

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
WEBINAR: FINAL TANK CLOSURE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT
December 10, 2012

Topics in this Meeting Summary	
Welcome	1
High-Level Overview of the Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (Final TC&WM EIS)	1
Next steps.....	4
Attachments	6
Attendees	6

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

Facilitator Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues, welcomed the webinar participants and thanked them for their participation in the webinar. Technical difficulties from GoToWebinar resulted in participants using the Hanford Operator Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) conference call line instead of the GoToWebinar phone service. The webinar was delayed about 15 minutes. Hillary reviewed the GoToMeeting hand-raising procedures, reminded participants to please mute their phones, and explained how to use the webinar toolbar to ask questions.

Purpose of the Webinar

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, explained that the purpose of the webinar is to receive a high-level overview presentation from the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) on the Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) and for participants to get a basic understanding of the EIS. With an understanding of what has changed from the draft EIS to the final EIS, issue managers can continue to develop framing questions for a proposed Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting at the January Tank Waste Committee (TWC) meeting. Some of these questions have already been developed. The group will need to discuss the need for a COTW meeting in January or February. Liz noted that the group will need to discuss whether or not the Board will want to issue advice on the topic, and if a COTW meeting will be necessary in order to do so.

High-Level Overview of the Final Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (Final TC&WM EIS)

Agency Presentation

Hillary Johnson introduced Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Document Manager, who provided a presentation (Attachment 1) on the final TC&WM EIS. The presentation focused on what has changed from the draft EIS to the final EIS. Mary Beth noted that once the final EIS is issued, it will supersede both the Hanford Solid Waste EIS (HSW EIS) and the Tank Waste Remediation System EIS (TWRS EIS). Mary Beth noted that common themes or Topics of Interest are summarized in the summary and comment response documents. Mary Beth added that the Notice of Availability (NOA) will appear in the Federal Register on Friday, December 14, 2012. The Record of Decision (ROD) can be issued no sooner than 30 days after the NOA is published in the Federal Register.

Participant 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: The modeling in alternative 2B removed all of the technetium. 95% of the technetium is going to be in the Low Activity Waste (LAW) Facility. What is the justification for the government's preferred alternative as 2B without Te-99 removal in the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) when alternative 2A had technetium in the groundwater also?

R: [DOE] For alternative 2B, when DOE started the EIS, there was technetium removal in the permit of the WTP. Alternative 2A does not have technetium removal in the WTP analysis, and alternative 2B has technetium removal in the (WTP). The EIS analysis with Te-99 removal in WTP shows that this is not as important if you are making high-level waste (HLW) or immobilized low-activity waste (ILAW) glass. Based on this fact, DOE chose alternative 2B as the agency preferred alternative, which does not remove technetium within the Pre-treatment facility, consistent with the WTP permit.

Q: Can DOE explain what timeline commitments the agency is making in terms of the Board's and the public's ability to review, hold workshops, and discuss the final EIS before DOE issues the ROD?

R: [DOE] The ROD cannot be issued sooner than 30 days after the EPA NOA is published in the Federal Register. At this time there are no details on a timeframe for when a ROD will be issued.

C: I encourage DOE to extend the review period from 30 days to 90 days so that people can point out potential flaws, review, and ask questions.

Q: Can DOE point to where to look for specific mitigation plans that appear to be referenced in the final EIS, such as removal of technetium, groundwater protection, and waste acceptance criteria for landfills?

R: [DOE] Chapter 7 includes detailed discussion of existing and potential mitigation measures.

Q: Groundwater maps in the cumulative analysis show fewer impacts in the final EIS than in the draft EIS. An example of this is in cumulative alternative 2 for iodine and uranium. What has changed?

R: [DOE] Mary Beth will look into this in further detail if specifics are identified.

Q: Isn't DOE required under statutes to identify a preferred alternative for supplemental waste, and will DOE identify a preferred alternative before issuing the ROD?

R: [DOE] What is written in the document is the information available. DOE is not ready to make a decision.

Q: How did DOE respond to comments received during the draft EIS public comment period?

R: [DOE] Specific responses to HAB comments are found in Volume 3 of the comment and response document. HAB is #218. The comments are delineated and response is provided. Other comments are delineated the same way.

Q: If something is found to be incorrect in the analysis put forth in the final EIS, is DOE ready to accept RODs with more remediation activity listed in them, specifying funding or some level of commitment to offset some cleanup risk not incorporated in the EIS? So far there has been minimal emphasis for soil remediation.

R: [DOE] In the vadose zone sensitivity analysis, DOE looked at the potential for soil removal over a number of sites. Soil remediation is an area where the analysis showed some environmental benefit, and it is something that needs further investigation, which is reflected in the tank closure preferred alternative language.

C: [Ecology] Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) noted that Ecology will have the EIS posted on Ecology's website the evening of December 10, 2012. Ecology's position on the final EIS is provided in their Foreword.

Q: When EIS's are issued in a draft, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) reviews them and rates them. The scale they use has a two letter plus number designation. The TC & WM EIS was rated EO-2. The EPA's rating means EPA told DOE that DOE needs to fix the EIS by substantially revising it because DOE does not even meet its own regulatory requirements. A second issue of concern is uncertainty. DOE uses the word uncertainty in the EIS and describes what they think is uncertainty in the EIS. What is actually provided in the EIS is a discussion about how sensitive DOE's model is to a variation of its parameters. DOE does not in any way do an uncertainty analysis. A likely area of comment will be what happens to the model when the parameters are changed. Where in the document is there a discussion of uncertainty? For example, is there a discussion of what changes are made in the document to overcome the EPA's EO-2 rating of the draft TC & WM EIS?

R: [DOE] Discussion of uncertainty is presented throughout the document. A suggested starting point is to look under the regulatory compliance topic of interest. Six responses to EPA and their rating can be found in the comment response document.

Q: Will Ecology be writing to DOE to urge DOE to hold off on issuing a ROD until there has been review and discussion?

R: [Ecology] Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, noted that Ecology does not have control of when DOE will issue the ROD. Suzanne added that she understands the concern of the Board and the public wanting to weigh in and provide input.

Hillary Johnson noted that she will send a PDF of the presentation slides to webinar participants following the conclusion of the webinar.

Next steps

Path Forward for Issue Manager Work

Liz reviewed the path forward that the issue managers had previously discussed, noting that if the Board wants to issue advice, a January COTW meeting may be necessary (instead of a COTW the day before the February Board meeting). Issue managers have begun and will continue to develop framing questions for the COTW at joint committee meetings with the TWC, the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) and the Public Involvement Committee (PIC). Liz noted that the current issue managers on this topic include: Liz Mattson, Pam Larsen, Dale Engstrom, Dirk Dunning, Al Boldt, David Bernhard, John Howieson, Vince Panesko, and Dick Smith.

Webinar participants decided to hold an issue manager call Thursday December 13, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. Hillary Johnson will send out an email noting the scheduled call time. The call will be one of several issue manager meetings and will serve as a way to touch base about the final EIS and producing draft advice.

Potential Board Product

Webinar participants suggested several ideas for potential Board advice:

- Board advice should focus on future activities.
- A serious comment has been pointed out in terms of concern with the EIS. The Board needs to go on record and produce advice voicing these concerns. One concern is that DOE could be on a fast track for RODs. Advice could include that the HAB wants input into and is concerned about RODs.
- Written advice may take the form of providing the Board's reaction to the final EIS rather than serving as a way to implement cleanup measures.

- Some committees have identified general advice points. For example, RAP is looking at advice about modeling and groundwater modeling.

Shelley Cimon noted that another option could be to issue a letter of concern stating that the Board does not want DOE to issue a ROD until the HAB can review the final document and identify any issues of concern going forward, including those regarding unwillingness to choose a preferred alternative for Supplemental Treatment.

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, noted that should the Board choose to issue a letter of this nature, procedurally it would be acceptable for Chair Steve Hudson to write a letter asking agencies to hold off action. This letter would be neither advice nor a board consensus product.

Timeframe for the Committee of the Whole

Hillary Johnson noted that having a COTW meeting the day before a Board meeting will be too close should the Board decide to develop advice. Having a COTW meeting the week of January 14th (committee call week) is one option. Liz Mattson noted that the group will want to have the COTW meeting earlier rather than later and that based on comments from this webinar discussion, the Board may be interested in issuing different kinds of advice.

Dirk Dunning and Susan Hayman noted that there are difficulties calling meetings on short notice. Dirk added that the group needs to be aware of funding and needs to schedule around the Martin Luther King, Jr. Day holiday on January 21, 2013. Susan noted that if a COTW meeting is something the group would like to move forward with, it could be challenging to get a well-informed COTW together in time for committee week. It might be necessary to hold the COTW meeting in place of a committee meeting. If the week of January 21, 2013 is an option, it would still be two weeks prior to the Board meeting, and meeting on Wednesday or Thursday would allow for travel time. Hillary Johnson noted that it would also be important to make sure the meeting fits with agency schedules. The potential COTW meeting will be discussed further on the issue manager call, Thursday December 13, 2012, 2:00 p.m. and in subsequent planning calls.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Final Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS (TC&WMEIS) Presentation

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Al Boldt	Dale Engstrom	Maynard Plahuta
David Bernhard	Laura Hanses	Gerry Pollet
Tom Carpenter	Steve Hudson	Wade Riggsbee
Shelley Cimon	Pam Larsen	Dan Serres
Samuel Dechter	Liz Mattson	Robert Suyama
Dirk Dunning	Vince Panesko	Jean Vanni

Others

Paula Call, DOE	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Meredith Crafton, Hanford Challenge
Tiffany Nguyen, DOE	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Regina Lundgren, Hanford Communities
Mikel Elsen, DOH	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Alexander Nazarali, CTUIR
		Ted Repasky, CTUIR
		Barbara Wise, MSA
		Sharon Braswell, MSA
		Paul Breddt, PNNL
		Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
		Holly Bowers, WRPS
		Felix Miera, WRPS
		William Ramsey, WRPS
		Allan Tedeschi, WRPS
		Daniel Brody, EnviroIssues
		Abby Chazanow, EnviroIssues
		Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
		Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues