

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING
October 11, 2006
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
Groundwater Technology Update.....	1
River Corridor Draft Integration Strategy Document.....	4
River Corridor Draft Long-Term Stewardship Plan	5
Risk Assessments.....	6
Risk Assessment Advice.....	9
M-15 Change Package	10
Responses to Advice.....	12
DOE and Board Priorities for 2007	13
Committee Business.....	13
Action Items / Commitments	14
Handouts	14
Attendees.....	15

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

Maynard Plahuta, outgoing River and Plateau Committee (RAP) Chair, thanked committee members for their work during his chairmanship over the past year. He passed the “RAP crown” to new Chair Jerry Peltier. Jerry thanked Maynard for his work.

Jerry emphasized the importance for the committee to consider advice development expectations. He reminded the committee that advice products are directed to the public and need to use common terms and be understandable to the public. He said the technical and non-technical expertise on the RAP Committee and Board is essential to quality advice development.

Susan Leckband introduced her new alternate, Larry Lockrem. Larry has geochemistry expertise and has worked onsite for the last 18 years.

Groundwater Technology Update

Briant Charboneau, Groundwater Remediation Coordinator, Department of Energy - Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), provided an update on DOE groundwater treatment technology using the \$10 million Congressional earmark.

DOE identified key contaminants of concern in the 100, 200, and 300 Areas and proposed criteria to evaluate treatment technologies. He noted part of the rationale for the technology selection was to explore technologies identified in several ongoing projects. A steering committee selected 10 of 23 proposals for peer review. The peer review panel recommended six of the 10 proposals, and requested additional proposals for review.

Approved projects address the following contamination:

- Hexavalent Chromium in the 100-D and 100-K Areas
- Strontium-90 in the 100-N Area
- Uranium in the 300 Area
- Carbon Tetrachloride in the 200 Area

Briant provided the committee with a handout offering a short synopsis of the technologies that were funded.

A similar earmark was proposed for fiscal year 2007 (FY07), which currently appears in the House of Representatives budget, but not the Senate budget. The earmark is specifically for Hanford. In recent discussions with Congressional staffers, many were interested to know whether other labs could become involved in the activities funded by the earmark. Several projects identified technologies that could be investigated given the opportunity for funds to be opened up to other labs.

Briant said a recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report recommended integration of the groundwater project. He said DOE has made great strides in the past six months towards integrating the waste sites and groundwater project into the same project. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) recognizes the integration of all projects along the river. This integration effort affords projects the ability to identify opportunities to share information and design, and make sure everyone who is interested in the project is involved in developing test design and conducting tests.

Regulator Perspectives

Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said application of groundwater treatment technologies needed to happen whether there was an earmark or not, and EPA would have mandated groundwater treatment. A recent five-year review emphasized the need for groundwater work. He suggested the committee determine whether its Central Plateau decision-making flow chart applies to groundwater.

Dib Goswami, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said Ecology repeatedly raised the idea of funding groundwater technology investigation, and is very glad to see a commitment from DOE.

Committee Discussion

- *Is ongoing groundwater work included in DOE's budget request?* Dennis said he was not sure whether the groundwater project would be put on hold until budget issues are worked out.
- *Does EPA agree with the technology selection and groundwater work?* Dennis said EPA agrees with the technology selection process, and reemphasized that the work is critical.
- Shelley Cimon said she met with Larry Bailey, the new director of the Office of Groundwater and Soil Remediation, at the Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs recent meeting. She indicated he wants to push groundwater remediation forward immediately. She emphasized the need to get information on Hanford groundwater issues to DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) and get treatment technologies implemented as soon as possible. She said the groundwater monitoring program is a crucial piece for the committee to consider. She suggested the committee start gathering advice on tanks to make sure the principles get rolled into the data quality objective (DQO) scoping meetings. Briant added DOE has a good working relationship with Larry, and he is involved in the groundwater treatment technology selection process. A committee member suggested inviting Larry to attend a future committee or Board meeting.
- *Pam Larsen said she has been reading about different uranium bioremediation technologies being studied and wondered why none were investigated under the Congressional earmark.* Dib said a bioremediation proposal was selected in the initial group of 23 proposals, but the uranium bioremediation technology was not selected for peer review during the steering committee selection process.
- *Is the \$10 million earmark completely devoted to implementing the selected treatment technologies?* Briant said \$800,000 was left in reserve to make sure all treatment activities move forward adequately.
- Several committee members asked for an update on apatite sequestration technology. Briant said the apatite sequestration injection was successful, but he has not received a recent status update. He will update the committee when information is available.
- Dib said the implementation of all treatment technologies is scheduled to be complete by March 2008 or earlier. He said full scale implementation is still a budget and funding issue for Ecology. Ecology is considering the most recent \$20 million earmark for long-term implementation. The schedule of records of decision (RODs) goes beyond 2008, so the implementation schedule needs to be defined.
- *What triggered Congress to earmark an additional \$20 million for the treatment technology selection process?* Gary Petersen said TRIDEC pushed for Congressional groundwater funding. In particular, the House of Representatives expressed considerable interest. Dib said Ecology also repeatedly raised the issue, and every ROD included considering technologies to address groundwater. Jerry Peltier said it is essential that Congress understand Hanford groundwater concerns and progress, and DOE should make sure they emphasize the successes with this process.

River Corridor Draft Integration Strategy Document

John Sands, DOE-RL, said DOE requested Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) draft an Integration Strategy Document to help develop final RODs for the River Corridor. DOE expected to release the document by now, but release was delayed to conduct additional coordination with EPA and Ecology. The document is written from WCH's perspective, and is not really a Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) document. John said the document serves as a kickoff point with information to figure out how to group RODs. John explained there are currently no TPA milestones for final RODs, and DOE would like to implement some to determine whether the approach needs to change. John said cleanup is far enough along that DOE needs to identify the end point and how to get there.

Jeff Lerch, WCH, said one of the motivations for developing the document is to discuss final cleanup decisions with the TPA agencies. He said it is important to know whether the work done in the past 12 years is protective or not, and whether any changes need to be made, in order to determine whether ongoing and future actions are on the right path. The idea to identify potential changes sooner rather than later is a shared interest among the TPA agencies. He noted that WCH could use input from the TPA agencies and the Board on specific ways to group sites, operable units, and other specific issues, to ensure all issues are covered up front.

Regulator Perspectives

John Price, Ecology, said it's important to remember this is a WCH strategy, and DOE still needs to develop its own strategy with input from the TPA agencies. He also said DOE needs to continue its work on groundwater integration.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, suggested considering groundwater a critical issue in cleanup projects. Not much work has been done on secondary contaminants. Funding the clean up of groundwater is a public policy issue, and he wants DOE to devote resources to it. He said it is important to identify which RODs are predicated on the risk assessment scale. In the 100 Area, EPA is comfortable that current cleanup will meet requirements; however, cleanup in the 300 Area continues to be an issue.

Committee Discussion

- *What is the thinking behind DOE's need to work with contractors to complete specified RODs?* John said DOE needs to identify whether RODs are in contracts. Gerry pointed out once the ROD is done, DOE has a formal agreement with Ecology on how to finish site cleanup.
- *What is DOE doing to ensure good working relationships between contractors and regulators?* John Sands said he is not the best person to answer the question, but if the regulators are not satisfied they should discuss issues with DOE. Dennis said there has definitely been a transition period between WCH and the regulators. He

said the new contract increases contractor responsibility, which contractors may not be ready to deal with. He acknowledged there are some issues that the regulators and WCH are working through.

- *Which contractor “owns” deep vadose zone contamination?* John Sands said as water fluctuates up and down in the vadose zone, there is a historical mound of groundwater that experiences liquid discharges. This re-wetted zone can contribute to contamination. Briant said this issue is considered in the integration document. He said DOE has to consider how the WCH contract was written to ensure scope is covered appropriately
- *How will DOE use the WCH document? Will an additional DOE strategy be developed?* John said the WCH document will be used as a foundation that presents WCH’s performance baseline and some alternatives. He said the message so far has been to combine source and groundwater operable units. He stated that the alternatives are not fleshed out much, and DOE needs to have a follow-up discussion with the committee.
- *How far along is the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) work?* Dennis said he believes the work is pretty far along, and there is a need to hone the existing RI/FSs and consider how much contamination is in the deep vadose zone to address existing data gaps.
- *Have the regulatory agencies done any work with DOE on a vision for how operable units should be divided?* Dennis said there have been some preliminary discussions. There are only so many ways the operable units can be divided, and there are positives and negatives about each way. Dennis said the TPA agencies will share this information with the Board to get its recommendation.

River Corridor Draft Long-Term Stewardship Plan

John Sands said an annotated outline for the River Corridor Long-Term Stewardship Plan was released, which seemed to cause some confusion. Many people expected a complete document, which is not due until March 2007. WCH’s closure contract ends in 2012 or 2013, so DOE needs to figure out how to package future long-term stewardship needs. The plan is another contractual document DOE requested WCH develop using existing information on long-term stewardship. There is a lot of information that will be generated through closure, so contractual language indicates a need to develop a final plan a year before the closure contract ends.

Regulator Perspectives

John Price agreed it is good to set up information systems; however, there is a disconnect, because WCH does not work on groundwater remedies. He said there will be another operating contractor after the WCH contract ends, which needs to be factored into decision-making. He said DOE needs to figure out how to bring together the priorities of the DOE offices managing long-term stewardship and real estate.

Committee Discussion

- *Were values from earlier workshops on long-term stewardship and institutional controls (ICs) integrated into the document outline?* John Sands said that was the goal. WCH hired a subcontractor to help develop long-term stewardship planning, with the goal of taking lessons learned from various areas on-site.
- Pam said it makes sense that DOE is working on information management related to ICs, but as a mechanism to protect human health and environment, ICs need to be included in RODs to make sure end state decisions are protective. Dennis added it is critical to establish mechanisms to build a redundant system to ensure ICs work.
- *Regarding integration with Legacy Management (LM), is DOE considering lessons learned from other DOE sites?* John said there is some loose integration with LM, but he noted that LM has declined several DOE offers to become involved with Hanford. He said lessons learned from previous transitions will be considered; however, he is not sure there is a formal lessons learned document. Jeff said WCH asked a subcontractor to research and develop lessons learned from other sites. Shelley said other SSABs have released lessons learned documents for review.
- Jerry Peltier commented that he does not believe ICs can ever work; however, the one that people can live by and has some enforcement authority is zoning. Why not rezone the Hanford site, so zoning restrictions go with the land? He said he believes zoning is the only way to direct future land use. John said DOE owns the land at Hanford, and the DOE Real Estate officer controls development. Briant said deed restrictions are another mechanism for restricting future land use. Dick Smith cautioned that zoning commissions often change zoning, so it might not be the best mechanism to use at Hanford.

Risk Assessments

John Sands and Jill Thompson, WCH, presented information about how DOE and WCH use Board advice to develop risk assessments (RAs). Ralph Perona and Randy Ryti, Neptune & Co., joined the discussion by phone to provide technical support.

John explained that DOE Order 413.3 is a project management guidance document, which drives project decision-making. Project management plans include an RA, which identifies the risks of the project achieving final RODs. RAs developed under 413.3 are more like business risk assessments.

John reviewed the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA). The RCBRA was divided into components: 1) All operable units and waste sites, including current waste site conditions, groundwater conditions, and near-shore conditions; 2) Inter-areas between reactors, including historic discharges; and 3) the Columbia River, including downstream effects. This component is scheduled to begin sometime in the next two years.)

Jill reviewed past Board advice on RAs, and described how WCH is incorporating it. She specifically addressed advice numbers 165, 151, 138, and 135.

- Board advice #165:
 - The Integration Strategy for Achieving Final Cleanup Decisions in the River Corridor provides guidance for reaching final cleanup decisions that integrate source and groundwater units, and the Columbia River.
 - The contractor responsible for the groundwater scope will address potential impacts of groundwater plumes arriving in the future.
 - Groundwater consumption is included in two of the exposure scenarios (residential and tribal) being evaluated in the RCBRA. These exposure scenarios are applied to all areas being evaluated, which will inform final future land use decisions.
- Board advice #151:
 - WCH benefits from continued stakeholder involvement in RA work and believes it is essential for good decision making.
 - The RCBRA evaluates the protectiveness of current cleanup under RODs for the 100 and 300 Areas. WCH has developed a working relationship with the Hanford Natural Resources Trustees Council and tribal representatives and would like more Board involvement in workshops.
 - The RCBRA contains risk characterization information for an industrial and monument worker, rural residential, tribal, and recreational scenarios for comparison during final cleanup decisions in the 300 Area.
- Board advice #138:
 - B/C Area Pilot Project provided valuable lessons learned as an opportunity to apply an exposure scenario to a more complete project. This was a very successful process to inform the 100 and 300 area risk assessments. Public and stakeholder involvement has been very successful.
- Board advice #135:
 - The RCBRA human health risk assessment will characterize potential risk under all exposure scenarios.
 - The RCBRA is applying a holistic approach, looking at different habitat zones, including riparian areas and near-shore aquatic zones (seep areas).

Wade Riggsbee said the Yakama Nation has applied to DOE for funding to develop its own tribal risk exposure scenario, to ensure full coverage of all traditional tribal uses along the river. He noted that the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) has its own risk exposure scenario.

Committee Discussion

- *Is DOE assuming an industrial cleanup level in the 300 Area?* Jill said the RA does not consider cleanup levels, but just identifies a risk level.

- *When will a work plan or RA be issued?* Jill said the work plan is available, and the RA report is in progress and will be issued for public comment in July 2007. Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, said DOE-RL is finalizing a fact sheet on the RA process, which should be available soon. Jill added that the EPA website provides fundamental information on RAs, and a link will be put on the WCH public website. WCH has held monthly workshops in response to a DOE and Ecology request to be part of an open discussion process. The final meeting is on October 17-18.
- Gerry Pollet expressed concern about the use of advice on the failure of ICs. From what he has heard, DOE is assuming people are not exposed if there is a sign to restrict access. Jill said with the waste site closures, the evaluation of whether cleanup is done assumes the same ICs as are in the RODs. The RA will add the exposure scenario involving drilling and direct exposure to deep drill cuttings. John Sands said the RA does not have any ICs, and reiterated its purpose is to identify risks and determine if ICs are necessary as part of the remedy.
- *Is the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) being used to develop exposure scenarios in the RA?* Randy and Ralph said WCH is operating under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) guidance for Superfund sites. Principal EPA guidance is used for human exposure, which addresses human health and radiological exposure risks. There are two primary RA scenarios that address exposure to children in the river. One is part of the tribal exposure in the CTUIR scenario. The second scenario addresses ingestion of surface water and contact with near-shore sediments and vegetation. Gerry suggested part of the Board's advice needs to address that cleanup needs to be redone if MTCA guidance is not used. At RA workshops, he suggested the Board pay attention to evaluating data used to determine risk. There are many differences between CERCLA and MTCA guidance. It was clarified that CERCLA requires the use of MTCA if it is more protective. Gerry said that does not account for cancer risk. Jill said all work plan and data quality objective (DQO) documents and minutes from DQO workshops are available on the Hanford website (www.hanford.gov).
- *The Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) is supposed to address groundwater contamination. How are EIS and RA schedules being integrated? Is an RA being developed before WCH has a valid assessment of groundwater contamination moving from the Central Plateau?* . Jill said there is an integration team that meets to address issues. A draft report will be available in July 2007. Completion of the RI/FS work for contractors is planned for release in 2012 and 2013. The TC&WM EIS is scheduled for distribution in 2008. John Price said there are three basic questions regarding RAs: 1) Is every piece of real estate covered by the RA?; 2) Is every point in time covered by RA?; and 3) Are all RAs consistent? He noted these questions have not been answered, and they need to be answered for the entire site to ensure confidence in River Corridor decisions. Briant said current work is only focused on current conditions; future conditions rely on a groundwater model that is being created with the cooperation of Ecology and EPA.
- *Was the RA work Bechtel did accompanied by procedures developed by the Configuration Management Group?* John said the Hanford Trustees Council also

identified that as a potential gap. Briant said the Executive Integration Group is taking over management of that work, so there is a consistent knowledge base carrying the work forward, although some work is dependent on the completion of the TC&WM EIS model. Contractors are restricted to using only certain software and data. The objective is to ensure there is upfront review of the approach, so documents are not based on an inaccurate model. Regarding modeling, Dennis said it is important to collect enough information to know whether to believe the models and have faith in long-term predictions.

- *From the outside the general RA process looks convoluted and not focused on an end product. Does the process feel that way on the inside?* Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, said DOE uses many different RAs at different project phases. This RA is done before cleanup to ascertain the risk to human health and the environment, and help decision makers understand the risk. Another RA process is conducted as alternatives are evaluated. RAs are also conducted to evaluate cost and schedule risks. In addition to CERCLA activities, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and RCRA activities also require RAs. Shelley suggested developing a map of RA processes and how they relate. Dennis said that is possible, but gets muddled when you have RAs for specific work while also trying to develop a cumulative impact assessment. Jill said the RA will help determine how cleanup addresses current risks, and will provide applicable information now and in the future. Susan agreed that a map of the RA process would be helpful, since there are short-term RAs that feed into specific decisions and larger RAs. Dennis said the nuance of RAs is that three or four parameters can change the entire RA; he suggested the regulators show the committee the cleanup tables to illustrate cleanup considerations.

Risk Assessment Advice

Gerry Pollet presented draft RA advice. He said the motivation for issuing RA advice is to ensure DOE is considering RA advice principles during the RA process. He suggested the Board create a guide of RA principles, which would apply to the RCBRA and other work.

Committee Discussion

- Dick suggested developing the RA principles as a white paper product, rather than advice. The committee generally agreed with this approach. Several committee members saw value in the Board having its own guide of RA principles.
- Susan said the Board RA guidance and principles would have to address the fact that RAs do not always consider the same thing. There are over 30 RAs either done or in process, and several overlap and cover the same subject matter. Dennis said DOE is trying to figure out how to reconcile this issue.
- Principles for RAs include:
 - Public and tribal input notice and dialogue should be considered early and often in RAs and decisions based on RAs.

- Characterize and investigate adequately for credible RAs.
- Base analyses on state cleanup and health risk standards.
- RAs under any program should not assume institutional controls in RAs
- Use the maximum individual reasonable exposure
- GW is to be cleaned up to highest and best use. Reasonable maximum exposure for groundwater should be drinking water and other uses.

Principles for remedial decisions: “When making decisions based on RAs...”

- Board’s bias is for retrieve, treat, and dispose
 - Board’s bias is to avoid or minimize use of ICs for establishing cleanup goals
- Todd encouraged the committee to define RAs up front. Since the principles are contained in a Board product, rather than advice, the Board could apply guidance to all RAs.
 - Harold said RAs look at a range of exposure scenarios, and he believes the Board is going too far into the decision criteria. He suggested the committee focus on decision criteria, but not develop principles for actually conducting a RA.
 - Todd said the Board has an extensive body of work detailing how to do RAs, and the goal of this product is to pull those pieces up to a policy level. Dennis agreed, and suggested putting RA guidance in the context of Board values.
 - Gerry said he believes assuming the rural resident scenario is the maximum exposure scenario is effectively the same as an IC. Dennis said EPA and Ecology RA guidance calls for using a reasonably exposed receptor, not a maximally exposed receptor.
 - *Does the worker exposure scenario in the RCBRA include safety of current workers?* John Price said worker exposure and dose are not normally evaluated in a RA.
 - Todd suggested adding the consideration of risks from all Hanford waste as another RA principle.
 - Todd, Susan, and Gerry will draft a cover letter and RA guide for distribution to the committee.

M-15 Change Package

Briant Charboneau said DOE has been working to move all Central Plateau CERCLA decision-making processes under the same group. DOE-RL is making some assignment changes to force integration, rather than relying on good processes. He emphasized the need for vertical and horizontal integration, as well as the need to develop a plan to address cumulative impacts.

Margo Voogd, DOE-RL, said the TPA agencies are reevaluating how to characterize more effectively and make sure decisions consider the groundwater system. DOE-RL considered all the waste sites individually, and then in groups. There were deep and

shallow contamination concerns. After grouping the waste sites, the TPA agencies collaboratively determined which of the sites warranted additional characterization. About 68 sites in model groups were identified for further characterization. DOE-RL typically does more characterization at higher risk sites.

Margo indicated that new information could change decisions. The M-13 series is a commitment to the RI/FS work plans. In M-15, added and modified milestones allow time to incorporate additional supplemental characterization to evaluate remedy selection. This caused the schedules to push back.

Additional characterization takes a lot of time and resources. Approximately 40% of the waste in waste sites that are smaller and less complex will be retrieved, treated, and disposed or no action will be taken. Decisions will be made earlier for this group. All modifications extended the major milestone from 2008 to 2011.

DOE has submitted TPA word changes for the proposal and work plans. There will be milestones for remediation, which will be captured in M-16. Appendix C of the TPA will also be modified to incorporate these changes.

Margo said DOE-RL is in the process of developing DQOs and the sampling and analysis plan for supplemental characterization. There are continued opportunities for committee and public involvement. There are potential future briefings on model group structure, systems evaluation, and sampling analysis approach for supplemental characterization.

Regulator Perspectives

John Price said there are three key elements to DOE's response to Board advice: 1) More characterization; 2) Picking out 350 waste sites (40% in the Central Plateau) and agreeing within TPA agencies that additional characterization is unnecessary; and, 3) Increased focus on technology. He added that the change package does not change the final cleanup date of 2024.

Craig Cameron, EPA, said not all milestones were moved; some were moved to make sure they were aligned so information can inform both.

Committee Discussion

- *How is the term "integration" being used?* Briant said integration refers to the data collection and evaluation processes.
- *What qualitative data is used to determine which waste sites need more characterization?* Margo said large matrices were developed including all information about particular waste sites, which enabled DOE-RL to identify data gaps and other issues. Substantial technical judgment was applied, and each waste site was considered from a three-dimensional perspective. Craig said it is hard to determine the success of the decisions. Dennis added that the decisions may change based on

additional data collected. John Price said some of the additional characterization is on groundwater.

- Todd noted the only possible topic for advice was the difference between a three-year delay and a two-year delay. He suggested writing a letter to thank DOE-RL for being responsive to the committee's request. Briant noted that a lot of work does not necessarily constitute a delay, but is more of a rearrangement of work activities. DOE-RL anticipates \$70 million to \$100 million in additional characterization work over three years. Maynard said he is pleased to know DOE-RL has committed that amount of effort.
- The committee agreed a committee member report to the Board on the change package is necessary. Dick Smith volunteered to conduct additional research on the change package and determine whether a letter complimenting the agencies for additional characterization or advice is more appropriate for the November Board meeting. Craig said when the TPA agencies piece together a plan for additional characterization, the Board's advice and input would be helpful.

Responses to Advice

The committee discussed how to consider and/or respond to TPA agency responses to Board advice. Jerry Peltier went through an example of advice that began in RAP and follow-up actions that resulted. He suggested that to ensure issues are not lost when the Board receives a response from any of the TPA agencies, the committee should regularly review responses and determine whether follow-up action is necessary.

Committee Discussion

- Maynard said more should be done to track and evaluate responses. He said the committee needs to consider whether the issue is complete, response is satisfactory, or further response is required.
- Harold said his review of 30+ pieces of advice indicated that responses are generally pretty typical. He said he believes the committee should develop a running log of advice and responses, to track and evaluate the response.
- Susan said she believes the committee issue managers should be evaluating advice responses and tracking issues to closure. Dennis emphasized it is very important for the committees to consider and respond to agencies' responses. Issue managers should track and recommend follow-up actions. Committee leadership needs to reinforce this responsibility.
- Jerry suggested adding advice responses to every committee meeting agenda.
- Todd said he used to put every piece of advice on every committee and Board agenda. As Board Chair, he tracks advice responses. He recommended the agencies need to respond to Board advice directly; using other documents as a response is not adequate. Karen added that DOE-RL plans to do both for the CERCLA 5-Year Review. At the least, Todd said the Board should discuss the motivation for its

advice with the agencies. Susan said it is important to air issues in a public setting, since they are not always captured on paper.

DOE and Board Priorities for 2007

Jerry compared the Board priorities and TPA agencies' priorities to identify overlap.

TPA agencies' priorities:

- Public Policy Values
- Prioritization of Cleanup Work
- ICs
- CERCLA 5-Year Review
- End States
- Tank Closure
- Groundwater Integration
- Public Involvement
- TC&WM EIS

Committee Discussion

- Susan said most of the priorities that came out of the Board leadership match up with the agencies' priorities. Todd said the only real differences from the Board list were end states and ICs. Committees can work to develop and define these issues.
- As the committee moves forward, Jerry said it is important to show the agencies how the committee and Board addressed their priorities.
- Dennis said the priorities are almost work categories. He said the priorities list is very high-level, so some work is necessary to identify specific topics to drive work.
- Susan suggested identifying a Board work plan to determine how Board activities fit into the agencies' priorities. Committee members agreed a work plan should be updated based on the priorities, from which the committee can identify any holes.

Committee Business

Future committee meeting topics

- Update on N Area (strontium and cesium)
- 300 Area Transition plan
- Draft Integration Strategy Document and advice on grouping RODs
- Groundwater flow sheet
- Gerry report on RA
- Dennis present cleanup tables and show how they align with RAs
- Update committee's work plan – remember IM sheet

The committee agreed a November committee meeting was necessary, but a November committee call is unnecessary.

No changes were made to the August meeting summary, and the summary was adopted.

Action Items / Commitments

- Todd, Gerry, and Susan will draft RA guidelines and advice.
- Dick will draft a letter on the M-15 change package, and list any causes for concern.
- Information about the M-15 Change package will be included in Board packet.
- Volunteers for TC&WM EIS assistance include Jerri Main and Dick Smith. Larry Lockrem will also consider working on the subcommittee group.
- Karen said she would determine whether Board member travel is approved for the upcoming human health RA workshop.
- DOE will provide an update on apatite sequestration technology to the committee.

Handouts

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

- Proposed Tri-Party Agreement Changes to the 200 Area Non-Tank Farm Waste Site and Groundwater Remediation Milestones (M-15) – Draft, Tri-Party Agencies, 10/11/06.
- TPA Proposed Modifications: Central Plateau Waste Site and Groundwater Remediation, 10/11/06.
- Proposed Tri-Party Agreement Modifications for Central Plateau Waste Site and Groundwater Remediation: Tentative Agreement on Negotiations, Tri-Party Agencies, 10/11/06.
- Major Issues for Consideration by the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) 2006/2007, Tri-Party Agencies, 9/7/2006. Incorporation of HAB Advice in Current River Corridor Risk Assessment Activities, DOE-RL, 10/11/06.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Response to HAB Consensus Advice #190, Nick Ceto, EPA, 7/27/06.
- CERCLA Five-Year Review, HAB Advice #190, Hanford Advisory Board, 6/2/06.
- Draft River and Plateau Committee Advice on Risk Assessment Values for Hanford Cleanup Assessments and Decisions, Gerry Pollet, 10/11/6.
- Proposed Agenda, 100 Area and 300 Area Component of RCBRA, Washington State Department of Ecology, 10/11/06.
- Columbia River Contaminant Migration Congressional Earmark Briefing, 10/11/06. FY06 Groundwater Technology and Cleanup Projects Funded with the FY 2006 \$10 Million Earmark, 10/11/06.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Jerri Main	Maynard Plahuta
Ken Gasper	Todd Martin	Wade Riggsbee
Pam Larsen	Donna Morgans	Dick Smith
Susan Leckband	Jerry Peltier	John Stanfill
Larry Lockrem	Gary Petersen	Eugene Van Liew

Others

Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Annette Cary, TCH
Briant Charboneau, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Janice Williams, FH
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Lynnette Bennett, WCH
Dana Ward, DOE-RL		Barb Wise, FH
John Sands, DOE-RL	Craig Cameron, EPA	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP		Chuck Hedel, WCH
		Jeff Lerch, WCH
		Jill Thompson, WCH
		Ralph Perona, Neptune & Co.
		Randy Ryti, Neptune & Co.