

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

RIVER AND PLATEAU

February 12, 2003

Richland, Washington

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introductions, and Committee Business 1
116-N Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD)..... 1
Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) 2
K Basins 3
Groundwater Protection Project (GPP)..... 5
DOE-HQ Draft End States Policy..... 8
100 B/C Area Risk Assessment Pilot..... 11
Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW- EIS) Discussion 12
Committee Business..... 13
Committee Path Forward 13
Handouts 13
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, Introductions, and Committee Business

Pam Brown, Chair of the River and Plateau Committee, opened the meeting and welcomed the committee and guests. The committee adopted both the January meeting summary and the meeting summary from October 2001.

116-N Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD)

Chris Smith, Department of Energy – Richland Operations (DOE-RL), gave an update on the ESD. This has been released for public comment and the comment period has been extended until Monday, March 31.

Committee Discussion

- Greg DeBrueler requested that Dirk Dunning and Wade Rigsbee give a presentation on alternative technologies. He would like them to discuss the alternative technologies and why they were not considered. John Price, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), stated that they are still looking at alternatives for the ground water and

are still talking with DOE about these options. Dirk said he and Wade could be ready for a presentation on this by next month.

Regulator Perspectives

- Ecology has received several letters from the Umatilla Tribe over the last few months. The last response letter from DOE was received on January 3. Many of the suggestions the Tribe has given have been in regard to alternative technologies. The Tribe has even given some suggestions about which contractors should be used. Ecology and DOE are continuing to look at alternative technologies though, currently, just in broad categories.

Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, discussed the progress made on the PFP since the summer. When the committee last received an update, the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestone negotiations were just being completed. These were signed in October, 2002. DOE-RL has submitted a chemical hazard assessment to Ecology; Rick Bond, Ecology, said that it looks good from their view and it has been verbally approved. DOE is currently in the process of producing several Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) documents in regards to the engineering evaluation, which should be submitted next month. Also, they are in the midst of the first pilot demolition project and are applying the lessons learned from Rocky Flats. PFP is to be used as a demonstration project for how the demolition process will work at the rest of the facility. Since the bulk of the Performance Incentives (PI's) with Fluor have been renegotiated, the key difference now is to have the facility ready for demolition by the end of Fluor's contract in September 2006.

Several Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) milestones have been completed since last summer. An agreement has been reached with Savannah River on how they will take the waste, specifically, how the material will be packaged. Additional material will continue to be packaged even after the complete disposition deadline of 2004.

Larry commented that there is currently a lack of political support for moving the waste. There is legislation under discussion to determine the final disposition path and this includes a discussion of which projects will be headed for Savannah River. Since DOE cannot move any more waste to South Carolina as of this date, a different vault here may be used. They will make sure that this is the best choice and, if it is, the material will be placed in safe storage and the demolition will continue. The transuranic (TRU) waste is not included in this, only the material going to Savannah River. There are four empty concrete structures under ground in the 200 West area, which were built for the tank waste program. These are very robust facilities and have been seismically qualified. The structures have been determined to be adequate for plutonium storage and are also qualified to be secure from penetration by various threats.

Committee Discussion

- A committee member asked about the D8 near-miss. Larry said they are looking at it for additional storage capacity. The analysis done on it was very conservative. The non-destructive assay showed a higher level than expected; however, the equipment comes with a wide error band. They were able to confirm the tank is dry with a bit of residue and discovered that the tank is actually eight feet in diameter, not three. (The paperwork was not as clean as it could have been.) This difference changes what can go into the tank. Appropriate recovery actions are now underway and they are getting a handle on the residue.
- Pam asked about the \$6 million request for the grout box and why it was listed separately in the budget. Larry replied that DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) asked RL to show this item separately. Pam asked if all of the material will be removed. Larry answered the material in the 313 containers and Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) fuel will eventually go to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). They are currently working to substitute Hanford's International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) material for that going to Savannah River. For the material that will remain on site, they are trying to utilize alternate storage that does not have frequent access.
- Pam mentioned that the Senate Armed Services Committee is looking into allocating money to hire guards and trucks to ship the waste to Savannah River, in order to get the material moved as quickly as possible and help DOE jump-start the movement of the PFP material to Savannah River.
- Pam asked George Jackson, Fluor, how they are doing with the work scope given the lack of money. George replied they are trying to figure out how to do it, especially with the acceleration, but they are making it work. Pam said if he finds any obstacles he should let the Board know so advice can be given to DOE regarding the matter. George added that Ecology and DOE are being very helpful.

Regulator Perspectives

- Rick Bond stated Ecology is working closely with DOE and the contractors. Ecology feels a lot of progress was made last year. Several reports will be coming in this year and four milestones are to be completed during this time. They are going to approve the Chemical Hazards Assessment. Rick mentioned that he had not previously heard that the Plutonium will go to Savannah River.

K Basins

Steve Veitenheimer, DOE-RL, introduced Larry Early, DOE-RL, and Stacy Charboneau, DOE-RL. Larry discussed the completion of milestone 3418. They are currently in the process of moving the waste and are on track to meet and possibly exceed the milestone. Larry warned that as they move further into this process there may be some slow down,

however, it will not affect the completion date that has been set. He also noted that canister cleaning is still progressing and is ahead of schedule.

Stacy added that two milestones have been completed: the completion of K West/K East Fuel Transfer System (FTS) equipment installation and construction and the start of construction acceptance test procedures for both systems. They are ahead of the baseline schedule.

The sludge removal milestone is behind schedule. The sludge transportation systems are on site and are in the K basins being prepared for operations. The readiness reviews for these should be done in March. DOE-RL has committed to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to have the sludge system constructed and running by April 30th.

Steve gave a brief overview of their accomplishments to date. These included the completed fabrication of all 2,209 baskets on schedule and under budget, and continued preparations to receive the first shipment of Interim Storage Casks in July.

Committee Discussion

- Dirk Dunning asked what the disposal path will be for the empty canisters. Larry answered that it will be Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) as the waste is low level.
- Gerry Pollet asked about the baseline for catching up with production. Norm Boyten, vice-president for Fluor on fuels, answered that he did not have the exact number but that he would get it to Gerry. Gerry added that this number should be given to the Budgets and Contracts Committee as well.
- A committee member asked how the most heavily damaged fuel is being dealt with. Stacy said that it is being dealt with in the same way as all the containers. Failing canisters are repackaged, however, there may have to be some longer drying times. All of the material is being processed at the same time, with the exception of scrap processing, which will start up sometime this summer.
- Maynard Plahuta asked if the waste currently being moved is better quality. Stacy replied that it is but they are moving into the lower quality material. The rate will slow down a little but it should catch back up.
- Pam wanted to know if clouding is affecting the movement from K East. Stacy said it isn't causing a problem and they have still been able to move the material, though the pace may slow a bit.
- A committee member wanted to know where the sludge will permanently be stored. Stacy anticipates it will go to WIPP, though the guidelines have not been set yet. Ports have been placed on the tanks and room has been left in them so that testing can be done or water added, etc. Grouting for TRU is not a likely option, but that

discussion will be part of the M91 negotiations. Acceptance criteria for WIPP will be the main determining factor in what happens with the TRU.

- Pam asked what other challenges Steve feels his team is facing. For technical operations, the main challenges are the resolution of K West sludge and the need to make some final end point criteria for turnover to decommissioning and demolition (D&D). For Norm, the main challenge relates to the baselines.
- Dirk asked what seismic qualifications were being done for T Plant since the material will be there for a while. Stacy replied that it has passed the current qualifications, but will need to be reviewed dependent upon the waste category placed there.
- Pam remarked that this group has made a remarkable recovery and asked how they had achieved this. Steve replied they approach this differently than the traditional DOE approach. He feels Norm has done a great job taking over Fluor and in getting a new philosophical mind set in place. Additionally, they have had full senior management support. DOE-RL reprioritized their work as needed to help the Spent Fuels project and Keith Klein is 100% supportive. Steve told Keith that they wouldn't ask for much but when they did, it was because they really need it.
- Pam asked how they are dealing with the morale of the employees as they are working themselves out of a job. Norm said there are several things they are doing: starting to post all up-coming jobs both internal and external; supporting employees who want to change careers in the future; and looking at a retention plan. One of the key things is that Fluor intends to give employees a firm ending date; it helps them plan for the future.
- Larry Gadbois, EPA, remarked that they have concerns over the sludge milestones. EPA thinks DOE divorced the sludge from the milestone but DNSFB does not. The completion of this milestone is still slated for 11/02. The expected date of completion is now April 18th though DOE is still saying April 30th.
- A committee member wanted to know why EPA is proposing a fine when DOE only missed the K West milestone by one week. Larry replied that EPA is considering a fine for sludge retrieval, which is four months behind schedule, not for the one week miss on the K West milestone.

Groundwater Protection Project (GPP)

John Morse, DOE-RL, explained that wells are starting to be drilled in the K Area and it is expected that 20 new wells will be drilled this year. They will also be drilling new monitoring wells in the burial grounds and will then be moving up to the Central Plateau for waste site investigation work. Progress is moving ahead and they are on schedule. The last of the injections will be completed in June.

John went on to say that the draft risk investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) has been completed and will be delivered to the regulators in time for the March 1st deadline. DOE-RL has been working to identify wells that will be abandoned this year; so far, there are 140 for the Fiscal Year 2003. While they are hoping to get a final budget soon,

operating on continuing resolution has not impaired the work being done. Budget delays may, however, impact the schedule of fieldwork as some of the work would have to be done in 2004. These tasks are aligned with the PI's for Fluor. Currently work is being done on the Hanford Site groundwater strategy and comments by the Tribes and the State of Oregon have been incorporated. It is scheduled for release the beginning of March so it will overlap with the Columbia River Keeper groundwater workshop series.

Bruce Ford, Fluor, spoke about the work they are doing on the essential actions for groundwater protection. This includes controlling the high-risk sources of contamination for which Fluor has two PI's. They are also working toward the U plant area closure (milestone M-15-47) which is expected to be completed in June.

Fluor has proposed a plan that focuses on performing high-risk actions over waste sites. Funding has been received for this and the plan is moving forward rapidly. In doing this, they are making sure there is a great deal of interaction with the regulators to ensure that everything is done properly and with the proper documents. At the project level, there is a project execution plan that details the life cycle of work completion.

Bruce also discussed the B/C Area cribs and the Control Area that receives the tank-related waste. There is a great deal of uncertainty as to where the technetium-99 is in the soil. They are currently working on a soil analysis in these crib areas to further investigate.

The team is working to shrink the footprint of the contaminated areas. The first area they expect to complete, by September 2006, is the 12 square mile B/C Area. The second part of the RI/FS process is the pond feasibility study, which will be out for public review in the fall. This deals with the large pond areas to the north and northeast of 200 East. This is the first of the operable units for which they have gotten to a feasibility study and plan.

Bruce mentioned that an update of the Groundwater Protection Project website is being done and should be completed in early March. They are hoping it is more user friendly and that the data is more accessible. Workshops will be held to show people how to use the new website.

Bruce also spoke about the area closure plan for this year. Twenty-three different areas are being looked at for closure and this information, along with the associated key concerns, will be shared as soon as possible. The closure document, which will be finalized by the end of September, is an attempt to develop a strategy to make a closure plan more regional for the site.

Jane Borghese, Fluor, discussed how artificial recharge is working with the Hanford site operations. They are realigning the water lines in the 200West area and hopefully this can be applied to the closure of U plant.

At K Area there is a well with an increasing chromium concentration. The monitoring well at this location was changed to an extraction well. The water was pumped up to the

K Area treatment area and this extraction was completed in two months. Additionally, the project is putting in down gradient monitoring wells to track the flow.

Committee Discussion

- A committee member asked if these documents will adequately cover the System Assessment Capability (SAC). John answered that the SAC is a different plan compiled using the information gathered in the analysis from each specific location. DOE is implementing a plan soon to cover the area closure plans and it will be submitted for peer review shortly. The peer reviews are a completely independent process performed by an outside group. DOE wants to evaluate each different model in order to do a composite overview of the site. The Central Plateau, for instance, needs a very detailed plan and then that plan will feed the SAC.
- A committee member asked if the wells are adequately dispersed. John stated that they are very concentrated on the Central Plateau because the project really wants to go after the ones that could be major contributors.
- Several committee members were concerned with the number of wells that are to be drilled over the next few years; they do not feel the number is matching the milestone, which stated 50 wells a year would be drilled because of the groundwater changes. Jane Hedges, Ecology, clarified that the TPA milestone said “up to” 50 wells a year will be drilled. Last year the agencies all agreed it was wise to have the prioritized wells together and to set aside that year’s plan for this year. John Morse added that there is a three-year rolling schedule for the wells, a total of 59, based on a calendar year. Currently, 17 wells are earmarked for the burial grounds where the others have gone dry. Also, they are looking at trying to deepen some of the wells that have gone dry. The plan is to have an integrated network by the end of 2005, though there may be a bit still to do in 2006.
- Several committee members stressed that these wells are important for groundwater monitoring and there appears to be zero funding for this. Additionally, the number of wells John mentioned is a lot less than the 30 per year the Board was targeting. John answered that there is plenty of money for this and that the wells are a priority. They are trying to maximize what they have and are continuing to monitor the situation. If there is a good technical basis for more wells, they will add more.
- DOE is currently in the permit process for additional wells at the burial grounds. They have submitted for 17 wells that would be completed by the end of calendar year 2005. This application is currently under review. Gerry responded that for years the Board has been saying groundwater well capacity around the burial grounds needs to be increased. He feels this is a budget constraint decision and that is why it keeps showing up as a negotiation, not as a failure. He feels the state needs to take responsibility for this and show this as a compliance gap.

- A committee member asked if and where the public could see the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Part B permit application. Jane Hedges responded that she will obtain the information. In the 200 West Central Plateau area the permitting process is going ahead and is in the Data Quality Objectives (DQO) process.
- Gerry reminded DOE that, because of public concern, the TPA was updated to say that whatever was needed would be done. Heart of America Northwest is looking at filing a notice of intent over failure to properly monitor the burial ground groundwater. John said DOE believes their approach in the Burial Grounds is appropriate.
- A committee member asked why there isn't a closure plan and why DOE is not submitting for a closure permit. The committee wanted to clarify how this can be an operational permit when the wells are supposed to be closed. Jane Hedges, Ecology, answered that a closure plan would be part of the permit.

Regulator Perspective

Jane Hedges said that Ecology wants to get DOE under a permit. There are differences over the number of wells the two groups want, but those will be worked out. In terms of continuing activity (which is what the well drilling is), it is much easier to do the work under a permit that clearly lays out what DOE is going to do rather than go into court every time something is changed.

DOE-HQ Draft End States Policy

Beth Bilson, DOE-RL, introduced John Sands, DOE-RL, who is a Hanford member of the complex-wide team. He represents all the sites that are similar to Hanford: large sites that will take a long time to close.

Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management, developed this concept during the Top-to-Bottom review of DOE Environmental Management. The idea behind this is to have a complex-wide program for clean up. Clean-up strategies will be developed based on risk-based end states, rather than the current method that is based on thousands of different requirements and strategies. The project begins with the end in mind and reassesses how cleanup is prioritized. A draft of this plan has been developed and sent to local regulators, tribes, etc. It is being reviewed and comments are being given. Each site is also doing a site-specific review of how the plan would apply in their situation. The goal is by September, each site will have an end state vision that has been agreed upon with the regulators and stakeholder communities.

This proposal has received a lot of attention; Keith Klein went over it word for word personally and edited it. Hanford has been doing much of the work that is part of this policy already. One of the concerns is that stakeholder groups will be suspicious of the policy, however, the policy does not change any of the regulatory processes.

The Cleanup Constraints and Challenges team (C3T) has been asked about this initiative. Three teams have been asked to report on what they have done over the year to see if they should continue in the current charter, have they completed their jobs, and are they qualified to continue. DOE-RL thinks they may be within striking distance of a vision for the Central Plateau; however, they are not committing to having a vision by September. This plan is what the DOE-HQ is proposing.

Regulator Perspective

Max Power, Ecology, stated there is some language that is causing concern. Many of the things Hanford has been doing for some time are included, yet some areas such as compliance agreements and things like CERCLA, which is already a risk-based process, appear to have been squashed. The major point from the state is that trying to have a department-wide policy is very difficult and complicated. Ecology thinks there is a lot of good work being done at Hanford that should not be jeopardized. The problem DOE-HQ is trying to solve is unclear. There are a myriad of different situations and issues to be dealt with. Ecology feels this policy implies that once the decision is made, that is it, without any thought to interim milestones and actions. Ecology has concerns as well over the future stewardship of the site under this plan. Max said it seems that DOE-HQ wants the end state to be a land use where they would no longer have to deal with the site, not complete the action. Both CERCLA and state law have a bias to making sure the land can be maintained and that the institutions are in place to keep it going in the long run. Anything else is not acceptable. There could end up being a lot of cases where DOE will assume a limited land use and not accept the responsibility. In closing, Max said he hopes DOE continues to have discussions with the regulators on this.

Larry Gadbois said EPA feels this is highway rhetoric; DOE has not provided input and has dismissed the effect public input has had already. There have been planning groups, as well as a lot of regulator and stakeholder forums which the document implies has never been done. They feel this is insulting. The CERCLA process is a legal process that has been working and it is a risk-based assessment. Things are not as bad as this document implies. EPA feels there is a good vision already and they would hate to see this document require a fresh start without taking into account the work already done.

Committee Discussion

- Pam asked about the final Records of Decision (RODs) and how those will be used to support this process. She does not feel the RODs have been asked to anticipate the end product to date. Beth responded that DOE-RL thinks the policy is premature and there may be time to get a waiver if they want to achieve clean up in a different way.
- Several committee members were confused about the policy. They wanted to clarify if this is the policy that will tell DOE how to define their end-states. John Sands and

Beth responded that the site should have an end-state and that it should be based on this policy.

- A committee member commented that new staff at DOE should be made aware of procedures that were tried in the past and failed. That way they won't keep trying the same things over and over. It was noted that this new document said the policy will not affect CERCLA, or the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), etc. However, elsewhere in the document it states that it may cause changes in federal requirements with input of the public. Beth answered the applicability of CERCLA, RCRA, and NEPA was DOE-RL's comment of concern as well.
- Several committee members were concerned about the C3T process. They feel this will remove the public from the process. The public needs to be made aware of how the C3T process is going to be involved in this and where DOE's Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) involvement is, since they would be heavily impacted. Committee members said there needs to be a discussion over a period of time with groups in addition to those represented on the Board.
- Pam added that C3T is not a good path to take. DOE will seek endorsement of what C3T does by the public but not through the public's involvement. When she spoke to Jessie Roberson, Pam conveyed that the public could do this type of work, similar to what was done with the 200 Area workshop.
- A committee member questioned if DOE-RL and DOE-ORP had any input in this process. John Sands responded that he was allowed to bring his knowledge to the planning meeting but could not discuss the draft policy with people back in the office until after it was compiled. Beth added that working in this large forum and crafting a policy that makes sense for Hanford yet makes sense nationally is difficult. She wanted to clarify that this is not a representation of John's work. There are problems with the product but perhaps they can be fixed.
- A committee member commented the policy can be read to mean either DOE will comply with the law or that they will not comply. The risk level can be set anywhere and so long as that is not exceeded, it doesn't need to be cleaned up. The whole site then becomes the buffer. Max agreed. He feels that the regulators can go into the end-state discussion and say no to things they find unacceptable, however those objections may not be heeded. He added that he feels DOE is trying to force this upon everyone by giving such a short timeline for completion.
- A committee member noted that the handout says there should be a draft ready by June 1, 2003. Beth replied that right now it doesn't look like they will be able to meet that deadline. Her hope is to have a pathway to developing the vision clarified by the deadline.
- The committee wanted to clarify that the term "sites" refers to both ORP and RL. Beth answered that, since they are pretty closely intertwined, there will be one final product from Hanford.

- Committee members wanted DOE to know that they strongly believe they need to be involved in this process. Larry Gadbois said EPA and Ecology support this. Beth will notify headquarters that the public wants to be involved.
- Dan Simpson commented that it seems the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) is the vision and it shouldn't be changed on the basis of this new policy. Greg DeBruler said just because DOE and the local community went through the CLUP process does not mean it is a legal document that will never be challenged.
- John Stanfill stressed that for the Nez Perce Tribe, there has never been a question about what the end-state will be: they have always said that the site should be left with no contaminants. This is the vision. The last twelve years have produced much progress from such a large unknown as Hanford and that progress has been very focused on reducing risk. The Tribe would like to see the accelerated cleanup conducted through the TPA, unless changes are agreed upon by all parties and preserve the treaty rights of the Tribe, and would like to see this new plan abandoned.
- Beth clarified that what she heard from the committee is the process needs to be transparent and open to more than just the Board. John Sands is coordinating a response to the document and Keith Klein is writing it. Beth has a proposal to take the work from the C3T vision effort and discuss it with the committee and other involved parties. In the next week or so they should understand where they are going.

100 B/C Area Risk Assessment Pilot

Chris Smith, DOE-RL, gave a brief update on the project's status, noting that this topic will be discussed in depth at the March committee meeting. The Bechtel staff will come in at that time and give a presentation of the DQO report, which will be distributed next week.

Chris updated the committee on the status of the peer review, which is being done by the Institute for Regulatory Science. They are continuing to have discussions with the group and the panel will be at the site in April to view the site and write their report. Currently, DOE is compiling a list of stakeholders who will be sent invitations by the Institute to attend a question and answer session. Chris asked that committee members interested in attending let him know so they can plan enough time for questions based on the number of people attending. Questions will be welcome on direction and lines of inquiry and disciplines.

Regulator Perspectives

John Price said Ecology is very happy with the draft DQO report and that in it, 57 specific issues are addressed. They are very happy with the peer review process being added. However, there has been a problem with the Trustee Council being adequately

involved in the process. In regards to the sampling plan, Ecology and EPA are not going to approve the plan at this time, but are going to wait for comments to be received because they feel there should be more stakeholder participation. They are encouraging DOE to continue to go out and sample even though in the end these may not be the right samples. They recognize DOE will have to go out next spring under the SAC and get more samples but it will be beneficial to start some work now. Chris Smith will try and get a rough outline out to the committee before the meeting so that people can comment and make sure that it is sufficient. Chris stated the session will have a good balance between the sampling designs and providing a bit of DQO primer on how they go through the process so there is consistency. They will also discuss how the sampling plan will be built.

Committee Questions and Discussion

- A committee member asked if the DQO report will be sent out before the meeting. Chris will try to get it out as soon as possible. The sampling plan has to go through legal review before it can be released, however a large portion of it will be in the DQO report. Greg suggested that the Exposure Scenarios Task Force be put on the invitation list.

Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW- EIS) Discussion

The committee noted that with previous EISes, they have commented on what was or was not in the EIS; they have not given an opinion on whether the conclusions drawn are valid.

- Gerry commented that you have to look at whether the EIS covers what it should and if that coverage is adequate. If it is adequate, then are there adverse impacts that should make them say no to waste storage? The committee should be looking at the EIS not only in relation to NEPA but also to the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA). There is a huge difference between the two and he does not feel that this EIS will meet SEPA requirements. He doesn't understand how a permit can be issued for a new facility which doesn't meet these requirements.
- Maynard wanted to clarify that they were looking at an assessment of the affects of the materials that may be coming here. He asked if they should be addressing questions like if the risk has been properly considered and what are the cumulative affects. The base information has been so lacking, he feels that it is hard to take it to this next level.
- Dirk commented they need to look at what is comprehensive, what makes environmental sense, and what is legal. He stated that mixed waste coming to Hanford ignores the state regulatory permitting regulations. He wants to cover the RCRA issues because those can only be used to issue the permit for onsite waste. He

feels that the issue is the cumulative risk of what is there now with all the material being added. He noted that he sees major discrepancies between all the EIS documents and that they don't appear to have been validated nor does it look like they can be when the site modeling is looked at.

The committee discussed the possibility of having two tutorials on how a Record of Decision is achieved.

Committee Business

- The committee went through the work plan and updated each issue and the related teams. Several new issue managers were chosen. The committee feels they need to line up their work in relation to the work DOE is doing and what the Board needs to do.
- The committee agreed that they would like a clarification of the EIS process and, specifically, who is in charge of the ROD. Ecology is planning to hold a meeting regarding the EIS; the committee would like to be involved in the state's meeting so the Board doesn't have to hold a meeting of its own.
- Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, relayed a request from Todd for volunteers to look back at advice the Board has given on waste disposition and see if anything has not been captured in recent Board discussions. Anyone is interested in volunteering for this project can contact Penny or Todd.

Committee Path Forward

- There will be no committee call next week
- The next meeting is March 12.

Handouts

- River and Plateau Committee Meeting Agenda, February 12, 2003
- River and Plateau Committee Work Planning Table, August 15, 2002
- Hanford Advisory Board Draft Advice, Gariann Gelston, February 12, 2003
- Technologies for Addressing Deep Contamination at 116-N-1, DOE-RL, February 12, 2003
- Hanford Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Project, Steve Veitenheimer, February 12, 2003
- Letter from the Yakama Nation, Yakama Nation, January 30, 2003
- Letter from the Nez Pearce Tribe, Patrick Sobotta, January 27, 2003
- Comments on two DOE draft End States Documents, Washington State Department Of Ecology, February 12, 2003
- Plutonium Finishing Plant – Progress Update, DOE-RL, February 12, 2003
- A cleanup Program Driven by Risk-Base End States Project, John Sands, February 12, 2003

- Interview Issues Matrix, DOE-RL, February 12, 2003

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Marty Bensky	Pam Brown	Shelly Cimon
Greg DeBruler	Dirk Dunning	Gariann Gelston
Harold Heacock	Dave Johnson	Susan Leckband
Sandra Lilligren	Jeff Luke	Maynard Plahuta
Gerald Pollet	Dan Simpson	John Stanfill
Dave Watrous	Charles Weems	

Others

Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Jack Donnelly, BHI
Stacy Charboneau, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Tony Knepp, CH2M Hill
Larry Early, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Liana Herron, EnviroIssues
Mark Freud, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Marla Marvin, DOE-RL	Mike Priddy, DOH	Jane Borghese, Fluor Hanford
John Morse, DOE-RL		Norm Boyten, Fluor Hanford
Nancy Myers, DOE-RL		Bruce Ford, Fluor Hanford
John Sands, DOE-RL		G.B. Griffen, Fluor Hanford
Yvonne Sherman, DOE-RL		George Jackson, Fluor Hanford
Chris Smith, DOE-RL		Rob Piippo, Fluor Hanford
K. Michael Thompson, DOE-RL		Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
Steve Veitenheimer, DOE-RL		Paul Henwood, Stoller Corp.
Kent Westover, DOE-RL		John Ercchter, PNNL
Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL		Jim Page, PNNL
Robert Yasek, DOE-ORP		Erika Harder, Southridge H.S.