities at WTP.
- Bechtel National, INC is leading the rebaselining effort for the HLW Facility, the Pretreatment Facility, and the Low Activity Waste (LAW) Facility. A rebaselining for the tank farms will be established after the rebaselining for WTP is complete.
- Stacy noted that the U.S. House of Representatives recently passed a bill that would provide only \$690 million in funding to WTP for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013, which is what is outlined in the flat funding profile. The projected base budget needed for WTP in FY13 is \$970 million; the rebaselining activity will help identify how to better align work with a lower budget allocation.
- Stacy said the number one priority for DOE-ORP in the coming months will be to address erosion and corrosion issues at WTP.
- DOE is making great strides for internal communication methods, including the addition of a SharePoint site for both field offices and an internal social networking site.

*U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)*

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said EPA is working hard to issue the proposed plans for River Corridor decisions. The 300 Area, 100-K Area, and UP-1 Groundwater Unit Proposed Plans will be issued for public comment in the next month.

Dennis spoke to the upcoming milestones in jeopardy due to budget constraints and schedule delays, Milestone-89 (M89) being the most imminent and the biggest driver. He said the TPA agencies will meet soon to begin negotiations on:

- M89: 324 Building.
- M1600A: Complete all interim actions in the 100 Area by December 31, 2012.
- M15: 200-W-A1 work plan to be implemented for field work that needs to begin in 2013 in order to be completed in 2016.
- M85: Canyon remediation schedule.

Dennis said DOE owes EPA a work plan for evaluating the Hanford Orchards. Remediation will occur in the next few years. Dennis reported that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) Five-Year Review is near completion, and EPA sent a letter of concurrence on the report in May; copies can be made available if Board members would like to see the letter.

Dennis said EPA will host meetings on the River Corridor decision documents beginning the week following the Board meeting. He showed a video available on the Hanford YouTube webpage inviting the public to the workshops.

*Board questions and response*

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

Q. Can DOE clarify what the glitches were relating to the recent smoking drums?

*R. The sand hopper used to clean out the drums did not perform as expected. The vibrating part of the equipment that was supposed to ensure removal of all sand from the drum stopped working half way through the operation. DOE has identified lessons learned and is working to make sure it doesn't happen again.*

Q. What lessons learned from the 100 Area will DOE apply to cleanup of the 200 Area, given that there have been many unexpected waste discoveries and problems?

*R. The most significant lesson has been that chromium is found far deeper in the soil than previously expected. DOE will have to prepare to remove chromium from the groundwater when necessary. EPA would like DOE to apply the lessons learned to contracting strategies.*

C. The Hanford website used to have a link to a backlog of construction photos for the entire WTP construction process; the archive is now missing.

*R. DOE will look into the photo archive.*

Q. If DOE is going to use water for infrastructure support at WTP, where will the water be diverted from?

*R. The water supply will come from the Columbia River, and it will be pumped and treated before being used on the Central Plateau. DOE is currently upgrading the WTP infrastructure so water can be applied in a continual flush. The two main supplies of water will come from the B and BC Areas. DOE still has access to a reservoir for the continual need, and the reservoir is also currently undergoing upgrades. DOE is in ongoing discussions with Mission Support Alliance (MSA) and infrastructure representatives to ensure it has the adequate electrical and water supply for the site.*

Q. DOE-ORP mentioned that it didn't account for the change in waste feed form as it processes through WTP – do you have concerns with the final glass product?

*R. The final product is well understood. Concentrations of certain kinds of waste will be analyzed to inform how to build the system appropriately. DOE is evaluating the margins in the design to make sure it understands waste throughout the vitrification process. DOE is also evaluating different feed forms and alternatives to feeding LAW directly from the tank farms to help improve the overall system to ensure and maintain a continual feed. Any changes to the feed system will need to be permitted by Ecology.*

C. The 324 Building and 618-10 Burial Grounds are close to Richland, and it is troublesome that those contaminants will remain longer than anticipated. In the future, the Board would appreciate learning about important project delays before they are announced in the *Tri-City Herald*.

Q. How does DOE-ORP plan to replace the vacancy for the federal assistant project manager for WTP?

*R. Scott Samuelson will serve in that position until it can be filled; DOE anticipates it will be a four to eight month process for announcing the vacancy, recruitment, and placement.*

Q. Can Ecology comment on the recent DOE-EM Advisory Board (EMAB) presentation on risk-informed budgets versus risk based budgets?

*R. Everyone on EMAB who has had experience with risk based budgets is extremely skeptical of their use. The EMAB Risk Committee was tasked with reviewing a new product from Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) that evaluates characteristics like cost, ability, and risk for a project. Its end product is a high or low risk rating for individual projects. The tool cannot be compared across sites or across a single site for multiple projects. Its function is to help make priority decisions for two to three projects at a time. The tool does not have the capabilities to include stakeholder comments. The tool is not yet a final product, so the Risk Committee has not approved it. DOE-EM leadership has said national DOE priorities should be based on risk, but the situation may need to be different for local offices. Jane Hedges serves on the EMAB, and will work to keep the Board informed of EMAB activities.*

C. The HAB's working relationship with the local TPA agencies, especially when dealing with funding shortfalls, is appreciated. There is frustration, however, with DOE-Headquarters and the membership reappointments. It seems that DOE-HQ does not like that HAB members have significant technical expertise and backgrounds.

Q. Both DOE field offices are commended for their work to improve safety culture at Hanford. Is it possible to receive the results of the upcoming site-wide safety culture survey at the September Board meeting?

*R. DOE tentatively agreed to share this information at the September Board meeting.*

Q. Does DOE have a figure in mind for how many people will be laid off in the upcoming CH2M Hill downsizing?

*R. There are ballpark numbers, but DOE is not comfortable making an announcement until a better analysis of the needs of the contract and resulting layoffs is completed.*

Q. When removing the hard heel material from the SSTs, will DOE isolate the waste or mix it with something else? Will a special tank be used?

*R. The material will be diluted from dissolve and sluice actions, so DOE is not concerned about erosion issues. The material will be transferred to the same tank as the other waste removed from the SSTs. Isolation has not yet been evaluated, but it is something to look at.*

Q. Care must be taken when comparing risk. Where in the continuum of risk is the 324 Building remediation?

*R. The CRESP tool may not be useful for identifying risk at Hanford. Risk informed decisions are more in line with how the Superfund program works at Hanford. EPA believes it is wise to slow down the work at the 324 Building, as the material underneath is relatively stable. The goal is still to remove waste from the River Corridor as soon as possible and certainly by 2018. The 618-10 and 11 Burial Grounds will be complete in the 2014-2017 timeframe.*

Q. What is the degree of infiltration back into already-pumped tanks?

*R. A number of SSTs that have been intermittently stabilized have seen an increase in volume. DOE has been pumping liquids down and out and will continue to drain where the pump is. Some liquids may just be resettling. We have pits that have been closed and foamed over, but we may need to revisit the institutional controls (ICs) to ensure they are still keeping out water, which is the contributing factor to the general rise in 20-50 tanks. DOE will prioritize tanks that see increases in volume. Visual inspections, as well as before and after pictures will help us identify where there is a difference. DOE will meet with Ecology next week, and the interim stabilization agreements address the need to keep watch for volume increase.*

Q. Is garnet still the choice material for cutting the tanks?

*R. DOE has recently evaluated the three to four cuts that were used on tank C-107 to install the Mobile Arm Retrieval System (MARS), and we have concluded that it is best not to use garnet as the cutting mechanism on tank C-105. We will use olivine, instead.. DOE has asked the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory to examine other cutting methods for tanks beyond C-105.*

C. The garnet method used for inserting MARS into the tanks enabled DOE to use an excellent tool. Hopefully, DOE will fully analyze other materials that can do the cutting without adding abrasive material to the waste, thereby causing a problem for treatment at WTP.

Q. Can DOE comment on a news article today about DOE reopening discussions about Yucca Mountain?

*R. DOE has no comment on Yucca Mountain, but is encouraged that there have been conversations about the potential division of defense waste from commercial waste. There may be an alternative for defense waste before its commercial counterparts for HLW disposal.*

Q. How will the rebaselining effort affect System Plan 6A?

*R. System Plan 6A, also known as System Plan 7, is just an update to System Plan 6 in terms of alternatives for existing scenarios. It will be issued before the rebaselining effort is complete. Impacts of rebaselining will be included in the next system plan.*

## **Draft Advice: Safety Culture at the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant**

### *Introduction of advice*

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge (Regional Environmental/Citizen), provided an introduction to the advice; her statements are included as Attachment 5. Liz concluded that the Board is looking forward to agency responses that indicate they are already taking the steps the Board may be advising.

### *Agency perspective*

Stacy said the advice addresses a number of different topics relating to safety, which is a challenge for one document. She asked the Board to clarify the reference to the design build, as she doesn't believe it is part of the safety culture program. She also asked that the Board clarify whether they believe DOE needs more technical staff or if they think the current technical staff isn't competent. Stacy said the advice would be stronger if it asked DOE to make sure incentives do not drive wrong behaviors and to balance milestones properly so they do not forgo safety. Stacy clarified that WTP is designed to treat all *kinds* of Hanford waste, rather than *all* of Hanford's waste.

Dan McDonald, Ecology, asked the Board to clarify its problem with safety culture, noting that there are many symptoms, but he is unclear on what the Board believes to be the root problem. He said that many of the actions the Board is requesting in the advice are being addressed through the safety culture corrective action plan, and the other items are too broad to address. He asked that the Board make the advice more direct.

### *Board discussion*

The following are the key points noted during Board discussion:

- Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), recused himself from the advice process due to conflict of interest. Larry Lockrem, Benton County (Local Government), Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), Tony Brooks, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local and Regional Public Health) and Jeff Luke, Hanford Work Force (Non-Union, Non-Management Employees), said they would be unable to support the advice until the language was less accusatory towards DOE, especially relating to technical staffing issues and ongoing safety efforts.
- The Board discussed removing advice bullets and language overly critical of DOE, including the reference to technical staff. Language was added from Liz's introductory remarks to acknowledge the Board's awareness of DOE's ongoing efforts to improve safety culture, and the background was revised to explain why the Board is still concerned with safety culture.
  - The Board resolved the reference to technical staffing issues by adding language to ask DOE to better utilize their technical staff, both DOE and contractor.
  - The advice bullet referencing the integration of WTP and tank farm teams was removed, as it is clear the integration is already underway.
- The advice point on milestone changes was revised to accurately reflect the Board's strong commitment to milestones while acknowledging that no milestone should compromise safety.
- The Board made technical revisions to the advice, and decided to work towards issuance of advice at this Board meeting, rather than send it back to committee as one Board member suggested.
- The Board discussed the advice bullet on the DNFSB acting as an independent oversight for DOE, and decided to keep this in the advice. While some Board members felt DOE-Health, Safety, and Security (DOE-HSS), acts in this role, the Board determined that this office is still within DOE and could not provide truly independent oversight.
  - DOE said they conduct their own independent review of safety basis designs from the contractor, and that they have their own role and responsibility to regulate that process. DOE said they already have an internal design authority, and the Board should clarify the need for an independent if that is the purpose of the advice point.
  - One Board member said DOE has a design authority to identify any technical issues, but that no one is making sure the issues are resolved. Someone should be held accountable to verify that the issues have been solved and the WTP is functional.

- The advice was revised to encourage DOE to once again form an expert review team to serve as a check and balance authority, as they did in 2006.
- Jerry objected to the inclusion of this bullet in the advice and asked that he be identified as dissenting from the advice. Jerry did not approve of the Board advising DOE to add another group that is not familiar with the project into the design approval process. He noted that many technical experts already have to buy off on the design before it can move forward. His dissent will be noted in the advice sent to the agencies.
- One Board member said the advice is not clear on whether the advice focuses on technical safety issues or employee matters. Board members feel there are both technical and behavioral issues at WTP, and that technical issues will be resolved when the design basis and safety analyses align. The advice should identify that changing the technical basis for WTP is the criteria for knowing the final design is safe. One Board member suggested separating the advice into two pieces: one to address technical safety and one to address behavioral safety. The Board decided to keep both concepts in one piece of advice.
- References to WTP's ability to treat all Hanford waste was revised to DOE-ORP's ability to treat all Hanford waste, as WTP may only treat all HLW and some of LAW. Supplemental treatment has yet to be determined.
- One Board member suggested recognizing DOE-ORP's safety record in the advice. Others felt the safety record with the work force is debatable and should not be specifically called out; the inclusion of the reference could lead to the Board losing their credibility with the work force.

Dan asked the Board if they believe the safety problems for employees and the WTP will be resolved by what they are advising for integrated safety management (ISM). Ken Niles, Oregon DOE (State of Oregon), said the issues go far beyond ISM. He said there is no simple answer for why they believe the WTP to be off track, but that they hope the advice points lead to a solution.

After minor edits to the language and content, the Board adopted the advice, with a notation of dissent by Jerry Peltier.

### **Draft Advice: Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement**

#### *Introduction of advice*

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), said this advice stems from the Board's frustration that the Tank Closure & Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) has still not been issued. The advice addresses the Board's concern with the change to the preferred alternative, and identifies their agreement with Ecology that vitrification should be the solution for both HLW and LAW. Pam said DOE has chosen to explore other technologies, but the research program may not have enough funding to do so. The advice asks DOE to provide adequate time for the Board and the public to review the final EIS before decisions are implemented and for the record of decision (ROD) not to be issued until there is adequate dialogue with the Board and the public.

#### *Agency perspective*

Marybeth Burandt, DOE-ORP, said she looks forward to hearing the dialogue on the advice.

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, said Ecology appreciates the advice and its support of Ecology's position. She said it is important that the TC&WM EIS identify a preferred alternative that includes treatment of the additional waste. Ecology wishes that DOE would pick a solution so actions may be taken immediately to begin preparing for the treatment, especially if the solution means the WTP must be augmented to comply. Suzanne said the result of the EIS is not what anyone had hoped for.

### *Board discussion*

The following are the key points noted during Board discussion:

- One Board member asked if the EIS is required to be final, because typically, whatever is identified in a final EIS is certain, whether or not the ROD has been issued. DOE said the EIS has to final at this point, and that DOE rarely defers RODs.
- The draft EIS did not identify a preferred alternative, it only showed a range of the alternatives. One Board member noted that the reference to DOE changing their mind on the preferred alternative is inaccurate as they had not chosen one in the first place. Ecology clarified that there was a parenthetical statement from DOE in a document relating to the draft EIS that said they would continue to look for alternatives that would optimize treatment for LAW between the draft and final EIS; Ecology reviewed this document, though it was not made publically available. Ecology feels DOE has since deviated from that agreement, as well as their commitment in the 1997 Tank Waste Remediate System (TWRS) ROD to vitrify LAW and have supplemental treatment online by 2022.
  - The Board discussed whether they can base their advice on a document and agreement that was not public knowledge. Some members said Ecology was aware of the agreement so the Board should be able to acknowledge it. It was noted that Stacy did announce that there would be no preferred alternative during the April Board meeting.
  - Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations require agencies to identify preferred alternatives in final EISs. The Board will draft a new bullet asking DOE to identify a preferred alternative in the final EIS, with specific reference to CEQ regulations. The bullet will identify the Board's preference for supplemental treatment.
- The advice was revised to ask for time for one or more public meetings, should there be enough public interest.
- The Board discussed advising DOE to research iron phosphate as a vitrification method. The Board clarified that the research should be simultaneous to review of the potential second LAW facility so as not to cause further delay. Some Board members are wary of iron phosphate, as it could lead to a decision for bulk vitrification instead. DOE believes there to be many issues with iron phosphate, so it is not currently considered an option for vitrification.
- One Board member said that many of the draft EIS identified alternatives should be eliminated from the final EIS because they violate groundwater standards.
- EPA asked that the advice be updated to advise DOE throughout the text, rather than the TPA agencies. They advised that the Board ask for a return to beneficial use, rather than highest beneficial use, to match the language used in CERCLA.

- Pam clarified that it is the Board's belief that DOE is moving away from the vitrification alternative because they believe there are less expensive options, but everything they have analyzed to date have not proven to be less expensive.

After minor edits to the language and content, the Board adopted the advice.

### **Draft Advice: 300 Area Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study and Proposed Plan**

#### *Introduction of advice*

Dale Engstrom, Oregon DOE (State of Oregon), introduced the advice, noting that it came before the Board in April as well. He said the reason this advice is important is because the 300 Area documents will be the templates for future River Corridor decision documents, and it is imperative that the Board comment now in order to see what they believe to be necessary changes. He said the big problem in the 300 Area is a uranium plume; DOE has proposed to conduct phosphate sequestration in order to remediate the plume, but the process has not been fully tested. The Board believes this process to not be mature enough to be called a final cleanup measure and is advising that the process undergo treatability tests before a ROD is issued. The milestone schedule would need to be changed to make this possible. Dale noted that DOE should allow for a fallback position to analyze other alternatives should the sequestration not prove effective.

#### *Agency perspective*

Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, said that after 23 years of working towards the River Corridor decisions, he believes DOE, private organizations, and the military have analyzed as many alternatives as possible for this type of issue. He said they will not adjust the milestone unless directed to by the regulators. Sequestration has proven to be the least harmful of any of the active remedial alternatives, and uranium has been demonstrated to be pushed down into the periodically rewetted zone and groundwater through the required use of dust control water application used in excavation-based remedial technologies. Mike said there is plenty of evidence that uranium will attenuate naturally within a reasonable time, and he is reluctant to spend over a billion dollars to excavate the uranium with the consequences of driving more uranium to the river than would occur if no action were taken. He said DOE has committed to analyze other alternatives should the process not work, but that they will not immediately fall back to Remove/Treat/Dispose (RTD) as the remedy. He noted that DOE hopes to have the 300 Area Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) submitted by July in order to meet milestones.

Larry Gadbois, EPA, said EPA has always been a strong advocate for the use of RTD as a remedy, and it is what is being implemented on most of the remaining waste sites. He said uranium has proven difficult to remediate, but that the agencies believe they have a strong possible solution. EPA believes it is necessary to take the first step with phosphate sequestration, but that it is appropriate to analyze other alternatives should it not work. A re-evaluation of alternatives also deserves a public process.

John Price, Ecology, said he is in favor of moving forward with the testing and looking for other answers should it not work.

Dennis advised that the Board not be consumed by the idea of this being the final cleanup action, because nothing is final until all of the waste is removed. He said the advice should focus on whether they want DOE to move forward with the technology, because he believes they will have to analyze other alternatives should it not work, with or without Board advice.

### *Board discussion*

The following are the key points noted during Board discussion:

- The Board acknowledged that they are commenting on an earlier version of the document than what is currently being discussed by DOE and the regulators, and that the TPA agencies have made advancements in their decision since the previous draft. The Board also noted that the timeline for choosing a remedy is not the Board's, but EPA's.
- The Board discussed their request that the final ROD not be issued until after testing of sequestration is complete. The agencies said they will issue the ROD as saying they will analyze other alternatives should it not work, but the Board is concerned this will give DOE license to go forward with modified natural attenuation (MNA) of the uranium should they not identify another alternative. The Board would like another process for decision making before the selection of MNA.
- DOE reported that all supporting documents for the RI/FS and Proposed Plan will be completed in time for the ROD. EPA noted that while the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) will not be finalized by the time of this decision (under the current schedule), the information the RCBRA contains that is relevant to the 300 Area decision is being used.
- DOE reported that they release 5,600 kilograms of uranium per year from the Site, 150 kilograms of which come from the 300 Area (~two percent). The primary goal for removing the uranium is restoration of the aquifer in a reasonable timeframe considering the conditions, as outlined in CERCLA. 40 to 60 tons of uranium has passed into the Columbia River over Hanford's lifetime; five tons remain on site. DOE has the ability to cut the reasonable timeframe for removal of the 150 kilograms in half if they implement sequestration.
- Board members spoke to the need to disagree with DOE and EPA on the decision to move forward with the final ROD before sequestration is tested. They believe an interim ROD should be issued until the technology can be proven.
  - EPA said it does not matter if the ROD is interim or final, because the regulators will ensure that DOE goes through another public process before selecting the final technology should sequestration not work. DOE said they have a testing process in place for sequestration, though it is not full treatability. If their testing shows sequestration to be insufficient, they have committed to conducting another feasibility study and submission of a new proposed plan.
  - The Board agreed to move forward with the advice in order to go on the record, as they are commenting on documents they have not yet seen updates to.

After minor edits to the language and content, the Board adopted the advice.

### **Draft Advice: Employee Concerns Program**

#### *Introduction of advice*

Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said the advice has evolved many times due to DOE actions to address the shortcomings of the Employee Concerns Program (ECP). Issues to be addressed include a safe avenue for employees to voice their concerns, an independent review of their concerns, and safety from reprisal. DOE has already responded to DOE-HSS findings that 70 percent of employees were uncomfortable voicing their concerns; the result is a cultural implementation plan that identified several corrective actions to address the shortcomings. One of the actions will be to ensure the ECP adequately understands employee concerns before investigating them. The advice considers solutions not yet addressed by DOE, including the inclusion of non-management personnel in development of employee policies, the re-establishment of DOE-ORP's ECP (recently consolidated with DOE-RL), and the elimination of reprisal to employees who raise concerns.

Becky Holland, Hanford Work Force (Hanford Atomic Metals Trade Council), noted that an announcement was made to all Hanford employees earlier in the week that explains the changes to the ECP. Copies are available on the back table.

#### *Agency response*

Dan said he thinks the advice is well done, and the agencies need to understand where the ECP is not working in order to fix it. Dan read from the employee announcement detailing DOE's identified areas for improvement, including ensuring that confidentiality is maintained and that the ECP emphasizes good customer service. Dan said he does not understand the need to reinstate the DOE-ORP program over fixing the DOE-RL program to support all employees. He noted that all Hanford agencies and contractors are accountable for investigating any instances of reprisal, not just DOE.

Dana asked that the Board describe what they believed to be the superior aspects of the DOE-ORP ECP, rather than just asking for it to be reinstated. He said the timing of the advice is appropriate, as it can be factored in to DOE's review of the ECPs.

Bonnie Lazar, DOE-RL, said the DOE-RL program has tried to incorporate advocate services and subject matter experts into the ECP program in order to sufficiently and adequately investigate all concerns on site. She said she relies heavily on experts to search for the answers to the problems. Bonnie noted that DOE did ask for an independent review to help identify areas for improvements, and that improvements are ongoing.

Dennis complimented the writers of the advice and noted that it is the clearest advice he has seen from the Board.

#### *Board discussion*

The following are the key points noted during Board discussion:

- The Board discussed the necessary expertise for investigating concerns across the site, noting that tank farm experts are better at investigating tank farm concerns, and the same goes for all other areas on site like the WTP, K Basin, etc. The Board clarified that even if a DOE-ORP ECP is not reestablished, investigators need to be familiar with the issues they are investigating, and the DOE-RL program needs to better exemplify the best practices of the former DOE-ORP program.
- Tom clarified that the advice only addresses the DOE ECPs in the spirit that the Board only advises the TPA agencies, not its contractors.
- Language was added to the advice to acknowledge DOE's ongoing efforts to improve the ECPs.

After minor changes to language and content, the Board adopted the advice.

## **Committee Reports**

### *River and Plateau Committee (RAP)*

Pam acknowledged RAP committee members and thanked them for their hard work. In May, the committee drafted the 300 Area RI/FS and Proposed Plan advice, as well as co-authoring the TC&WM EIS advice. RAP also discussed cleanup integration planning, the Site-wide Permit, and received an update on the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility performance assessment. Pam said RAP will be moving their June committee meeting to July, in order to avoid conflicts with the reappointment process. In July, RAP will review the agency response to Advice 242 on historic preservation and the UP-1 Proposed Plan. They will discuss the TPA milestone delays on the Central Plateau and what is and what is not included in the 2015 Vision. Pam noted that the June 20 Site-wide Permit issue manager will still be held according to plan.

### *Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP)*

Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, acknowledged HSEP members and vice-chair Becky Holland. Mike said HSEP is looking into the future safety of Hanford to try to anticipate risk, an example being future waste transport and how to influence the design of the process before someone gets hurt. Mike said HSEP believes traffic accidents on site to be high cause of concern for future fatalities, and they will monitor the traffic and transport situation for safety and environmental concerns. The basis of the July 10 HSEP meeting will be a discussion between HSEP, Dana Bryson, and Ray Cory, Assistant Manager for Safety and Environment, to determine how the Board can assist in Ray's efforts. Mike noted that HSEP will continue to monitor issues like beryllium and asbestos. Becky said the cross-site transfer system is a cause of concern for traffic accidents, and the committee will be digging deeper into how to address the problems between jurisdictions.

### *Tank Waste Committee (TWC)*

Dirk Dunning, Oregon DOE (State of Oregon), acknowledged TWC members and thanked them for their hard work. TWC recently worked with both HSEP and RAP committees to bring forward the Safety Culture and TC&WM EIS advice. Dirk said due to the urgency of other items like the budget and Board reappointments, TWC has determined to defer their June and July meeting topics until August.

### *Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC)*

Jerry said BCC is working to clarify their scope of work. There aren't any contracts currently up for review, and there will not be a new budget to review until next March. Jerry said BCC may hold a call in July or August to prepare for a meeting in September to discuss DOE's budget assumptions and proposed changes to the 2013 budget and cost report.

### *Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC)*

Liz reported that PIC did not meet prior to the Board meeting due to the lack of time sensitive topics. The next PIC meeting will be in September, when they will discuss the public's understanding of cleanup and how to follow up with past pieces of advice and their responses. Liz noted the committee may bring forward advice on the State of the Site meetings, which will be prepped during committee calls in July and August. PIC will be discussing lessons learned from the PW1/3/6 advice and process and will assist

in advice development for the Site-wide Permit. Liz said the committee looks forward to reviewing the new Hanford Public Involvement Plan, which should be completed by the end of the fiscal year.

#### *Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB)*

Susan Leckband said she and Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, participated in the June 6 SSAB call; Shelley took notes on news from around the complex and provided it to the Board (Attachment 6). Susan is working with Ken Niles to draft a white paper on HAB values that will be brought before the Board in September; Susan noted that the Savannah River site is also working on their values. There will be an SSAB meeting in Washington D.C. at the beginning of October. Susan asked that the Board identify any topics they would like her to raise during the meeting. DOE-EM leadership usually attends the meeting where the SSAB identifies one major topic to discuss. Other items of concern are provided to leadership prior to the meeting.

Susan asked if the Board approves the SSAB letter on DOE's budget. The Board agreed unanimously; Susan will sign the letter to be sent to DOE-EM. Barbara Harper, CTUIR (Liaison), asked if DOE-HQ intends to defund sites once they near cleanup completion. Susan noted that it is a topic of concern and she has spoken with DOE privately about the issue. Dana said the Board and DOE need to continue to convey the message that Hanford will need support through cleanup completion.

Susan spoke to the potential new sequestration law that would result in a 10 percent budget cut across the federal government. The projected FY13 budget is based on that likelihood. If the government enters a continuing resolution for FY13, DOE will hold back 10 percent. Dana said that since a continuing resolution is a strong possibility, DOE is working to ensure budget carry over for the first few months of the next fiscal year so there won't be a huge project delay.

#### *Executive Issues Committee (EIC)*

Susan Leckband said the EIC is concerned about the HAB budget, with many EIC members trying to think of ways to save on costs between now and September. The Board will discuss potential budget savings later in the meeting. The EIC discussed the 2013 Preliminary HAB Priorities during the June 6 meeting, as well as the chair selection process and HAB reappointment/membership process; both topics will be addressed later in the meeting.

### **Board Business**

#### *Draft priorities letter*

Susan Leckband said the Board works with the TPA agencies every year to develop considerations and priorities for the upcoming fiscal year. Priorities are first identified generically, and then the committees identify more specific topics to address and include them in their work plans. Dana pointed out that the HAB Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) includes many items of interest for the Board, and the purpose of the priorities letter is to identify key areas for focus. The draft Board priorities letter is provided as Attachment 7.

The Board reviewed the draft letter and flagged areas to be updated by the agencies, including the exclusion of any identified priorities for HSEP. Liz asked the agencies to identify all priorities in their letter rather than assume the Board is working off priorities identified in the MOU. The agencies will revise the letter and provide a final copy before the September Board meeting. The agencies specifically noted that they would like the Board's help identifying areas for priority in the upcoming year in the face

of an even tighter budget. Dana said DOE will provide the updated work scope, or activity building blocks, to the HAB so they can see where the projects stack up and what their cost amounts to.

The Board and agencies agreed that the letter should include information on the criteria and selection process for cutting certain site activities due to budget constraints. Dennis said the process includes a public component, and the public will be involved on all five milestones to be negotiated in FY13.

Susan Leckband asked the committees to take the priorities letter into consideration as they further develop their FY13 work plans. The Board will need to respond to the letter once it is final as well as further refine their work scope.

Susan Hayman said the EIC is working on a companion document to the accomplishments table that will help both the Board and the agencies identify work and advice, including that which goes beyond what is called out in the priorities letter. The table will address policy level questions and track anticipated outcome of the Board's work. Susan said a draft of the new document will be ready for the September meeting.

#### *Board chair selection process*

Susan Hayman distributed and reviewed a handout outlining the HAB chair selection process. The process was developed in 2006 for the chair selection process and updated in April 2012 for the vice-chair process. Susan noted that the developed process is consistent with the HAB's Operating Ground Rules and MOU. The difference between the vice-chair and chair selection process is that DOE determines who will be chair with additional input from the regulators and stakeholders. Susan Leckband noted that the TPA agencies always consider the Board's choice for chair in the selection process. The Board will make a recommendation to the agencies in September, and Susan Leckband's last meeting as chair will be in November.

Each Board seat receives one vote for chair, so the member and alternate for each seat need to cast their vote together. Susan Hayman asked that the Board select a nominating committee to work on collecting nominations, biographies, statements of interest, and resumes from those interested in the chair seat.

Ken asked if DOE still does not reimburse the chair for phone charges. Dennis said he thought the agencies have worked to ensure the chair is reimbursed or provided a phone card, but he will follow up with the issue. Laura Hanses, Hanford Work Force (Non-Union, Non-Management Employees), pointed out that the HAB chair selection process handout does not include information on the nominating committee; Susan Hayman will make the update.

Susan Leckband clarified that the new chair does not have to give up their seat on the Board when they are selected as chair, but they are required to give up their opinion that stems from that seat. Susan will continue to serve as a representative for the Washington League of Women Voters when her term as chair has ended. Becky asked if former chairs can be re-elected. Susan Hayman said they cannot be re-elected in succession, but there is nothing in the HAB rules and regulations that prevents them from serving again.

Ken, Norma Jean Germond, and Pam volunteered to serve on the nominating committee.

#### *Board membership / packages*

Paula Call provided a presentation on the HAB membership appointment and reappointment process. Her presentation is provided as Attachment 9. In addition to her presentation, Paula noted:

- Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) membership packets are reviewed thoroughly before approval, given the increased scrutiny of federal advisory boards across the country. DOE-HQ, their general council, and a White House representative are all involved in the HAB membership review process.
- Appointment letters have not yet been distributed. DOE hopes to have the membership packages approved by July and will seek to implement interim travel approval in the meantime.
- The low turnover rate of Board seats has contributed to the challenge of filling vacancies with more diverse representatives.

Dennis said he is not optimistic that the Board can fill empty seats according to the diversity requirements. He asked Board members to consider how their seats can help the Board diversify when they go through their own appointment cycles. Dennis said the TPA agencies especially need the Board's help to reach out to the Latino community.

#### *Board discussion*

- The Board agreed that the decision to replace long-standing public-at-large members due to term limits is a problem that needs to be solved, especially if highly valued members with years of experience are only being replaced to attain diversity goals.
- Some seats stand to have their member and alternate replaced within one to two years of each other, leaving the seat to people without experience. The Board asked DOE to consider allowing alternates to serve in succession to ensure at least one representative has experience with the Board.
- Paula clarified that one cannot serve six years as an alternate and then six years as a member. Six years is the term limit regardless of seat position. Paula also noted that in year's membership package submission, the local DOE office includes rationale for requesting term limit exemptions for Board members, because DOE policy does include term limits for all of the EM SSAB boards. There are no plans to request that nominating authorities for Board seats adhere to term limits at this time. For the two seats where the TPA agencies are nominating authorities - the public-at-large and non-union/non-management seats - the TPAs have agreed to adhere to the six year term limits beginning with the 2013 membership package.
- One Board member pointed out that it takes a long time for new Board members to learn how to be effective on the Board, and by six years, they may just be reaching their peak. Replacing effective people with new Board members is counterproductive.
- One Board member suggested looking at Board meeting attendance records to determine who is participating actively. Inactive members would be more easily replaced than those that really contribute.

#### *Preliminary September Board meeting topics*

Susan Hayman reviewed potential topics for the September Board meeting, including:

- Review employee safety culture survey responses (Request to DOE; tentative)
- TPA agency annual reports
- Confirm FY13 Board work priorities

- Confirm FY13 Board calendar
- Report on FY12 Board accomplishments
- RCRA Site-wide Permit advice
- State of the Site advice (tentative)
- HAB values white paper
- Update on DNFSB recommendations and activities (tentative).

Ken noted that the HAB values white paper is an overarching document outlining the HAB's values that have been reiterated in advice but never collected in one document. The draft document has been provided to the TPA agencies, and EnviroIssues will post it to the HAB SharePoint site for further Board review and comment.

### *HAB budget*

Susan Leckband spoke to the HAB budget matrix the EIC received prior to the Board meeting. The matrix is not as detailed as the EIC had hoped, and it shows that the Board will have enough money with some carryover for the end of the fiscal year; this is not the case. Susan asked the Board to consider cost saving measures for the remaining months of the fiscal year, as DOE has advised that it would be advantageous for the Board to have carryover funds for FY13, given the project budget situation and likely sequestration cut of 10 percent across federal agencies.

Vince Panesko, City of Richland (Local government), presented some ideas for cost savings through the end of FY12. The most drastic measure would be to cease all Board activities July through August, which would result in a savings of at least \$60,000. Other options include committees only meeting to prep for the September Board meeting, or asking Susan Leckband to facilitate the September Board meeting rather than EnviroIssues. Vince asked if DOE can guarantee the Board will receive carryover funds from FY12 in FY13. Dana said nothing can be guaranteed, as sometimes carry over funds are allocated for different projects in tough budget years. DOE is working with other contractors to ensure their work will continue under a continuing resolution even if DOE itself does not have funds to operate. Dana advised the Board to consider their contractual obligations to support contractors before cutting anything. EnviroIssues will identify base contractual requirements for the Board.

Vince said the Board is at risk of even more drastic cuts in FY13 if they do not carryover funds from FY12; he asked that the Board decide whether or not carryover is a priority for them and to act accordingly for the remainder of the year. Dana noted that the Board and committees can conduct business as usual as private citizens to work on advice, etc., but that anything relating to travel costs and facilitation support has to be accounted for by DOE.

Liz asked that the Board not make any drastic decisions today without having adequate budget information. She noted that she does not want to see anything cut if it's not necessary, and those decisions cannot be made until DOE provides an updated budget matrix. She suggested a subcommittee meet to discuss the figures and cost saving measures in order to make an informed decision.

Becky said HSEP is willing to forgo their July meeting to save on costs, and she volunteered to serve on the HAB budget subcommittee. Jerry suggested that a committee work on identifying ways to permanently save money for the fiscal years ahead, rather than trying to find fixes at the end of every year. His suggestions for cost savings in the future include eliminating committee weeks during Board meeting months to reduce on travel and facilitation.

The Board agreed to form a subcommittee to review the HAB budget and make cost saving suggestions; the subcommittee will include Susan Leckband, Jerry, Becky, Dick Smith, Steve Hudson, and Vince.

They agreed to go forward with the September Board meeting as planned. Tom Carpenter noted that if the TPA agencies find the Board work valuable, they have ways of making money available. The HAB budget is small compared to that of other DOE work, and Tom advised that it is dangerous for the Board to demonstrate that it can operate at lower costs.

**Public Comment**

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government) provided public comment as a private citizen. His comment is provided as Attachment 10.

**Closing Remarks**

Dana announced that Board travel for July has been approved. He also announced that a contract has been awarded to a local Kennewick business to provide occupational medical services for all current and former Hanford employees through two clinical offices. The contract will be assumed on October 1, 2012.

Susan Hayman announced that today will be Melissa Thom’s, EnviroIssues, last day with the Board. Melissa will conclude her work with the Board to attend graduate school in the fall, but will still be working for EnviroIssues. Melissa was thanked for her contributions to the work of the Board.

Susan Leckband thanked everyone for attending. The meeting was adjourned.

**Attachments**

- Attachment 1: SSAB Letter
- Attachment 2: HAB Ecology Update
- Attachment 3: HAB DOE-RL Update
- Attachment 4: HAB DOE-ORP Update
- Attachment 5: Issue manager introduction to safety culture advice (Liz Mattson)
- Attachment 6: SSAB notes on news from around the complex
- Attachment 7: TPA – draft Board priorities letter
- Attachment 8: HAB Chair Selection Process
- Attachment 9: HAB Membership / Reappointment Process
- Attachment 10: Public Comment on the WTP (Richard I. Smith, P.E.)

**Attendees**

**HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**

Tom Carpenter, Member	Gerry Pollet, Member	Barbara Harper, Alternate
Tony Brooks, Member	Howard Putter, Member	John Howieson, Alternate
Robert Davis, Member	Dan Serres, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate
Earl Fordham, Member	John Stanfill, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Richard Stout, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Liz Mattson, Alternate
Floyd Hodges, Member	Eugene Van Liew, Member	Emmett Moore, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member		Vince Panesko, Alternate

Pam Larsen, Member	Al Boldt, Alternate	Richard Smith, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Margery Swint, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Lynn Davison, Alternate	Art Tackett, Alternate
Ken Niles, Member	Dirk Dunning, Alternate (phone)	Jean Vanni, Alternate
Bob Parks, Member	Dale Engstrom, Alternate (phone)	Steve White, Alternate
Jerry Peltier, Member	Laura Hanses, Alternate	

**AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF**

Dana Bryson, DOE-RL	Larry Gadbois, EPA	Robb Pippis, MSA
Paula Call, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Barb Wise, MSA
Bonnie Lazor, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Todd Nelson, BNI
Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Linda Lebman, CHPRC
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Susan Eberlein, WRPS
Marybeth Burandt, DOE-ORP	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Charles Laursen, WRPS
Stacy Charboneau, DOE-ORP	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Alex Teimouri, DOE-EM	John Price, Ecology	Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Sharon Braswell, MSA	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Shannon Cram, UC Berkley	Anne King, WSU/NPR
-------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------