

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING January 9, 2008 Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions	1
Hanford's Environmental Sampling Program	1
Columbia River Component Remedial Investigation	5
DOE-RL Update	7
Discussion on Central Plateau Waste Site Cleanup	9
Committee Work Planning and Committee Business	11
618-7 Burial Ground and 300 Area Tour	12
Action Items / Commitments	12
Handouts	12
Attendees	13

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

Welcome and Introductions

Maynard Plahuta, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) chair, welcomed everyone and introductions were made. The committee adopted the October and November meeting summaries.

Hanford's Environmental Sampling Program

Susan Leckband, Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) chair, said Laura Buelow, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), contacted her to ask if this committee would be interested in learning about EPA's work to develop an Environmental Sampling Plan for Hanford. Susan told Laura she thought the committee would be interested from a groundwater perspective. Susan said the discussion today is an opportunity for this committee to understand the program and potentially ask the Board to submit comments on how this work plan should be performed.

Laura Buelow said EPA wants to be more involved in sampling efforts at Hanford and therefore is creating an independent sampling program. Laura felt this would give more credibility to EPA scientists and provide an opportunity for public input. Laura said she has heard criticism from the public about sampling that is not being done by the other agencies, when in fact the samples actually are being collected but the reports are not easily accessible to the public. EPA's independent sampling plan will be an additional

element to the sampling already being done on site. The program will be very small in scale and EPA will provide the funding. Laura said their plan is to gather public input on ideas for sampling by late winter and then to get out in the field this year by the summer/fall.

Ted Poston, Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL), said PNNL conducts sampling for air, water, sediment, soil, vegetation, farm products, fish and wildlife which is compiled in an annual master sampling report. Ted said over time, the footprint of the site has shrunk due to site mission and operation changes which makes the area PNNL samples smaller. There are some components that are sampled for every other week, and others they do on a three year rotation such as soil and vegetation which saves on their budget. The shortest half life of what PNNL reports on is cobalt 60 which is five years. Ted provided a list of analytes they sample; he said there are radiological and non radiological components included. Ted encouraged committee to contact the individuals in his handout with further questions regarding the sampling program.

Briant Charboneau, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said DOE-RL has not taken a position on this but encourages EPA to get involved in DOE's oversight programs. Briant said EPA can define their involvement; they can sample independently and also conduct verification samples to provide credibility to sampling already being conducted. DOE has a preference of doing cleanup investigations under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) because it includes radionuclides. Federal law requires EPA to review and approve a record of decision (ROD) and the sampling plan under CERCLA. The regulators need to determine if the sampling adequately addresses the issues at each site. Briant said DOE has a chain of custody that allows oversight regulators to send samples directly from the lab.

Laura clarified that her intent was not to say that EPA does not trust the samples originating from DOE. EPA has heard from the public that the role EPA has played thus far in assisting and reviewing DOE samples is not valid. EPA's intent is to go out in the field themselves and collect samples to verify and validate DOE's work. Briant suggested the topic of inclusion versus independence in sampling is an appropriate topic for the committee to address. Briant said Washington State Department of Health (DOH) is not controlled by DOE, but DOE provides a grant to them for their sampling because they value their work. Laura said the DOH program does a great job of doing radiation absorbed dose (RAD) splits. EPA would like to be more involved in taking split samples that DOH does not collect.

Dib Goswami, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), said he strongly supports what EPA is proposing for an independent sampling program. He said Ecology has been conducting sampling since the 1990s with a focus on operable units. They have their own lab, and have been sampling RAD and non RADs. Dib said Ecology has an independent budget for the lab to split samples with DOE, DOH, or EPA. Ecology is currently sampling in the D, H and K Areas and is planning additional sampling in other areas. Noel Smith-Jackson, Ecology, said Ecology does lab audits that are method based

and includes a full sweep of metals. Noel said she thinks the Ecology sampling program is well equipped and supports DOE sampling efforts well.

Debra McBaugh, DOH, discussed DOH's oversight program which examines all sampling programs at Hanford including oversight to the PNNL program and other contractors. Debra said generally DOH samples 10 to 20 percent of what PNNL does. She emphasized that they do not repeat the other agencies' programs, but verify the results are valid by taking split samples. PNNL will sample more than they need and will give a portion, normally half, to DOH. DOH uses the State's Public Health Lab to analyze their samples; the lab is well known for the quality of analysis they perform. Debra said DOH also samples at joint locations to make sure both agencies come up with the same results. DOH typically samples at locations where the public could be impacted, i.e. the river, cities, produce, etc. Debra said they recently took over the Thermal Luminescent Dosimeter (TLDs) from PNNL. TLDs read the dosage rates along the river to evaluate the exposure in a particular location. Debra said DOH also conducts special studies when necessary. She referred the committee to their website to find additional information about these studies (www.doh.wa.gov/ehp/rp/rp-publ.htm).

Committee Discussion

- *What kind of sediment is PNNL sampling, just surface?* Ted said they currently only sample surface sediment, sampling below six inches was done in the past and PNNL is not involved in that work anymore. Ted said they have sampled up and down the river to look at the sediments behind the dam. Sandra Lilligren asked if they are doing any vadose zone sampling. Ted said they are not.
- *How does PNNL determine where they take samples?* Ted said they started sampling sediments in the late 1980s, since then they have done transects across the dam and they tend to go where they find real disposition.
- *Is there additional sampling that should be happening to be more helpful?* Ted said their current sampling plan is based on historic knowledge and databases. Ted said the areas that demand attention are getting it.
- *Does PNNL increase their sampling after fires?* Ted said they do which is captured in the annual report where there is a summary of the supplemental sampling that is done post fires. PNNL continues to monitor those supplemental samples over time.
- *Are there any analytes missing from the list, and how would you know if there were?* Ted said when the reactors were operating they released activation products into the river that had a short half life. As soon as the reactors stopped operating those products ended. The half life of the radionuclide determines what is still present in the environment. Ted said they used to look at a full sweep, but now have narrowed that list because some of the analytes have hardly been detected.
- *Are the Site Environmental Reports from 1959-2006 (sited in the handout) written in a reader friendly way?* Ted said they are written for the public and are supposed to be readable by a layperson. Laura said she has a hard copy of the most recent report if committee members are interested. Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, said the HAB received the

report via email a few months ago. She said there is a summary as well if anyone would like a copy.

- *The driver for the program has historically been offsite exposure to humans. Will that driver change cleanup onsite continues?* Ted said the operations over the last few years have focused on ecological exposure. The driver is part of DOE's executive order and is currently under revision. Ted did not know to what extent the revision will look at other contaminants beyond radiological components. He said the exposure for animals is less than for humans so it is still focused on human health. Sandra said the Nez Perce are considering the possible use of areas on site, so the focus should not just be on exposure offsite anymore. Ted agreed.
- *Does the new executive order consider the types of biological life unique to an area?* Ted said the executive order will identify site specific issues, but has to apply across the site so they cannot get to that level of specificity. Ted said the site has an environmental monitoring plan that covers all the programs which will address the site specific issues.
- *What is the scientific basis for how the EPA sampling will be done? Will EPA revisit the DOE sites or look at contaminant transport?* Laura said these decisions have not been made yet. She said she did not want to choose a method until she received stakeholder input on the best method with a limited amount of resources. Wade Riggsbee suggested looking beyond CERCLA to see what contaminants are out there and determine where the air, groundwater, and other releases have concentrated.
- Wade said the tribes are engaging in a process to develop a memorandum of agreement (MOA) for sacred sites. Wade said they have an interest of looking at the contamination on Gable Mountain. The tribes would like to see the site be reintroduced as a site of concern. Wade encouraged EPA to consider looking at this site as an additional sampling location.
- *Who does the quality assurance (QA) on the non RAD components?* Briant said Ecology and EPA have oversight. Dennis Faulk, EPA, said there is another set of programs for waste sites that has not been discussed today. Dennis added there clearly could be a role for EPA in QA for non RADs.
- Wade said under CERCLA, EPA should do independent audits. This committee could look at to what degree that is done and could consider suggesting a more rigorous QA program. Dennis said EPA has done an audit of the lab, but not the sampling. Briant said they have an internal QA program but there is not an independent organization performing QA.
- Maynard said he understands the benefit for EPA and believes this program is a win-win situation for all the agencies. However, Maynard said he would not like to see money spent on duplicative efforts. Laura said instead of repeating sampling that has already been done, her plan is to respond to stakeholders input about a lack of sampling in areas that are actually sample rich to show people how to find the samples they are interested in.
- Dennis said the Hanford site is data rich, but sometimes it is hard to put the data in a useable form. He thought the committee could help to organize the information for

public use. Sandra added that she wonders if the agencies know where the data is and can use it effectively. Dennis said it takes institutional knowledge to point people in the right direction. He said when they lose institutional knowledge, people end up repeating work. Jerri Main stressed that records management is an important issue for the committee to address.

- Joe Franco, DOE-RL, said DOE is in the process of looking at their databases and categorizing the information. He said often data is gathered for a particular project and gets categorized in such a way that it is not useful to anyone else. Bob Suyama suggested having DOE brief the committee on that process when it is complete. Committee members supported that idea.
- *What kind of input was EPA hoping for from this committee?* Laura said she received some good input from this committee and asked if the topic should go to the full Board. Susan said she did not think that was necessary at this point. Laura said she is available via email or phone if anyone has further input after this meeting.
- Laura will come back to brief the committee on the progress of the sampling plan in March.

Columbia River Component Remedial Investigation

Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL, said he and Larry Hulstrom, Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) are the new project leaders for the Columbia River Component (CRC) Remedial Investigation which is one of the three components of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA). Larry said they would like to get HAB input on the planning process for the CRC RCBRA. Larry reviewed two maps outlining the CRC study area. He said the team's overall objective is to "complete the data quality objectives (DQO) process for determining the scope of sampling to address data gaps identified in the CRC Data Gap Analysis." Larry summarized the differences between a Screening Level Risk Assessment and a Baseline Risk Assessment for the committee. He also reviewed the team's process and schedule for completing the DQO and submitting a work plan to regulators. He explained that they are accelerating the typical comment period due to sampling demands and a deadline to support RODs beginning in 2010. Larry welcomed committee input and encouraged the committee to identify issue managers to follow up with DOE-RL on this work.

Regulator Perspectives

- John Price, Ecology, said he is excited about this work. He said there are many toxics studies underway due to a growing concern about the quality of the river. Ecology has not yet commented on the data gaps but will do this as a part of the DQO process.
- Laura said EPA has more comments on this work plan but generally supports this work because it pulls together the sediment and deep core data. Dennis said people will be able to see the data and review the data gap analysis report during the workshop. Larry offered to get copies of the report made if people want to see it; he

said it is also available on the WCH website. The workshop will be at the Ecology offices on February 5 and 6, from 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Committee Discussion

- Wade said he has some concerns about how the risk assessments will be identified and how the methodologies will be explained. He suggested this might be a good platform to get the public and tribes more involved in this work and to see all risk assessment data from previous years.
- *Are there other areas of the Columbia River beyond the 300 and 100 Areas that will be included?* Jill Thomson, WCH said the shoreline areas between the reactors outlined in the figure on Slide 4 of the presentation are included.
- *Why is the public review period so short?* Larry explained that the short comment period is due to regulator pressure to develop a good work plan prior to sampling. Larry said they are hoping to get all the sampling done this year and therefore need to accelerate the comment period. John said he agrees the sampling should be done this year to avoid the issues WCH had in previous sampling. WCH found out they had some bad samples which forced them to resample the following year and miss their deadlines.
- *Is the sampling timeframe driven by bird migration?* Jill said the sampling plan is targeting sediments and is driven by the low water level of the river. If they sample biota they would have to sample at a certain time of year. She said the decision to sample biota is dependent on the outcome of the DQO process.
- *How will the baseline risk assessment be used when it is done?* Larry explained the document will support the final RODs. The agencies are currently working off interim RODs and this process will support the final RODs. Each ROD is scheduled to come out at different times, but the first is in 2010. Jill added that it is important to find out if there are impacts offsite from Hanford that need to be addressed. Currently, the river is not an operable unit, but the agencies need to determine if it should be, and this process will help them to do that.
- *Does the information from the baseline risk assessment get incorporated into the site wide Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?* John said it does not since it is a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document. The EIS looks at the impacts of a proposed action and there is already a lot of information to support the EIS. The risk assessment will provide new or additional information. Pam felt that the information should be integrated and consistent. John agreed, but said for permitting you have to decide if the impacts need to be mitigated. John felt they already know the quality of the river but need to validate it.
- Wade Riggsbee and Sandra Lilligren volunteered to be issue managers on this topic. Maynard said that Greg deBruler has previously been identified as an issue manager on the RCBRA issue and would seek his participation.

DOE-RL Update

John Price provided an update on the BC Controlled Area Waste Site Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis which is similar to a feasibility study. John said they are proposing an interim action on the BC Controlled Area which is Hanford's largest waste site. An interim action could be no action, monitored natural attenuation/institutional controls, and remove, treat, and dispose. John said DOE has made a commitment to clean up this site and will take action this calendar year. Ecology and EPA are supportive of this work. John said the new source of soil for the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) will be an additional benefit of this work. John said the site is contaminated potentially with Cesium-137 and Strontium-90 six to twelve inches deep but in some cases the contamination is deeper due to animals digging in the area. Over the 140 acres, they will strip the soil on average 12 inches; the 750-1000 hotspots will need to be dug up further. The hotspots are typically several square feet and are located on the perimeter of the area. John said once the site is remediated and verification sampling is done to ensure it is clean, the site will be revegetated with native plants.

John Morse, DOE-RL, provided an update on the Central Plateau ZP1 Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study (RIFS). He said DOE-RL is currently responding to regulators comments, when they have formally submitted their response, DOE-RL will send it out for public comment. John said the Deep Vadose Zone Test Plan was recently distributed as well. He said the plan looks at different technologies to address the contamination in the deep vadose zone. John said DOE-RL plans to start testing a technology that will move air through the soil in the BC cribs. They will add this detailed testing plan to the RIFS. John said they would still like comments on the current document even though the detailed test plan is not included at this point. DOE-RL will hold a workshop on February 19 to discuss the details of the document and receive comments. Karen said all of the workshop times and locations are posted on the Hanford website on the public involvement calendar and the presentations will be added to the website after each workshop. Susan suggested including a link to these from the HAB website.

Briant discussed a River Corridor earmark included in the Congressional appropriations to address groundwater acceleration. Briant said DOE has authorized Fluor Hanford (FH) to accelerate their work in the River Corridor to meet that deadline. Currently there is a pump and treat station DOE-RL is planning on updating to full capacity which will provide chromium cleanup in the 100 K Area. Once the pump and treat is upgraded near the end of this year, the operation will run at 900 gallons per minute compared to 300 gallons per minute

Briant said DOE -RL is also working on additional activities with funding left over from increased efficiencies in other areas. They put in a pilot plant at D Area which uses a new ion exchange process. Briant said they are hoping to site a building in D Area this year and choose a technology for the pump and treat. They may use in-situ technologies in some areas, but the pump and treat will be the backbone of the plan for the D Area. Briant added they have some high efficiency resins they are using in D as a pilot. The

resin regenerates everything in place and holds chromium contamination to provide a better cleanup. He said the outlet from that operation is coming out non-detectable whereas in the other units the levels are detectable at two-five parts per billion. Briant said they have done some tests with electric coagulations as well but have some concerns with it because it is picking up iron as it goes through. He said they might be able to address that through pH.

Committee Discussion

- *Is the driver for the interim action in the BC Controlled Area the soil needed to balance ERDF?* John Price said they are excited for two reasons: it will protect the environment and it will balance out ERDF.
- *Are animals still digging in the BC Controlled Area?* John said they are not.
- *Is there still old growth sage brush in the BC Area?* John Morse said there is some remaining that did not get burned in the recent fire. Craig Cameron, EPA, said they will minimize the damage to the sagebrush during this work.
- *How mobile is the soil in the BC Area?* John said in the recent past it has been stable, but historically it was pretty mobile.
- *Are you planning to use the resin at M Area too?* Briant said in the M Area there is strontium contamination which likes to bind with the soil. He said the contamination in this area continues to leach and the pump and treats were not very effective. DOE-RL is looking at testing a chemical treatment of the sediments in the aquifer to totally bind the strontium in the soil to a mineral process. Briant said if the contamination stays in the soil and no one digs it up it, then it will be gone in 300 years.
- *Are you planning to use the same technologies you are using in D Area in the K Area?* Briant said they are looking for a comparable technology for K Area. In the K Area, the concentrations are lower and therefore the resins do not deplete quickly. It is cost effective to use them in the large contamination areas where you will dig up the contamination, but in the low concentration areas you have to change the resin so often it is not effective.
- *When the excavated material from K Area is shipped offsite, is there any value recovered from the chromium?* Briant said they do not receive any money from the chromium in the excavated material. Briant said there have been concerns about shipping and how to verify free release of the material and shipments were suspended last year because of that concern. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulates the facility. The regulation had quantities designated, but it was unclear if the quantities were for the material in the shipment, the facility, or the end product. Briant said they got all the agencies together and came up with an interpretation that everyone could agree on. The final decision allowed the facility to operate under the Atomic Energy Act. At the Effluent Treatment Facility (ETF) DOE-RL did a test to see if they could regenerate the resins with a process they were already using but do not have any results from that test yet. Briant said they are interested in processing the material onsite instead of having to ship it, but DOE needs to work out the details.

Discussion on Central Plateau Waste Site Cleanup

Shelley Cimon explained the intent of this agenda item was to organize and prepare the committee for issues coming forward in 2008 and to learn about what the agencies are planning in the upcoming year.

Craig started the discussion with the White Paper on the 200 Area done by EPA and Ecology. He said they wanted to share EPA and Ecology's thinking and considerations of how they look at the different problems in the 200 Area and address what they might do about them. He said their White Paper is not intended to replace or supersede any CERCLA or Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) processes, but attempts to initiate cleanup discussions. Craig agreed the committee should look at how the ideas in the White Paper relate to HAB advice. He felt the agencies took into consideration HAB's values when writing the paper. Dennis suggested the committee review the White Paper, see if it matches with HAB values, and then discuss any findings with the agencies at the next RAP committee meeting.

Dennis highlighted upcoming topics he sees as important for the committee to address over the next year. Dennis said he would like to see ZP1 and PW1 released for public comment out at the same time. PW1 has pre 1970's transuranic (TRU) waste in liquid disposal sites and EPA is working on a technical basis to make a decision about how to deal with the pre 1970's TRU. Dennis said they are looking at whether there are any in-place solutions. He said their goal is to have a proposal by this coming summer, but it might happen closer to the end of the year.

Dennis said they are currently collecting data in the BC cribs and have a commitment to do a treatability test. He said this crib is full of plutonium and fission products and they will evaluate how the work progresses to see if it can be dug up safely. Dennis said he is hoping to do the test this summer which will lead to a proposed plan for the BC cribs operable units. This site also has deep technetium contamination. EPA hopes to do a field implementation test to try to deal with the deep technetium contamination as well. Dennis said this will be their first attempt to deal with the deep contamination in a tangible way.

John Price said Ecology is working on removal actions in the Central Plateau and seeks input from the HAB if they support these. He also discussed how Ecology is focused on three areas. First is where and what is the contamination. There is a lot of characterization that needs to happen to meet the characterization milestone by 2011. Second is defining the role of technology. John said he thinks the site is three years behind on identifying technologies and deploying them. He said they used to have a site coordination technology group, but it fell apart. Third, John explained their goal is to have two projects happening at the same time so if one gets shut down the other can continue. He said this was their model in the 100 Area and they want to continue it. He said they are doing treatability tests, deep vadose zone work, and pipeline investigations but are not applying enough money or being aggressive enough about it.

Karen said DOE-RL plans to provide more substance on the above mentioned regulator topics to show how DOE will move forward and to provide context for committee discussions.

Committee Discussion

- *Does the White Paper from EPA and Ecology address staging of decisions in terms of how a decision to move ahead in one area affects other waste sites nearby?* Craig said they are not addressing staging. The White Paper is broken down by waste sites and model groups but does not get into that much detail.
- *Is the White Paper a living document?* Craig said it could be, but they intended it as a starting point. It reflects EPA and Ecology locally and is a snapshot of what the regulating agencies are thinking now. John said they sometimes work with other EPA and Ecology departments and this White Paper illustrates where they are headed.
- Susan suggested the next step for the committee is to review the paper and identify a few issue managers to compare HAB advice including the groundwater and capping flow charts and priorities with the values in the paper.
- *What is the timeline for ZP1?* Dennis said the most eminent decision is on the groundwater unit. The three parties have become aligned to restore to the highest beneficial use at ZP1. EPA hopes to have it ready to comment on in April. Dennis said they will verify the timeframe to make sure they can brief the committee in detail.
- *Were you talking about the pre 1970s TRU that is in the trenches and cribs?* Dennis said he was referring to the burial grounds, but specifically the Z cribs. Dennis said the first couple decisions that are made about how to deal with pre 70's TRU will dictate how it is dealt with in the future.
- *Is there need for the Board to get involved in the interim actions?* Dennis said he did not think the Board needed to take action on the issue but the agencies would like the Board's support on it. John added that the agencies have not done a lot of removal actions and it would be nice to hear that the community generally supports this work.
- *What parameters are used in making the decision to shrink the site with these interim actions?* John said proximity to other waste sites, depth, contaminants, and disposal all factor into the decision. He said the removal actions are done in areas where the agencies are fairly certain they can clean up all the contamination and take it to ERDF. John felt that the value of shrinking the site has been overlooked because of the focus on environmental risk. There is an opportunity in the 200 Area to shrink the site and John said he believes they should go ahead and do the work because the environmental risk is not great.
- *Would the parts of the 200 Area under the interim action get taken off the national priorities list (NPL)?* John explained that shrinking the site is a way to focus on particular areas, but will not mean the areas come off the NPL list. John said there is a lot of characterization being done on site. Originally the goal was to be finished by

2005 but now it has been pushed out to 2008. These are areas where additional characterization is not needed; they know what contaminants are present making it relatively easy to deal with.

- Shelley suggested the committee should send a letter to DOE-Headquarters reiterating the need to look at a site technology investigation working group. Dennis agreed, he said there are many technological processes that are valuable in the Deep Vadose Zone Treatability Test Plan that are not funded. He thought the Board could write a letter tying and prioritizing the elements of the plan that need funding. Pam said the advantage of that previous technology group was the inter-site coordination. She said under the old model Oak Ridge could approve a technology and Hanford could use it.
- Susan suggested a group meet regularly to focus on application of field technologies which would build new and increased enthusiasm for new technologies. Dennis added that there are real tangible problems to solve, whereas a few years ago the technology needs were not as real or immediate.
- Pam said how the previous technology board was set up was very costly. She suggested draft advice should say it should not use the same model. Craig said the technology group also does not need all of the previous subgroups
- *What is the status of SW1 and 2?* John Price said they are still scoping the size of SW 1 and 2. He said he does not know the timeline but will make sure to get that information to the committee. John Morse said data is currently being collected on technetium and uranium. He said the committee could expect a briefing at the end of fiscal year.
- Dennis said next month he could provide a detailed briefing on the groundwater carbon tetrachloride issue at ZP1. Dick said he heard the high concentrations of carbon tetrachloride will be removed and the rest would be left to natural attenuation. Dennis said that is part of what they want to explain and discuss with the committee.

Committee Work Planning and Committee Business

Cathy McCague distributed the committee work planning table. She asked that committee members think about which topics they would like to serve as issue managers on. Maynard suggested the chart should be updated to identify time sensitive topics. He said he would work on updating the work plan and would bring it back to the committee for further discussion.

Regulator Perspectives

- Dennis suggested that the committee should bring forward to the full Board the topic of institutional controls (ICs) in the same format that was done at the committee meeting. He said making it tangible is challenging, but it is necessary to engage people and provide context. Pam said she would set up time for Jay Pendergrass and Seth Kirshenberg to come to the Board to discuss ICs. Cathy said this topic needs

some issue manager work done before that can be scheduled. Dennis clarified that he was thinking this topic could come up this summer, but is not an immediate issue.

Committee Discussion

- Shelley said there is a Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting at Hanford in April. She suggested that Dennis might want to schedule time with the SSAB while they are here to see if he can leverage resources and support.

618-7 Burial Ground and 300 Area Tour

Some committee members went on a DOE-RL tour of the 618-7 Burial Ground and 300 Area. The tour provided committee members an opportunity to learn about and see operations for burial ground remediation which will commence in mid-January. This burial ground was a disposal site for reactor fuel fabrication and laboratory process debris from the 300 Area. After touring the burial ground, committee members went on a brief tour of the 300 Area and heard about DOE-RL's plan for facility demolition in 2008 and what has already been done.

Action Items / Commitments

- There will be a committee call on Tuesday, January 15th.
- Dennis will provide a detailed briefing on the groundwater carbon tetrachloride issue at ZP1 during next month's committee meeting.
- The committee will draft a letter to DOE-HQ voicing support for a site wide technology group.
- Wade Riggsbee, Sandra Lilligren, and Greg deBruler will serve as issue managers for the Columbia River Component Remedial Investigation.

Handouts

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

- River and Plateau Committee FY 2008 Work Planning Table, 12/18/07.
- Board 2008 Priorities – From: Susan Leckband and Executive Issues Committee, 6/8/07.
- Major issues for consideration by the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) for 2008, Tri-Party Agreement Agencies, Sept. 6, 2007.
- Upcoming Public Comment Period – BC Controlled Area Waste Site Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis, Karen Lutz DOE-RL, 1/9/2008.

- Columbia River Component – Development of Remedial Investigation Work Plan, DOE-RL & WCH, January 9, 2008.
- Columbia River Component Regulatory Path Forward (Figure 6-1 from WCH-201), DOE-RL & WCH.
- Surface Environmental Surveillance, PNNL, January 9, 2008.
- Public Health Always Working for a Safer and Healthier Washington, WDOH.
- Hanford and the Washington State Department of Health Oversight Program, WDOH, June 2006.
- Office of River Protection Environmental Radiation Section, WDOH.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Ken Gasper	Bob Parazin	Bob Suyama
Pam Larsen	Maynard Plahuta	Gene Van Liew
Susan Leckband	Mike Priddy	
Sandra Lilligren	Wade Riggsbee	
Jerri Main	Shelley Cimon	
Debra McBaugh	Dick Smith	

Others

Peter Bengston, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Janice Williams, FH
Briant Charboneau, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Barb Wise, FH
Joe Franco, DOE-RL	Noel Smith-Jackson, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
John Morse, DOE-RL	Laura Buelow, EPA	Ted Poston, PNNL
John Sands, DOE-RL	Craig Cameron, EPA	Dale Bignell, WCH
Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Larry Hulstrom, WCH
		Jill Thomson, WCH
		Karl Kasper, W&C