

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)

DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE

March 12, 2003

Richland, Washington

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introductions, and Committee Business 1

Data Quality Objectives (DQO) Tutorial..... 1

100 B/C Area Risk Assessment Pilot – DQO Workshop 3

100 Area Cleanup Alternative Technologies 5

Groundwater Protection Project (GPP)..... 7

Groundwater Strategy Advice Discussion 7

Planning for April Board Meeting Systems Assessment Capability Tutorial 9

Washington State Department of Ecology Lawsuit..... 10

DOE-HQ Draft End States Policy..... 10

Committee Business..... 13

Handouts 13

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, Introductions, and Committee Business

Susan Leckband, committee vice-chair, opened the meeting and welcomed the committee. She briefly went over the agenda and the goals for the meeting. The February meeting summary was adopted.

Greg deBruler stated he had two concerns regarding the agenda. The first was the B/C Area Data Quality Objective items. He asserted since the document was just received on Thursday, there was not ample time to review it fully enough to have a detailed discussion. Secondly, he was unsure of how much prep work had been done on the B/C area issues and was concerned there would not be a full flavored discussion.

Data Quality Objectives (DQO) Tutorial

Greg gave a brief tutorial about Data Quality Objectives (DQO) program in order to help prepare the committee for the upcoming discussion. He stated the goal of this process is to have good quality data that was collected in a high quality manner. There are seven steps that make up a DQO process. These are:

- 1.State the problem.
2. Identify the decision

3. Identify the inputs to the study
4. Define the boundaries of the study
5. Develop a decision rule
6. Specify the limits of uncertainty
7. Optimize the sampling design

Within each of these steps, numerous questions can be found to answer. The issue can become in the end, how to balance the responses to meet the goal. An experienced DQO leader will recognize this issue early on in a group. This process allows for a great degree of variability.

Committee Discussion

- A committee member stated he would expect a DQO to have a narrow scope. The DQO should focus on what is needed to make the decision correct or to remedy the problem. He commented this process seems to go beyond that considerably. Greg responded that this is what needs to be done legally from an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standpoint. These are the seven steps that are gone through.
- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), commented the DQO process at Hanford appears very rigid. Actually, the process is just a defined way of thinking about what will be done before doing it and then documenting that thinking. DQO's are done for many different reasons, and are really to help with the protection of human and ecological health. This process creates a record for the decision process in places that previously had no documentation.
- Michael Thompson, Department of Energy – Richland Operations (DOE-RL), commented the purpose of the DQO is to look at what decisions need to be made and to hopefully have input from the stakeholders in doing this. The decision makers then need to determine what data and quality of data are needed to support the decisions.
- Greg commented that this seems to be putting the cart before the horse. If the DQO process has not been done up front to find out what the objectives are and what is trying to be protected then the process is flawed from the start. Dirk Dunning responded this is just one way to approach a problem. This was targeted to the situations where all of the decisions have been gone through and now it is down to the small pieces and you need to get the pieces you need, not the ones you don't. You want to find out what data you need.
- Dirk added that he feels this is just a process and not a specific outcome. When the DQO starts being used to make the actual decision, a lot of thinking gets lost and things get put behind closed doors. Those items that are not considered can cause a big hole in the final plan.
- Dib Goswami, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), stated he has not seen a more well defined process. Ecology has used it on several occasions and it is working well.

100 B/C Area Risk Assessment Pilot – DQO Workshop

Dennis Faulk, EPA, gave a brief update on where they were in assessing the DQO process in terms of the 100 B/C Area Risk Assessment Pilot. The first site is finished, 116C-1, and a very good job was done however, other issues have not been addressed. The EPA would like a more holistic risk based assessment of the site. They have been concentrating on the sites that are already completed. Specifically, they are looking at the seeps and springs in those areas which were added to the scope with the near river environment, riparian zone, and the up river zone. Once the areas of the study are defined, it will move forward. There will be a very extensive scoping process for this project. The end points that are chosen to sample may not be the only samples taken. If there are other things that should be sampled, they will go out and sample everything needed to get a complete data set.

Chris Smith, Department of Energy – Richland Operations (DOE-RL), thanked the committee for letting DOE-RL come back to this month's meeting so they could give a better presentation than would have been given last month. He stated this will not be the only time DOE-RL will be meeting with the committee to discuss this process. There will be activities going on throughout the process such as the upcoming peer review panel on the 14th of April. He repeated the invitation from February to have committee and board members come and give comments to the panel.

Ken Cano, Bechtel Hanford Inc. (BHI), discussed the results of the DQO process and the sampling analysis approach that will be used. For the B/C area, they want to focus on areas that have been remediated and are in the early stages of recovery. Three areas will be sampled as part of this process: the upland zone, riparian zone, and the near shore zone. For these sites, several factors will be investigated including ecological and human health receptors, groundwater and resident species. During the DQO process, several global issues were identified, these included:

1. The need to develop Native American scenarios. DOE would like input from the Tribes so they can better understand what the impacts of the B/C area on native cultures may be.
2. The need to determine if groundwater conditions in the B/C area will support a human and ecological health assessment. Results from this will be provided to the groundwater project.

Ken briefly described some of the features of the sampling process. The first step is to determine the exact spots to sample because some of the areas are dry while others are bursting with useable data. For each area, they will be collecting samples of resident species to test for toxicity levels. In the case of plant collection, the associated soil will be collected as well. The soil will be archived and may be tested in the event the toxicity level in the plants is high. For each site being sampled, there is a corresponding reference site outside of the 100 B/C area. This will allow Bechtel to compare toxicity levels in the same species from different sites and will also help develop toxicity levels for some species that have no toxicity measurements.

Ken briefly described the work that will be done in each zone. The first zone to be started will be the upland areas where they will be focusing on the areas around the waste sites. Sampling will be done in the buffer zone that straddles the perimeter of the waste site to see if there is any residual contaminant, below regulatory levels, which the ants and vegetation may be encountering. Some data and information already exists in the form of soil samples and site data from before the area was backfilled. The data will be used along with the new samples of resident species. They will be focusing the most attention on those species that have the highest chance of taking in contaminants. The overall purpose of the upland area study is to investigate the chemical and radiological health of the site.

The Riparian Zone is a small area close to the water. A number of surveys will be conducted here including radiological surveys, an area wide survey of the surface soils and the potentially contaminated areas, and a systematic grid survey. The systematic grid will be used to determine the sampling locations for the zone. They will be looking at several resident species including the deer and house mouse, darkling beetles, and canary grasses. Additionally, a soil characterization will be done to see how the soil coincides with the plants.

In the Near Shore Zone, Bechtel will sample the groundwater, however; this can be difficult because the river has significant impacts on the water table in this area. Sediment and water samples will be taken in this area and river water conductivity measurements from along the seeps will be collected. There are three primary seeps, which have been historically sampled, and those will be sampled again. Additionally, some of the secondary seeps, seeps that occur intermittently, will be sampled. Outfalls in three locations, upstream, mid-stream, and downstream, will also be sampled. Samples of the resident species will be taken from this area. These species will include sculpin, crayfish, clams, mayflies, caddis flies, and milfoil, among others. A near shore radiological survey from a boat will be completed to determine what a recreational boater would be exposed to.

The information from these studies will be used to establish the pilot risk assessment and will supplement the groundwater project integration. Ken noted that long-term monitoring would be required to verify health and ecological protections.

Committee Discussion

- Dirk Dunning stated that with the sampling occurring in advance of the sampling plan, peer review, and the Natural Resources Trustee Council or the Hanford Advisory Board (Board) having input on the peer review, an unequal balance of information is being created.
- Shelley Cimon asked what is being done with the areas of contamination in this zone that are not addressed in the document. Dennis Faulk answered that those will be

looked at in the future. This is just a pilot to get the mechanics of the process down. This is simply getting ready to do the final risk assessment.

- John Morse, DOE-RL, stated at Hanford they typically clean up what are obvious issues. Once they are past that stage they need to determine if they have enough information to finish the cleanup. This assessment provides a place to determine what information there is now and if more investigation is needed to finish the project. This is past the point of what is blatantly obvious; the question is really is more investigation and data collection necessary.
- A committee member asked what factors determine the sampling season. Ken stated that they sample in the spring because things start to emerge and can become unavailable by June. This is the same with mice and insects as when it is hot and dry, they are not around. The near shore and riparian zones will be sampled in the fall during the low water season.
- Dirk commented what is observed now determines if more work needs to be done in the future. This is not actually the risk assessment that will have to include other analysis. Beth Bilson, DOE-RL, stated the purpose of this effort is to understand more clearly what should be done next, not to presume it is the right method for all areas. The lessons learned will be applied to other areas but the process may differ.
- Greg asked what the timeline is to complete this. Dennis answered unofficially 2006 but officially 2012. It will depend on whether or not the whole river corridor will be done.
- Greg commented DOE stated this will not be used as a template, but it seems like this should be taken and moved down throughout the reactor sites to look at all of the impacts. Beth replied one of the issues is different things happened in each reactor so one set of samples cannot be presumed. The model will be looked at and then the lessons learned and the good outcomes will be applied to the larger picture. This cannot be committed to now as they do not know what the exact situations will be
- Todd Martin commented this process appears to be beneficial because it is not only looking at the data already collected, it is having the right data to look at and making sure it was collected in the right way.
- Greg stated Hanford should be clean enough for future populations to use for any activity.

100 Area Cleanup Alternative Technologies

Committee members Dirk Dunning and Wade Rigsbee presented possible alternative technologies for use in remediating the 100-N sites. The problems found at these sites include contaminated groundwater, contaminated soils in the river flushing zone, deep earth contamination and trenches 1301-N and 1325-N, which are major sources of contamination. There are several alternative technology methods, which could be used in remediation of the 100-N sites. These include:

- o Excavation Alternatives – these include temporary shoring, soil stabilization, and the use of grouts.
- o Soil Washing Alternatives – options include the use of salts such as potassium chloride and sodium chloride, the use of organic fluids and soaps, and in-situ or ex-situ soil washing methods.
- o Containment Alternatives – these are options such as caps, covers, slurry walls, and reactive walls.
- o Other Alternatives – these include - fixatives, reactive walls, and dewatering.

The presentation offered many possible actions to be taken at the site. It was suggested that a characterization of the site should be completed. To do this, conceptual models and site-specific scenarios need to be developed. Complete comprehensive feasibility and treatability studies should be completed to use in developing future use scenarios. Dirk and Wade concluded that future uses will define institutional controls but conversely, institutional controls will define future uses. It was also noted that offsite actions could possibly impact residual contamination. Additionally, there are many treaty rights issues that will need to be addressed. They would like to see more public engagement in the process. They commented there seems to be a rush by DOE to close the site without fully looking at the future cultural and ecological uses of the site.

Committee Discussion

- Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, commented the near-term question is how deep should they dig and what needs to be done in the N area as a whole. Many different interim actions have been explored. The first priority is for the near-term or the interim solutions, not for the final state of the site. To accomplish the interim solutions, surface protection is the most important. Digging any deeper would not make a difference. Even if all of the soil was excavated, the water would still not be clean, to do that, everything which had been touched by the discharge water would have to be removed. They could try to flush it out but they may be unable to capture it.
- Greg deBruler commented there is a possibility if soil is placed over the trenches, the groundwater will eventually move through the soil into the aquifer. There is no guarantee of who will be inhabiting the valley at that time and it could have a large effect. Beth stated the point they are trying to make is should the excavation continue. The only way to truly clean everything up is to dig out the river. Digging accomplishes the primary objective but it may not be the best option to use continuing forward.
- Dennis Faulk noted that until the end goal for the site has been defined, this will be a frustrating discussion. The end goal of the site is a major policy issue that needs public input.
- John Price, Ecology, stated it has to be determined what will be credible institutional controls for the site in the future. Additionally, current actions do not preclude future actions. It would be possible after filling in the trench to pull the soil back out, as removing clean soil is not as expensive as removing the dirty. There will need to be a feasibility study to get the site to a final decision.

- Dib Goswami, Ecology, commented he strongly believes alternative technologies need to be looked at. There has been a lack of site-specific treatability studies and these need to be done to get a grasp on what is applicable in terms of technology.
- Wade stated there are many contaminants that are of concern on the site. The biggest issue he found though was how complex the geologic environment of the site is. Because of this, there will need to be a combination of technologies to effectively clean the site.

Groundwater Protection Project (GPP)

Dick Wilde, Fluor Hanford Inc. (Fluor), discussed the progress on the Groundwater Protection Project (GPP). Dick discussed water line repairs that are ongoing and described a leak newly discovered. . The pipe is leaking a large amount of water everyday, which is to be expected with a 50 or 60-year-old pipeline.

Dick said that a challenge in the last major repair, by U Plant, was that while trying to repair the leaky line, a valve blew, releasing 300,000 gallons of water to the ground. While sampling is ongoing, it will probably be few years before it is known if the water blast has any affect on the groundwater.

Wells are starting to be replaced. Two were finished last week. Samples were taken when the new wells were put in and those samples should be back in April. Dick reported drilling is occurring in some sensitive areas of known contaminations and care is being taken not to pull up material that would blow around. A portable enclosure is used, which ensures the waste material will not be blown around the rest of the site. There is some concern that with the river level down, some of the wells close to the edge may go too far down for sampling or may even go dry. The GPP will be holding a workshop on N springs to get the issues on the table in a relaxed environment. There will be no decisions on the final remediation approach, however. The goal is to look for what the concerns are. Anyone who has an interest may come. This workshop will be in April or May.

Dennis Faulk stated the groundwater strategy will be sent out for public comment beginning March 24, 2003. There will be a 30-40 day comment period for this. The regulators and DOE are still working on the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) M-24 Milestone, which is the well drilling milestone for the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) wells, and they hope to have a change package released soon for comment. The regulators hope M-24 becomes the standard for all of the wells on site.

Groundwater Strategy Advice Discussion

Gariann Gelston gave an overview of the draft advice on the groundwater strategy and groundwater implementation plan. The points in the advice were drawn from the December Board meeting on the topic. The regulators have asked the Board to give advice on this.

Greg stated he has 11 pages of comments on the groundwater strategy. He has not shared them with the committee, and does not plan to until the revised strategy is released. Greg said the strategy is a high level piece that does not look at what the public wants or needs. Greg is holding meetings in Hood River and Portland on this document. He is trying to craft what the public would want. At the meetings, they will couch the issues and have a discussion based around that. He wants to have a constructive dialogue so there can be clarity on what people want to see in the strategy. If there is a strategy, which reflects the group's values, there can then be a discussion. Greg commented there has not been any detailed discussion in the committee about how the document is framed. He does not want to rush to advice without a full discussion on the strategy.

Several committee members commented there were two full meetings on the strategy leading up to the Board meeting in December. Additionally, time was allotted at the last two committee meetings to work on the advice. There was a very full discussion in December on issues the committee members would like to address. The issues from this discussion would be a good basis to start from.

Dennis Faulk commented EPA would like to see the Board step forward and define what the beneficial use of the site should be. It keeps being stated the end use will be drinking water but actions to date do not support that. The EPA is frustrated that there is not a groundwater exit strategy. It is difficult to make progress if the end goal is unknown.

Greg asserted the point of compliance should be directly under the waste site and that the highest beneficial use should be drinking water so then the strategy would have to change fundamentally. He stated the document moves in the opposite direction of the regulation.

Susan commented they should keep it short by saying protect the Columbia River and get on with the cleanup. One clear statement from the committee to the board should be sufficient. When the draft does come out this statement can be tied into new advice.

Dennis cautioned against setting the bar too high. He expressed concern that if it does not seem realistic and doable then those doing the work may get frustrated and choose not to attempt to achieve the goal.

Dan Simpson stated the committee should be careful not to over simplify the issue. It does not matter what the standards are, it matters how much of the water people are drinking and using.

Todd noted that in eight years the board has never actually said the water should be safe. Previous Board advice on groundwater has not made a policy recommendation on how clean groundwater should be.

Dennis stated it would be very helpful if the Board would advise maintaining the new emphasis on groundwater. Priority decisions need to be made and they need the DOE senior management to pay attention.

Harold commented there are widely differing views on what is trying to be accomplished. People need to understand what the risks are and what is being done to clean those up to an acceptable standard. A lot of decisions are being made programmatically and there needs to be some factual risk based analysis.

Dirk commented the advice should say groundwater is of a high value and needs to be cleaned up and deemed okay for human health. He said he believes risk-based assessment can drive people to cause harm or make the problem worse. Good decisions need to be made today so that future generations are not encumbered by what is done today. Boundaries, which allow the site to be left dirty at any level, should be removed.

Greg, Susan, Gariann, and Dirk will work on crafting the advice and will try to have it complete by next week for the Executive Issues Call. There will be time on the April Board meeting agenda for this topic.

Planning for April Board Meeting Systems Assessment Capability Tutorial

Gariann noted the Board has been consistent in saying they would like a comprehensive assessment done of the site. DOE has responded that the Systems Assessment Capability (SAC) is a tool to determine how waste sites may impact the whole system. The Board would like to understand how this fits as a comprehensive tool. The expectation is this tool will be used on many projects and the Board should be comfortable with tool and how it is used. While this tutorial is similar to the one at the October board meeting, it will be at a much higher level. The information in this tutorial will be covered in a user-friendly format because it will be the basis for the general public's understanding. This will help the Board understand how the SAC is used in the Hanford Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS). DOE will give this presentation at the Board meeting.

Dan Simpson asked if the SAC will replace the Residual Radiation Model (RAD). John Morse responded RAD is used in different situations and is dependent upon the type of analysis. The SAC uses data from many different sources to look at the groundwater impacts. Greg wanted to clarify that Keith Klein had said the SAC would be used as a key model in the HSW-EIS. John commented that DOE does not rely only on one or two analyses. For example, to look at individual waste sites in detail, the groundwater model is used.

Susan noted it would be helpful to hear what other modeling tools can do and how they work. She suggested a handout with brief descriptions of each would be helpful, as it is likely DOE is using many different programs and techniques.

It was noted the two major discussion points for the tutorial should be 1. What the System Assessment Capability is and is not; and how it is being used in the HSW-EIS.

Dennis stated the EPA originally was not supportive of the SAC but a lot of progress has been made to refine the tool. One of the best things DOE has done is to recognize there are limitations of its use.

Washington State Department of Ecology Lawsuit

Max Power, Ecology, discussed the lawsuit filed by the Attorney General of Washington to stop the shipments of Transuranic Waste (TRU) to the state. The lawsuit asserts there was not adequate National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) support in DOE's Record of Decision to send waste to Hanford and there was not site-specific data to support the activity. Additionally, it asserts DOE is in violation of the State's hazardous waste laws and therefore, the waste is being added to an already non-compliant situation. Lastly, the lawsuit asserts that in acting without NEPA coverage, DOE is acting in a capricious manner. The State is asking for an injunction to prevent any other TRU from being shipped to the site. Pending satisfaction of the NEPA claim, the judge has barred any additional waste from being shipped until there has been a hearing on the matter. This hearing will be held on the 12th of April in Yakima and a decision regarding the injunction will be issued at that time.

In working with the Hanford site, Ecology is trying to tread a line regarding state authority. A number of milestones were negotiated based upon retrieving, categorizing and then certifying the waste so it could be sent to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project (WIPP). The negotiations were predicated away from the existing M-91 building facilities and did not succeed. Tom Fitzsimmons, Director of the Washington State Department of Ecology, issued a final directive on the M-91 dispute stating DOE needs to provide a TRU waste management plan which develops facilities to categorize and ship the waste out; and M-91 facilities must be in place by 2012. DOE has the option to appeal this determination.

A committee member commented Jessie Roberson, DOE Assistant Secretary of Environmental Management, was asked how DOE would respond to the lawsuit. Jessie stated DOE would continue to proceed with activities as they currently are. Max said Tom wants there to be an enforceable milestone to complete this removal.

DOE-HQ Draft End States Policy

Dan Simpson, issue manager, reported on issue manager work on the Risk-Based End States policy. He gave an overview of the policy and its development. After the E.M. Top to Bottom review, Jessie Roberson issued a draft directive requiring each site to develop final risk-based end states vision documents by September '03. This issue was discussed at the February committee meeting and the committee is working to determine if the board should provide advice to the agencies on this issue. Today's review is intended to give the committee an opportunity to see what DOE is attempting to accomplish and to determine what should be brought to the Board.

The issue team reviewed how the issue was being handled and found that the Cleanup, Constraints, and Challenges Team (C3T) had been assigned the task of developing a vision for Hanford. The issue team requested and were then invited to attend last week's C3T meeting to gather background information as well as to develop ideas on where to

go with this information. The committee members did not present themselves as representing the Board.

Dan said the C3T team is in the process of developing a project team to have responsibility for developing the vision statement. The project work plan schedule is developed but not currently available. The C3T team intends to hold a series of workshops on developing the Hanford vision but does not yet have a schedule for this. A self-assessment of Hanford has been completed and sent to headquarters, it is not available as of this date for public review. The hope is Hanford will be providing some leadership to the system as a whole. It is yet to be determined what type of relationship there will be with other activities, national groups and what specific groups will be involved. The Board needs to determine if they are going to follow the C3T process, try to lead the process, or leave the process and develop something on their own. In closing, the site's general view is that the programs at Hanford currently meet the new guidelines so all programs should be maintained and continued.

Dan presented a list of some of the issues the Board may run into, these include:

- o Being able to see the self-assessment of Hanford. Receiving the scope and plan document for the production of a vision.
- o What does the term risk based end-states really mean? The issue is how to describe the vision if there is uncertainty to what the end-states are.
- o What is the risk based part and what is the end-state. The vision document should represent a conceptual design for when remediation is virtually complete including long-term stewardship and institutional control options.

Committee Discussion

- Susan stated the C3T meeting provided a long list of identified risks all of which, with the exception of one, are programmatic risks. John Morse stated there are many items that are not on that list which should be and they are working to develop those.
- Dirk commented the risk-based end-states rely on using the interim records of decision for final actions. This is not how the process should be, but it is headed that way. There are concerns over the DOE exit strategy and that the Vitrification Plant may not work. He said they would like to see a clearly defined path for how the site will be turned over. There is ongoing discussion about how to handle the burial grounds and there are concerns about barriers and waste moving laterally rather than downward through the vadose zone.
- Beth Bilson stated one of the requirements was Hanford must look at how the project could fail. That is why the risks in this table are not the same as in risk-based end-states. Rather, these are the risks of not succeeding. In this context, DOE is looking at what will hurt the program. At the Hanford C3T meeting they spoke about the programmatic risk program.

The C3T meetings are routinely held and public involvement will be impacted based on the status of the lawsuits. Beth Bilson noted the C3T process was developed to bring people together to talk who were battling in court. The intent was not to cut people out but to bring people together who were warring and abrogating their responsibility to work together to find solutions. Beth requested risk-based end-states be placed on the C3T agenda because DOE-RL is working on a tight deadline. There has been little action on the risk-based end-states development since the February committee meeting. The premise she gave to the C3T team was roll some of their work up to the vision decision. In the 200 Area, those decisions have not been made and they are taking a conservative and traditional approach based on Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The vision needs to be developed not just because Jessie mandated it should but it really is the next step. Now it is time to have a conversation on this matter.

Beth stated there are two things the committee should be doing: 1. Keep an eye on what is going on and ask questions; 2. Form and solidify an opinion on the type of public process they would like to see and inform the team of this so the agencies have a group of Board people who are well informed. This would help the group come to a more acceptable vision conclusion earlier.

- Greg deBruler commented this could be valuable and is a good opportunity to begin having end-state discussions. It does not seem this should be a C3T vision however but a Northwest public vision. This process should be a broader forum similar to the exposure scenario task force and should represent what the public wants.
- Dennis Faulk commented this is not actually DOE's decision. They are to be a proponent of the public process and currently, it has the flavor of reducing cleanup standards. It may turn out differently though and should be looked at as an opportunity.
- Todd asked how much this policy will change the way the Hanford cleanup is managed. Beth estimated it will change about 10%. She stated the site believes they are already in compliance with the intent of the policy.
- Several committee members noted the item which continues to nag is the TPA and the current path forward are not in agreement with one another because the path forward assumes some things which were not in the TPA. They would like to see analysis that demonstrates this new policy is the right thing to do.
- Dan noted it is possible this plan could have positive impacts. These discussions can be interpreted broadly depending on how the original guidance is interpreted.
- Susan commented the Board should pay attention to what the new policy implies. She is concerned about not giving this policy appropriate attention and stated the Board should not ignore any trial programs.

- Several committee members asked what the best way to stay engaged in the C3T process is without speaking for the HAB in an inappropriate way. Involvement with C3T does not constitute HAB endorsement of the process.

Committee Business

Shelley announced that the Natural Resources Trustee Council is interested in coming before the Board to give a presentation on who they are and what they do. The Board would need to send a letter of invitation to the Council. The committee will recommend such action be taken at the April Board Meeting.

The April committee meeting will focus on groundwater strategy, M-24 well drilling, a pump and treat update and a presentation by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB).

Greg, Susan, Gariann, and Dirk will work on crafting advice for the March 18 committee call.

Handouts

- Technical Alternatives for Remediating the 100-N Sites, Dirk Dunning, March 12, 2003
- 100 B/C Pilot Study Data Quality Objectives/Sampling and Analysis Plan Approach, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., March 12, 2003
- 100-N Groundwater Workshop Proposed Agenda, DOE-RL, March 12, 2003
- Groundwater Strategy and Groundwater Protection Program Plan Draft Advice, Gariann Gelston, March 12, 2003
- River and Plateau Committee Meeting Agenda, March 12, 2003

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Martin Bensky	Dirk Dunning	Sandra Lilligren
Pam Brown	Gariann Gelston	Todd Martin
Shelley Cimon	Harold Heacock	Dan Simpson
Jim Curdy	Dave Johnson	Leon Swenson
Greg deBruler	Susan Leckband	Dave Watrous

Others

Beth Bilson, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Pam Doctor, Bechtel Hanford
Dave Evans, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Jack Donnelly, Bechtel Hanford
John Morse, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Ken Gano, Bechtel Hanford
Chris Smith, DOE-RL	Jim Vanni, Ecology	Nancy Meyers, Bechtel Hanford
K. Michael Thompson, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Jennifer Linnlle, CH2Mhill

Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL	Mike Goldstein, EPA	Liana Herron, EnviroIssues
	Dick Jaquish, WDOH	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
	Mike Priddy, WDOH	Roy Bauer, Fluor Hanford
		Dick Wilde, Fluor Hanford
		Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
		Kim Ballinger, Navarro Inc.
		Marcel Bergeron, PNNL
		Ted Poston, PNNL
		John Stang, Tri-Cities Herald