

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE MEETING
May 11, 2005
Richland, WA**

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions 1
Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) 1
K Basins – Sludge Containerization 5
U Plant Area Waste Sites (200-UW-1 Operable Unit) Proposed Plan 6
Groundwater Protection Program 8
Central Plateau Caps and Barriers decision considerations 10
Decision documents check-in and look ahead 12
Committee business 13
Handouts 14
Attendees 14

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 (RAP) Committee Vice-Chair, welcomed the committee. Changes to the April meeting summary were accepted, and the summary was adopted.

Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF)

Delmar Noyes, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), and Moussa Jaraysi, CH2M Hill (CHG), briefed the committee on the IDF Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Draft Permit coming out for public comment. Delmar thanked the committee for its work and contributions to facilitating the process. The presentation covered general information and specifics on the IDF, history of the reasoning for IDF construction, construction status, and the proposed path forward.

The permit application was modified to restrict mixed low-level waste (MLLW) streams to immobilized low activity waste (ILAW) from the waste treatment plant (WTP). Ecology completed a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) determination, draft permit, and started public comment in May 2005. The permit is scheduled to become effective in August 2005, and the IDF is planned to begin operation in Fiscal Year 2007 (FY07). The waste to be disposed of at the IDF will meet waste acceptance criteria, and

the locations of waste placement will be recorded to ensure easy access and retrieval if required.

In addition to regulatory requirements (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), SEPA, etc), the design of the IDF includes additional enhancements and safeguards, including two geosynthetic clay liners and a third high density polyethylene geomembrane liner beneath the liquid collection area to provide a secondary leak detection system.

Construction status update:

- Site preparation activities were completed in November 2004.
- A safe and stable condition (i.e., control of dust, erosion, and access) was created on site in December 2004.
- A clay liner test pad is being constructed to test the system design and collect data. Test data indicate the clay liner is functioning well thus far.
- Construction of the low-level waste (LLW) cell is scheduled to begin in June 2005, following the completion of the clay liner test.
- The IDF permit is anticipated to be effective by August 2005.
- DOE is likely to request a third Temporary Authorization to allow the start of construction of the lower portion of the liner system on the MLLW cell after the public comment period and before the permit is effective.
- DOE wants to get an Admix layer installed before winter 2005.

Regulator Perspectives

- Suzanne Dahl, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), updated the committee on the IDF draft permit. The IDF draft permit and permit conditions are complete (including SEPA Determination) and have been combined and released for public comment. She indicated landfill regulations are very prescriptive for design, construction, tests, etc. From Ecology's perspective, the goal of the permit is to provide a well-designed and well-constructed facility, operated in a manner resulting in no, or minimal, impact to human health and the environment.
- Suzanne described the SEPA Determination process for the committee. Ecology reviewed the SEPA checklist and modified it to reflect the permit application. To write the permit conditions Ecology incorporated information from several existing environmental documents, such as the Tank Waste Remediation System Environmental Impact Statement (TWRS EIS) and specific portions of the Hanford Solid Waste (HSW) EIS, which already meet SEPA requirements. Ecology feels the document gives a satisfactory view of the impacts from storing waste on-site.
- Suzanne outlined topics of the draft permit conditions:
 - Glass formulation
 - Risk assessment for waste
 - Secondary leak detection capability
 - Groundwater monitoring

Ecology feels the draft permit conditions will contribute to a more robust facility and improve protection of the environment. Public comments were used to inform the draft permit conditions, and Ecology is excited to receive public comment on the Draft Permit and the SEPA Determination.

Committee Discussion

- *How is the Arlington site dealing with the liner failure they experienced with their disposal facility?* Suzanne said it is not the newer liner system that meets current regulations that is failing at the Arlington site, but a section with an older design. She is unclear exactly which units are failing.

The committee discussed several issues concerning waste form disposition at the IDF.

- *Considering waste disposition across the DOE complex, is there an expectation that the IDF permit could be modified to accept additional waste streams in the future?* Suzanne said the IDF permit restricts the specific waste streams going into the IDF. It is possible DOE might decide to add other waste streams to the IDF if revised treatment decisions are made; however, the existing permit forces DOE to account for appropriate Hanford waste streams first.
- *Does the absorption capacity of the clay layer in the liner create any concerns?* Moussa explained that the clay layer has the capacity to swell in a protective way, without compromising the protectiveness of the liner system.
- *Were comments that were submitted on the prior determination of non-significance (DNS) addressed?* Suzanne said comments on the prior DNS were considered as input, but she does not believe comments were addressed explicitly in a response summary. *Gerry Pollet asked if Ecology will include comments originally made on the prior DNS in the public comment on this IDF draft permit?* Suzanne said those original comments would be included in the public comment on the IDF draft permit.
- *Gerry commented that DOE indicated it would like to import 13,000 cubic meters of waste material before the IDF facility opens. Has Ecology analyzed this possibility in the risk assessment for the IDF permit?* Suzanne said DOE's permit application only asked that the 50 bulk vitrification (vit) boxes and waste treatment glass be considered for disposal at the IDF. The IDF permit did not consider on- or off-site LLW. Ron Skinnarland, Ecology, added that Ecology focused only on the waste it was asked to permit for disposition at the IDF, and that legal issues need to be settled in court before the prospect of amending the permit to allow for additional waste disposition at IDF can be addressed. Suzanne said if Ecology does receive a permit modification request from DOE, the waste stream under consideration would have to be analyzed to show it does not constitute a risk.
- *Gerry, speaking for Heart of America, expressed concern that the IDF is only one landfill, and this is the only time the public gets a chance to see the risk assessment for the IDF. Therefore, he said, the public should be entitled to see an EIS which considers the cumulative impacts of various proposals to use the IDF. Has Ecology considered the possibility of a cell size reduction for existing waste at the IDF?*

Suzanne said the volume of existing waste being considered in the current IDF draft permit would exceed the size of the cell in the permit being applied for today.

- *Why does the IDF draft permit not use stricter drinking water standards than federal drinking water standards to evaluate the facility?* Suzanne explained that Ecology considers all relevant standards (e.g., state, federal, and local drinking water standards). She said she would look into different drinking water standards and determine if there is a better way to state the requirements for the IDF. However, the landfill is not supposed to impact drinking water, which serves as a strict requirement to ensure activities associated with the operation of the IDF do not impact other systems.
- *Considering the significant impacts associated with construction activities, will secondary vadose zone monitoring start during construction? Are there safeguards in place to monitor damage caused to the secondary vadose zone monitoring system during construction?* Suzanne said Ecology wants to initiate monitoring during construction. Since secondary leak detection will most likely happen during construction (i.e., construction squeeze water), it will be a good chance to test the monitoring system. Moussa said a three foot “operations layer” composed of native sand exists above the liner systems to ensure operation activities would not impact the containment barrier layers that compose the liner.
- Al Boldt commended Ecology for precluding other waste streams not covered in the HSW EIS from the IDF draft permit; however, he commented that if DOE has any plans to dispose of other waste in the IDF, they need to address these waste streams, specifically by providing data to show they can be safely disposed of in the IDF. A federal court ruling states that DOE does not have the authority to designate waste as LLW; instead, orphan waste forms are to be considered high-level waste (HLW). Therefore, Al believes it is not appropriate for the State to accept waste DOE designated as LLW in the IDF draft permit. Suzanne said the IDF draft permit precludes some waste forms that are not in the HSW EIS and some that are in HSW EIS. Suzanne said the State believes the 1996-1997 discussion between DOE and the U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) are adequate for determining whether waste meeting requirements to be classified as LLW can be disposed of in landfills.
- Al suggested the committee evaluate whether the Hanford Advisory Board (Board) should comment or advise that waste reclassification issues be resolved before waste is disposed of in the IDF. Moussa cautioned that the State deciding to assume the position that there is no clear path forward for disposing of waste at the IDF could be detrimental to continuing work on the IDF.
- Several committee members said the Board is on record with the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) EIS, stating that ILAW was to be stored in a manner allowing it to be retrievable. Suzanne confirmed that the State has maintained the position that ILAW would be retrievable in the IDF. Moussa said DOE is keeping a record of where waste forms are disposed of in order to make them accessible in the event they need to be removed.

- A committee working group, including Gerry Pollet, Al Boldt, Vince Panesko, and Susan Leckband, was created to draft advice on the issue of waste disposition at the IDF permit and SEPA determination for the June RAP committee meeting in preparation for the June Board meeting.
 - There was general committee agreement that advice on IDF waste disposition is not technical in nature, and ought to focus on significant existing policy questions.
 - Todd Martin suggested there are three issues for consideration in potential advice:
 1. Commending Ecology for precluding waste forms not adequately addressed in the HSW EIS.
 2. Is it wise to decide to accept ILAW and bulk vit waste in the face of current legal uncertainties?
 3. SEPA issues with a comprehensive look at cumulative impacts and the public's opportunity to comment on the risk budget.

K Basins – Sludge Containerization

Dave Faulkner, Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), briefed the committee on progress with sludge containerization. Sludge material is currently half containerized. Removal of an estimated 25 to 26 cubic meters of the estimated 50 cubic meters of sludge is complete. Removal of sludge material in the K East area is two-thirds complete. Containers are being installed in the K West area in preparation for acceptance of sludge material, which will allow for decommissioning and demolition (D&D) of K Basin East. Removal of sludge waste material and container installation will go ahead, and is on track to meet Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones. Any sludge material remaining after the primary containerization activities will be cleaned up and containerized.

DOE missed the March TPA milestone for complete containerization of K East Basin sludge. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) fined DOE \$75,000 for failure to meet that TPA milestone. DOE will pay the fine. DOE commissioned a study to determine whether or not sludge material is understood well enough to engineer containers for disposition.

Regulator Perspectives

- Larry Gadbois, EPA, said the majority of sludge treatment is scheduled to begin in 2007, and is estimated to be complete by 2009. DOE and the regulator agencies are realizing sludge is hard to work with, and there is frustration that sludge containerization is not being completed according to schedule. Ultimately, EPA feels sludge containerization will get done, but the process is just taking longer than anticipated.

Committee Discussion

- *When will work within the K Basins be completed?* Dave said sludge material will be consolidated in K West by December of 2005. By the end of the contract period D&D of the K Basins will be close to complete. Committee members commented that any contract changes could impact the dates of estimated work completion. Harold Heacock asked when all of the work would be completed and the basins closed, Dave replied in 2009.
- *What are the total project costs for sludge containerization?* Total project cost for the entire K Basin Closure Project is estimated to be \$1.84 billion.
- *Does DOE still plan to leave lids in the bottom of the facilities and grout them in place?* Dave said there remains a possibility that some material will remain in the Basins. Fluor Hanford (Fluor) is looking into the most efficient way of optimizing the mixture of waste that exists. As much waste as possible will be removed, but there are cost efficiencies that also need to be considered, which may result in some waste remaining in the K Basins. Sludge material is more difficult to remove than anticipated, requiring implementation of innovative methods of removal. Some waste debris can safely be left for in-situ grouting.
- *Is DOE building on the history of work scheduling to better anticipate and limit scheduling short falls?* Dave said Fluor was asked to develop an aggressive schedule without knowing much of the information about the waste constituents, resulting in a schedule with little room for contingencies. As long as positive progress is being made and unanticipated issues are being dealt with, DOE would rather operate under aggressive schedules and look to the Board for support and advice.
- *How are morale problems in the Basins impacting work schedule?* Dave said DOE allows Fluor to manage the work force without much federal oversight. It is important to recognize workers are currently being asked to find efficiencies and adhere to accelerated cleanup schedules, which amounts to working themselves out of a job. Scott Sax, Fluor, said workforce morale is significantly better now than it was a year ago. The reality is that as sludge work finishes, Fluor will be reducing workers; however, they are now able to predict when those transitions will happen, so workers have time to figure out their transition and Fluor has time to fill employment gaps.
- There was general committee agreement to wait until next fall to update the Board on K Basins, when there are more accomplishments to highlight.

U Plant Area Waste Sites (200-UW-1 Operable Unit) Proposed Plan

John Price, Ecology, updated the committee on the U Plant Proposed Plan. He mentioned the Feasibility Study and Proposed Plan are available and his presentation covered the purpose of the U Plant Proposed Plan, context for the plan, issues of concern, and strategies to mitigate concerns. John asked the committee for feedback in preparation for a public meeting on the plan on June 2.

This is the first proposed plan for 200 Area soil waste sites, done as part of the U Plant Regional Closure, and proposes capping five out of 31 waste sites. This is a good opportunity for comparison to the pending Board decision logic flowchart.

The four proposed alternatives in the U Plant Proposed Plan include: 1) No action (two sites); 2) Monitored natural attenuation (nine sites); 3) Remove, treat, and dispose at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) (15 sites); 4) Engineered surface barrier (five sites). The regulatory agencies (EPA and Ecology) evaluated the four alternatives using the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Nine Decision Criteria, and considered all balancing criteria, not just focusing on cost.

John highlighted several issues of concern in the U Plant Proposed Plan, including the approach to characterization efforts, the lack of employable technology to deal with deep vadose zone contamination, and the integration of RCRA and CERCLA regulations. He indicated that a lot of the work in the 200 Area will not be driven by environmental priorities, so committee members should voice any particular concerns. He suggested contracts and budgets are not set up to conduct regional closures; there are currently five closure sites being managed and the budget is not available to conduct one complete area closure project, indicating some inefficiencies exist. In addition, there is a serious lack of technology development and deployment, resulting in technologies being implemented roughly two years behind when they are needed. There is also a public involvement challenge to make closure documents understandable to the general public.

Regulator Perspectives

- Craig Cameron, EPA, introduced Alicia Boyd, a recent addition to the EPA Hanford office. He had no specific comments on the U Plant Proposed Plan.

Committee Discussion

- *Does the U Plant Proposed Plan presuppose the 221-UW-1 (U Plant Area) Operable Unit will be capped?* John said some of the alternatives in the plan account for capping 221-U, but others do not.
- *Gerry Pollet asked why the plan does not employ retrieve, treat, and dispose to a practical depth before capping as a potential alternative?* John was unsure, and said he would look into it. He said he would like to get Gerry's comment for inclusion in the record of decision (ROD) responsiveness summary. Gerry asserted that all the information about each alternative needs to get out to the public for consideration now. He suggested this is a logical alternative, which the plan does not consider.
- Gerry expressed concerns about the accuracy of information regarding waste discharges presented in the U Plant fact sheets handed out to the committee. John said there is substantive information that dangerous wastes were in tanks.

- *Will U Plant Regional Closure be used as a lessons learned model for cleanup across the Central Plateau?* John said that is the plan, but without adequate funding cleanup, lessons learned will be limited because activities will not be run as an integrated project. Budgets do not currently support an integrated project.
- Rob Davis suggested a single fact sheet discussing salient issues related to integration would prompt more comments from the Board. It would be good for Board members to understand how Ecology and EPA view integration efforts. John said Ecology is investigating facilities for integration, and is working on DOE to do better integration. He said DOE is being reasonably responsive to integration efforts. There are currently around 51 risk assessments currently being done on-site, all of which are being captured in the Status of Hanford Risk Assessments document. Committee members would like to review and comment on the document when it becomes available. John said he could provide a briefing at a future committee meeting, and that committee members should send their concerns to him to be sure they are addressed at the public meeting.
- *Shelley Cimon mentioned that FEDRAD 05, a government and vendor forum, seems to serve as an opportunity to match vendors with cleanup issues in order to address needs. How are Hanford needs being carried forward to this forum?* She suggested this issue has potential as Board advice. Susan indicated this is particularly timely as the national budget is being reduced. Dennis Faulk, EPA, suggested that the new DOE Secretary would hopefully be more amenable to technology needs since he has a science background.
- Dick Smith expressed concern that alternatives are not being addressed or commented on in feasibility study and proposed plan documents. John said Dick's comment would be addressed.

The committee discussed potential advice on the U Plant Proposed Plan. The previous issue managers for the U Plant Proposed Plan (Dick, Rob, Susan, and Shelley) will continue working on the plan. There is an opportunity to apply the Board's caps and barriers decision flowchart to decisions about capping in the plan. The workgroup needs to have an approach to address the plan before the next committee meeting in order to have it ready for the June Board meeting.

Groundwater Protection Program

Dick Wilde, Fluor, updated the committee on the Groundwater Protection Program. He said safety is the primary focus during well drilling, sampling, and decommissioning; the project has achieved one year without an Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) recordable event, which is impressive. DOE has strict controls in place for worker safety and exposure. The heart of the uranium plume has been removed, and tests were conducted to see if uranium concentrations returned. Technetium-99 concentrations are stable except for Well 299-W11-25B.

Dick updated the committee on the status of well decommissioning. Webster well decommissioning is currently half done, and will likely be finished by the end of July. Well decommissioning is operating on an accelerated schedule.

Dick provided the committee with information on utility waterline leaks. Waterline leaks have potential to cause sinkholes and drive contaminants deeper. Repairing utility waterline leaks is on hold until the budget is resolved.

Dick provided the committee with an overview on well drilling activities. He said when workers were installing a new monitoring well, they ran into a new Tech-99 contamination area in the groundwater under cribs 16 and 17. DOE needs to locate the source of the leak, and are initiating an investigation of the tank farm. By the end of the summer, DOE should know if new technologies are viable for dealing with new contamination. He promised to keep the committee informed of the findings and what DOE plans to do about it.

Dick highlighted a new technology for Chromate at the 100-K site. DOE anticipates starting field-testing the treatment technology this June, and running tests for roughly four months. He expects to report to the committee on relative successes from the field tests.

Regulator Perspectives

- John Price, Ecology, said the State is happy with the progress of the groundwater protection program. The work is important enough to be done, however, budget short falls remain a concern.
- Craig Cameron, EPA, said an expert panel at a recent conference (held by Fluor) looked at the UW1 Area 200 BC Cribs and trenches area. These investigations illustrated an in-depth look at the way different compliance wells are handled and how modeling is done. There is a need to look beyond capping, since capping may not be enough to address deep contaminations. Soil desiccation is a technology that might address deep contamination events, so there is some movement to work with potential technological advances.

Committee Discussion

- *What is the reason for the drop off in the total number of wells being decommissioned?* Dick said the drop off in number of wells decommissioned is a direct result of a lack of funding for Fiscal Year 2006 (FY06). The project went from 565 wells planned for decommissioning to funding to decommission only 255 wells. The project is funded through Fiscal Year 2005 (FY05). There are no technical reasons for not doing more well decommissioning.
- *Referring to the graph in the presentation handout depicting the status of well disposition, does the number of planned cumulative regular wells reflect the number of wells appearing in the baseline?* Dick said the graph represents TPA compliance

requirements for well decommissioning and wells in the accelerated baseline. DOE has until December of 2006 to meet the TPA requirement for well decommissioning. Joe Voice, DOE-RL, and others pointed out that changes needed to make the graph more accurate.

- *Does the budget deficit come out of the groundwater program, or is the deficit a result of site-wide deficit?* Dick said the deficit comes out of the program. There are funding requests in DOE system to support well decommissioning activities in 2007.
- *How are DOE and the regulatory agencies responding to the recent discovery of the Technetium 99 contamination plume?* Dick said there is a fairly high concentration of Technetium 99 deep in the subsurface, so there is significant concern about the plume. The sources of the contamination need to be found, in addition to the need for more precise data on the vertical and lateral plume dimensions. This contamination is deeper than existing wells can monitor, so more geophysical work needs to be done to evaluate the subsurface conditions. By the fall 2005 there will be wells that can go to the depth of the contamination in order to better identify the real dimensions of the plume. A number of activities will coalesce to provide a better handle on the issue.

Central Plateau Caps and Barriers decision considerations

The committee discussed how to organize the list of policy questions and considerations for caps and barriers that Gary Peterson and Rob Davis put together, which complements the Board's Central Plateau Remedial Action Values Flow product.

Committee Discussion

- The committee decided to organize the information into three categories: 1) Purpose of the decision considerations; 2) Overarching policy statements; and 3) Other considerations. The committee drafted the following language for each category:
 - 1) Purpose:

The Board's recommendation for the criteria to include when considering a barrier. The HAB has clearly stated its preference for the Remove, Treat, Dispose (RTD) alternative for remediation of contaminated facilities and sites. However, there are some circumstances where capping may be selected for remediation. Those circumstances are generally limited to situations where RTD becomes impracticable.
 - 2) Decision-making considerations:
 - Recognition that barriers aren't permanent
 - Do not sacrifice protection for retrievability; maintain a balance between protection and retrievability
 - Prior to decision, conduct characterization and a thorough analysis of what's being capped at each site

- Fundamentally, first properly characterize, do a risk cost analysis...second conduct a feasibility assessment to examine the effectiveness of several approaches and outcomes
 - Risk assessment must examine the likelihood of failure of institutional controls
 - Include public input on exposures and subsequent future use restrictions
 - A barrier must be as protective as RTD
 - Will the barrier protect human health and the environment over life of the contaminants?
 - If so, proceed with barrier decision for final decision barrier
 - If not, use a barrier as an interim step until technology is available and go back and apply the RTD flow chart
- 3) Overarching policy statements
- The federal government should maintain Long Term Stewardship responsibility for capped sites (e.g., cost, monitoring, public safety, repair, legacy records and design integrity life.
 - After a cap is placed, ongoing reviews should include: monitoring, actions to be taken if failure occurs or appears imminent, budget, new technologies developed for possible remediation, EPA five-year reviews, Hanford environmental changes, groundwater contamination, interaction of two or more adjacent caps and ownership responsibilities.
 - There should always be a public review process associated with ongoing reviews and this public process should be budgeted for.
 - Failure to maintain or repair a cap means a failed cap. (monitoring policy statement)
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, and Rick Jansons will summarize and organize the committee's drafted statements for the June RAP committee meeting.
 - Referring to the policy statements and decision considerations, Gerry Pollet commented that risk assessments need to examine the risks associated with the failure of institutional controls and engineering, need to include adequate public input into the determination of what is considered reasonable exposure, public notice needs to be given about the risk of restrictive actions (i.e., weighing the set of public values about what DOE is reducing the use of), and waste sites need to be properly characterized. Craig Cameron, EPA, said it is an exaggeration to say waste sites will not be characterized. Characterization (“confirmatory sampling”) is done after a decision is made to ensure the waste in questions fits the conceptual model. Gerry asserted that if characterization is going to be done anyway, why not do characterization before decisions are made so that the best available information is used during decision-making?
 - *Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, reminded the committee that Board products have to be useful and accessible to the public as well as the Hanford agencies. How could a document of policy statements and decision considerations be useful to the agencies?*

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, said it would be helpful to know things that might be acceptable to the Board, since there are several drivers that are beyond the control of the agencies. Kevin Leary, DOE-RL, noted that many of the considerations and policy statements the committee discussed are inherent in DOE's operating efforts, but he definitely considers the document useful.

- The committee discussed the language that should be used to describe barriers. There was general committee agreement to use the term "interim" to describe barriers, since it recognizes barriers are not permanent. Several committee members expressed discomfort with the terms "temporary," "permanent," and "stabilize."
- Larry expressed concerns about the definition of failure regarding caps and barriers. In addition, he is not convinced people have thought enough about why moving waste to another area is a good objective. What are the attributes that make people feel that doing something with waste is better than doing nothing? Several committee members responded that a cap or barrier that does not meet its performance objectives should be considered in a state of failure.
- Considering how policy statements and recommended considerations would be most useful for the Hanford agencies, Dennis Faulk, EPA, encouraged the committee to focus on the policy level recommendations, and not delve too deep into technical information. He suggested using the technical statements as a foundation for determining policy statements on various topics.
- Dick Smith expressed concern about the timing of comment opportunities on decision documents. Craig Cameron echoed Dick's concern, saying comments were received too late in the decision-making process with the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI). Some committee members suggested this could be a general piece of Board advice.

Decision documents check-in and look ahead

The committee reviewed the document listing the schedule for decision documents.

Committee Discussion

- *Committee members asked if DOE has any idea about the documents listed as to-be-determined (TBDs)?* Joe Voice, DOE-RL, said there was no more specific information on the schedule for decision documents. Dennis said EPA could come present to the committee on the 100 Area River Effluent Pipelines Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD). The analysis is done on the document, so he wants to provide the committee with all the available information as soon as possible.
- *Does DOE have any idea when the committee could expect to see the 200 BC Cribs and Trenches Proposed Plan?* Larry Romine, DOE-RL, said DOE would receive the document in two weeks. Dennis said an effort would be made to get it out to the committee as soon as possible once it is received, so it will be ready for the August

RAP committee meeting. Todd suggested the 200 BC Cribs and Trenches Proposed Plan is a good potential test case for the Board's Central Plateau Remedial Action Values Flow regarding caps and barriers.

- Al Boldt reviewed the Technical Guidance Document for Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement Vadose Zone and Groundwater Revised Analysis (TGD), which was originally presented to the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) in April. He presented issues he identified with the document to the committee. In light of Al's review of the TGD, the committee discussed if the Board should issue a piece of advice to reiterate the need for technical expertise in order to maintain the visibility of the issue. Dennis explained that by reviewing technical documents, the Board would be looking at the ramifications of any possible inconsistencies. Todd said he would contact Paige to update her on the issue and Todd, Al, and Dirk would draft some language for a presentation at the upcoming Joint RAP and TWC meeting.

Committee business

- The next Inter Agency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) meeting is on May 24 at 11am.
- Topics for the June RAP committee meeting:
 - Status of Hanford Risk Assessment document
 - IDF permit
 - Central Plateau capping piece
 - Dennis Faulk – river pipeline ESD
 - Tank Closure EIS Guidance Document Advice
- The committee decided to request the June RAP committee meeting be on Thursday, June 2 in order to have more time to discuss issues before the June Board meeting.
- The committee reviewed issue manager (IM) and work plan responsibilities. Vince Panesko agreed to assume IM responsibilities for the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP), Tom Stoops and Shelley Cimon will be IMs for 618-10-11, and Gary Peterson will be added as an IM for caps and barriers.
- Pam presented information on the fact sheet created for U Plant Regional Closure by the Hanford Communities. She indicated the fact sheet language was changed by DOE, so there are some DOE information filters the Board should be aware of.
- Pam presented the committee with two letters from the City of Richland regarding an analysis of future use of the 300 Area. Keith Klein wrote a response letter to the City describing issues he has with their analysis. The City wrote a letter in response to Keith Klein's response letter. Pam said there was absolutely no interest in the 300 Area from potential industrial operators.

Handouts

- Integrated Disposal Facility, May 2005.
 - Integrated Disposal Facility Draft Permit, Suzanne Dahl, May 11, 2005.
 - 200-UW-1 Operable Unit CERCLA Proposed Plan, May 11, 2005.
 - U Plant Regional Closure Issue Paper, Hanford Communities.
 - Cleanup Alternatives Evaluated for the U Plant Area Waste Sites (200-UW-1 Operable Unit) Fact Sheet, Tri-Party Agencies.
 - Groundwater Protection Program, Fluor Hanford, May 11, 2005.
 - Hanford Advisory Board – Central Plateau Remedial Action Values Flow, Hanford Advisory Board, April 29, 2005.
 - 2005 Meetings and Public Comment Periods Timeline, May 10, 2005.
 - Technical Guidance Document for Tank Closure Environmental Impact Statement Vadose Zone and Groundwater Revised Analysis, U.S. Department of Energy, March 25, 2005.
 - City of Richland (letter), John Darrington, May 3, 2005.
 - Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office, Keith Klein, April 12, 2005.
-

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Allyn Boldt	Pam Larsen	Gerry Pollet
Shelley Cimon	Susan Leckband	Mike Priddy
Jim Curdy	Todd Martin	Dick Smith
Rob Davis	Vince Panesko	John Stanfill
Harold Heacock	Gary Petersen	Tom Stoops
Rick Jansons	Maynard Plahuta	Dave Watrous

Others

Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Larry Gadbois, Ecology	Moussa Jaraysi, CHG
Dave Faulkner, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Bryan Kidder, CHG
Larry Romine, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Joe Voice, DOE-RL	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
		Bruce Ford, FH
Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP	Alicia Boyd, EPA	Dick Wilde, FH
Thomas (Zack) Smith, DOE-ORP	Craig Cameron, EPA	Barb Wise, FH
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Scott Sax, FH
		Kim Ballinger, Nuvotec/ORP