

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)

DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE

February 13, 2002

Richland, Washington

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Introduction..... 1

200 Area Change Package 1

Institutional Controls Plan 8

Solid/Hazardous Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS) 9

Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) and M-91 Milestone Negotiations 11

Committee Business..... 12

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.

Introduction

Pam Brown, River and Plateau (RAP) Committee Chair, opened the meeting and noted that there was not yet a meeting summary to adopt from the joint Budgets and Contracts committee meeting on January 28.

200 Area Change Package

Pete Knollmeyer, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), gave an update on the Central Plateau Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) negotiations. He noted that the scope of the negotiations was a four milestone series – M-13, M-15, M-16 and M-20. Under M-13, DOE submitted work plans stating how it would investigate operable units. M-15 laid out the schedule for completing fieldwork, which leads to the Record of Decision (ROD) and M-16 (completion of remedial actions). Then, it submits Part B Permit Applications or Closure/Post Closure Plans for all Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (TSD) units.

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), had a correction on M-15. He stated that after the Feasibility Study (FS), there would also be a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) proposed plan. If there is a RCRA site within that CERCLA unit, then a permit modification would also be done.

Pete Knollmeyer laid out the schedule for the negotiations. The agencies signed the Agreement in Principle (AIP) on December 14, 2001 and completed the negotiations on February 7, 2002. They had hoped to mail the change package on February 14, start the public comment period on February 19, end public comment on April 5, and take April and May to incorporate and respond to comments. The plan was then to sign the Conclusion Agreement on or about June 5. Keith Klein briefed Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary of Energy, on February 12 and said he would sign the Agreement as is. It will then be mailed out to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the EPA. It looks as if there will be a one-week slip in the public comment period, so it will start on February 25 and end on April 12.

Pete Knollmeyer felt the tri-party team had worked excellently together. They had streamlined the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) process by consolidating operable units (OUs) and investigations. They will now investigate all OUs via 12 RI/FSs instead of 22, and will still cover all waste sites. The parties had agreed to focus on some high risk waste sites first to address sites that could potentially contribute to groundwater contamination. The remaining M-15 work is to submit the 12 work plans. They stuck to the date in the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) to complete investigations in 2008. They also added an M-15 milestone that commits DOE to submit a proposed plan for any remediation action(s) for source control at a high-risk waste site(s), including an engineered barrier evaluation, by June 2003.

The agencies used to have three M-15 milestones for every investigation – complete the fieldwork, submit the RI report, and then submit the FS plan. During the negotiations, they agreed to delete completion of the fieldwork, so now they just submit the RI report, FS, and proposed plan. They also deleted some M-15 milestones that talked about closing out the BP-1 waste site and consolidated completion of that work into the TW-1 and TW-2 Proposed Plan. In the M-16 change package, the 200 Area OU remediation milestone was extended from 2018 to 2024. This is a subset (around 40 of the 750 waste sites) that should be deferred to 2024 at the latest to coincide with any tank farm closure decisions. 100 Area Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) activities were deleted from M-16-00, since they were accelerated via the 100/300 Area TPA change package and are covered by M-16-00A. The agencies also directly linked M-20 RCRA milestones with the appropriate M-15 milestones. They believed it makes sense to submit Closure/Post Closure submittals with the Proposed Plan for OUs.

Regulator Perspective

Dennis Faulk encouraged the committee to take a hard look at the package. He thought the best outcome for EPA would be to get rid of a lot of administrative paperwork. EPA is investigating and trying to gather enough information to select remedial actions. Right now it is looking at two actions – capping the waste sites or digging them up. It will have to be more innovative about how to collect information when implementing remedies. Dennis hoped that by the time EPA implements remedies in the 200 Area, its characterization tools would be slick and cheap. One of EPA's goals is to get analytical costs down to around 10% of the remedy implementation. In the 100 Area, it currently

runs around 5-8%. EPA does not want to spend 50% of remedial action dollars on characterization activities, so Dennis stressed the need to push technical programs.

The big win with M-15 is that EPA is getting DOE to commit to actively pursue known groundwater contributors. Dennis Faulk said he hoped to set up an administrative framework, so they could plug more sites into the Record of Decision (ROD) as they are found. DOE also had a big win with the M-15/M-20 milestone alignment. Currently, DOE has to submit a closure plan to Ecology under M-20, which is often way ahead of EPA's investigations. By aligning the two milestones, Ecology has given DOE an extension of four years. When the RCRA plan comes in, it will now be the same as the CERCLA plan. One contentious issue is the M-13 and M-15 milestone series that requires DOE to complete work plans and RI/FSs for all OUs (including groundwater).

Jane Hedges, Ecology, underscored that Ecology's coordination of M-20 and RCRA closures with CERCLA activities was a real advantage to Ecology because it was a disconnect. Coordination with tank farm closures was also an advantage. Jane noted that the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) had been very positive about the 100/300 Area because the framework had been established, and this package also sets out a framework. Jane felt there was a lot of benefit in clearly identifying RCRA areas, and she was also encouraged by the "RCRA C Comparable Type Barrier."

Committee Discussion

- Marty Bensky asked where risk or impact assessment fit into the process for selecting remedial actions. Dennis Faulk replied that one requirement of RI/FS work under Superfund is doing a risk assessment, so they would be performed on a number of the sites. Typically a go/no go decision is made based on whether there is acceptable risk posed by the site, and then the RI is implemented. DOE has also done a lot of work through composite analysis and other programs. Marty commented that he sometimes felt the tie-ins were not developed, even though they are essential to getting Hanford cleaned up properly. Marty added that the existence of a contaminant does not necessarily determine the cleanup decision. It is the potential impact of the contaminants that is important. Dennis stated that EPA wanted the work done in the context of their decision-making framework, and he felt all Superfund decisions were based on solid risk assessment information. Pete Knollmeyer explained that all 100/300 Area decisions to date were interim decisions, and there is a risk assessment process that has to be done before final decisions can be made. The agencies had discussed whether 200 Area RODs would be final or interim, but the package does not make that indication. The onus is on DOE to show through RI/FSs that it has done sufficient risk assessment. If not, it would have to do risk assessment later through the final RODs.
- Shelley Cimon asked about the Canyon Disposition Initiative (CDI). Dennis Faulk said that they would not have a decision on that until they have a holistic 200 Area program. It would be really nice to have a solid baseline, since there are a number of waste sites within the footprint of the canyons. The CDI proposed plan, which is a decision on the U-Plant facility, is going through EPA legal review. There are two parts to the decision – will the facility be used for waste disposal, and what does the

final configuration of the facility look like? The plan should be out for public comment within the next two to six months.

- Dirk Dunning asked how the new plans accounted for moisture movement in the subsurface. Also, if they did rely on monitoring, were there plans to put in vadose zone monitoring to see where the waste is, where it is going and if it is moving? Pete Knollmeyer told him the RI/FS process would take groundwater movement into account. The only discussion they had about subsurface movement with their models was in trying to integrate the CERCLA decisions on waste sites immediately adjacent to tank farms with RCRA corrective action on tank farms. They would have to use the same assumptions, since groundwater cannot move in different directions on different sides of a tank farm fence. The agencies would discuss groundwater immediately following the negotiations, and DOE was interested in coming up with an integrated groundwater strategy. Dennis Faulk added that if they built good barriers, vadose zone monitoring would be obsolete.
- Pam Brown asked whether there was a plan to coordinate monitoring wells. Jane Hedges told her that one of the Constraints to Cleanup and Challenges Team (C3T) disconnects was monitoring and groundwater, since they have over 8,000 wells and sample approximately 1,000 of them. They looked at coordinating that sampling and figuring out what areas they needed to do differently or what additional things they needed to do. The vadose zone was one of those areas. Ecology hoped the effort would look at drilling and characterization as well, and what they needed to do to move forward. Ecology has been focused on looking at the vadose zone where it had operable active units, and would be talking to the committee about that in March.
- Dirk Dunning expressed concern that the Science and Technology Coordination Groups (STCGs) were going away. Jane Hedges replied that one of Ecology's principle values was science and technology and being able to develop a process that captures needs. Dennis Faulk felt ambiguous about STCG going away, since he had seen DOE move in a positive direction over the last couple years. Marrying projects with science and technology had paid dividends. Dennis visited Savannah River and noted that the Subsurface Contaminants Focus Area was successful in implementing science and technology. He thought Hanford needed to think about how it would compete for limited dollars. Pete Knollmeyer felt STCG needed to go away because it had consistently tried to push technology when the STCG site needed projects to pull technology. Fluor Hanford had assigned people to each of the projects linked to Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), so it had a good fusion of technology into projects.
- Dirk Dunning was concerned about the reduction from 700 waste sites. He felt it was presumptive to put barriers on everything. Pete Knollmeyer explained that it was not a presumptive remedy. They would analyze the worst-case waste sites to bound the RI. Then, as they moved to doing an RI on waste sites that were not characterized, they would perform verification sampling to make sure the remedy under the RI/FS was still appropriate for the waste sites they were about to do.
- Shelley Cimon felt capping was preemptive. For example, they discovered a lot of uranium barrels when they dug up 618-4. Dennis Faulk told her that was an issue. For the 200 Area, they would dig up the waste site, cap it, and then conduct confirmatory sampling to determine the sites posed no risk. They have already done

a tremendous amount of analysis on the waste sites, and a lot of remedies could be employed. Dennis felt they needed to be a lot cheaper and smarter about remedy verification. The 200 Area will be here for eternity in a safe and stable condition. Mike Goldstein, EPA, added that 618-4 was not the best example. EPA had done more of a traditional RI/FS, and none of those drums had shown up in test trenching. There was still a decision of digging up the burial ground, which was controversial at the time. The time to comment on that strategy was during the RI/FS timeframes.

- Dirk Dunning commented that if the agencies treat Hanford as a sacrifice zone, it creates conflict within their own guidance under Superfund to clean up to risk-based levels. If the agencies are considering treating Hanford as a National Sacrifice Zone, they should say that to the public. Dennis Faulk encouraged everyone to read what the Future Site Uses Working Group report says about the Central Plateau, since it shapes the agencies' decision framework.
- Shelley Cimon said she saw integration with all the sites but not Inactive Miscellaneous Underground Storage Tanks (IMUSTs). Dennis Faulk informed her that was their next step. The agencies were just not as far along in the planning process for the 200 Area as the 100/300 Area. Pete Knollmeyer told Shelley that the IMUSTs were being treated and captured in the OUs. They could be pulled out of OUs and addressed as part of Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) closure, if it makes more sense. The best way may also be to handle that as part of the CDI decision. Dennis noted that EPA challenged DOE to finish all waste sites in 2024, rather than 2028.
- Pam Brown asked how this effort would help DOE get incentive funding. Pete Knollmeyer replied that in this part of the package, they had agreed to accelerated commitments along the river corridor. That meets a lot of Jessie Roberson's priorities in the Top-to-Bottom Review. Keith Klein, DOE-RL Manager, was saying a lot of good things about the River Corridor Contract, and they thought the negotiated package supported that. Dennis Faulk commented that assuming the slush fund is there (\$800 million), EPA supports this package to try to access some of the extra money to start taking care of potential groundwater contributors. EPA is encouraging DOE to emphasize this piece.
- Mike Goldstein remarked that the baseline still reflected the 2012 vision and was a disconnect. It was not in the scope of the proposed River Corridor change packages. He thought DOE would have to update baselines to track the commitments it had made. Pete responded that the original 2012 plan said to finish the 300 Area by 2012, and the TPA negotiations set that milestone at 2018. The River Corridor Proposal was written so that if DOE could get enough funding, it would complete the 300 Area by the earlier date. If Congress does not support it, then 2018 is a fallback position. DOE has already asked contractors to bid a slower funding profile to stretch out to 2018. Mike wanted recognition that there was a slight disconnect between the baseline, budget request and contract desired amounts. DOE may get conflicting information because of the different purposes for putting the information together.
- Pete Knollmeyer stated that all this work was captured under the Project Baseline Summary (PBS) for the Central Plateau in Fiscal Year (FY) 2001. DOE's commitments are backed by funding in its baseline. In the FY 2003 budget, the number reads \$42,500, but it is actually around \$38,000. DOE was not worried about

that, since the budget is not finalized. DOE is confident it will bring home funding to keep its commitments. Any help HAB can bring in getting funding would be greatly appreciated.

- Dennis Faulk asked the committee to take a look at the package and see if there are questions, fatal flaws, etc. He reminded the group that if DOE did accelerate the River Corridor cleanup, there would have to be trade-offs in the 200 Area.
- Dirk Dunning observed that the structure of the milestone was based around the fact that in some cases the barriers were thought to be the answer. It also appeared that the RI/FS had been collapsed into Closure/Post Closure to become one process. Dennis Faulk clarified that actually M-20 had been expanded. Ecology gave DOE four extra years, so it would make consistent decisions. DOE issued the proposed plan to EPA and Ecology that satisfied the Superfund part of the equation, at the same time that it issued the closure plan to Ecology for TSD units. With the proposed change package, DOE would issue two plans at the same time and coordinate the process. The closure part would then be incorporated into the permit, and the proposed plan would happen under Superfund. Dennis felt this was good because DOE could not have done an analysis to issue the closure plan by 2004, which was the milestone. Jane Hedges said Ecology did not perceive it was losing anything and felt everyone would get better information. Pete Knollmeyer added that it would ensure the OU investigation would adequately characterize RCRA TSD waste sites, so a sound closure plan could be made.
- Pam Brown asked about the advantage of what was proposed for identifying or remediating groundwater contamination. Dennis Faulk replied that EPA was now looking at those it thought were potential groundwater contributors (at how many have had completed investigations in the RI/FS), so it could jump to the ROD stage. Dennis felt this was a big win to get into the process earlier. Pete Knollmeyer stated that one of the new milestones was M-15, which does near-term source remediation on high-risk, potential groundwater contributing wastes sites. The committee affirmed that was a good thing. Dirk Dunning noted one of his big concerns was with the subsurface, since no one knew what was happening under the site or whether the barrier was doing what it was supposed to. Was it eligible to be left or was it waste covered under the Atomic Energy Act? Pete replied that they decided to defer that until they made a decision on tank waste OUs.
- Dirk Dunning inquired about the grouping of waste sites. Would the agencies develop criteria in advance as triggers to say variability was too large, and they needed to break up the sites and do more examinations? Dennis Faulk said yes, and cited an example that had just occurred with an MW-1 submitted to EPA. Pete Knollmeyer said that if things differed from what DOE anticipated, more categories would be triggered, or waste sites might be moved into different OUs.
- Dirk Dunning requested documents that had been pulled off the Bechtel website regarding the RI/FS work plan.
- Penny Mabie asked the committee to consider what was in and out, what the trade-offs were, and if there were any fatal flaws in the package. Pam Brown commented that the package started with soil contamination, and the next effort would be groundwater. There needs to be linkages between the two. This process consolidates

from 22 to 12 OU groups, and one of the advantages was the reduction in administrative time and paperwork.

The committee discussed key questions the agencies should address as they go through this process. Dennis Faulk mentioned that a lot of the committee's questions had processes in place to deal with them, but the agencies had not been able to articulate that. Maybe the agencies could return and have those discussions. He also asked the committee to review the fact sheet EPA would be producing over the next couple days.

Key Issues/Concerns/Values Brainstormed by the Committee: (flip charts)

- What are the process assumptions that went into development of the change package?
- There need to be linkages between groundwater and soil issues.
- The proposed changes consolidates from 22 to 12 operable unit groups. The advantage of this is a reduction in administrative paperwork.
- Do the selected sites bound all of the sites?
- Is there/what is the defined criteria for reopening a site if something is found during investigation?
- Is there any process for limited study to confirm groupings (transparency of process)?
- What drives the technology development (robustness of technology)?
- What triggers review of new technology and decisions to implement or not? And does the site get a product that is usable and needed from the technology development?
- Is funding available to address technology concerns?
- The basic assumption that Dennis stated was to leave the site in a safe and stable condition. Is there any debate about decisions made by past generations?
- What are the key questions agencies should address as they go through their process?
- Is risk assessment sufficient and integrated?
- Scheduling and timeline for investigations – will there be integration with budget requests and justifications?
- Application of various laws and how those interface with the milestones, particularly the Atomic Energy Act and things dealing with transuranic or high-level waste.
- What are the trade-offs on the Central Plateau for accelerating cleanup along the River Corridor? Are they acceptable?
- Is risk driving the priorities or is politics?
- What was the Board's past advice about grout, and the ability to exhume what was left in the ground?
- Use recognizable names, such as the carbon tetrachloride waste site, instead of nomenclature such as LW-2 .
- How are proximity issues addressed, i.e. MUSTS, canyons, etc.?
- What is the framework for monitoring vadose zone water movement?

- Is the M-15 milestone regarding near-term source remediation a good thing?
- What provisions would be made in the 200 Area for the possibility of flooding of the Hanford site in 60,000 years during the next Ice Age? The proposed Black Rock Reservoir needs to be evaluated regarding impacts on Hanford.

Funding Issues: (flip chart)

- For contractors to be successful in a multi-year contract, it must be funded.
- Support performance-based contracting, as long as adequately funded over time.
- Fund M-91 facility.
- Budget zeroes the LTSP (Long-Term Stewardship Plan).

Next Steps:

Dirk Dunning, Shelley Cimon, and Dan Simpson agreed to do issue manager work, and to draft advice on the change package and discuss it with Dennis Faulk and Jane Hedges. Committee members should review the change package and get additional thoughts to the issue managers. The issue managers will develop draft advice for the committee to consider in March. Pam Brown suggested that the March meeting should be held after the task force meeting. That would give the committee the chance to review anything coming from the task force, meet as a committee again prior to the April HAB meeting, and have the chance to look at draft advice and interface with DOE and regulators.

Penny Mabie suggested that task force members should get copies of the meeting summary, so they would see all of the questions.

Institutional Controls Plan

Jim Daily, DOE-RL, gave a status report on DOE's Site Wide Institutional Controls Plan (ICP). DOE collaborated with the regulators on a draft document that should be ready to go out for a 30-day public comment period in mid-March. One of the actions to follow-up on the plan is an assessment of ICs, which DOE would like to schedule as soon as possible.

Dirk Dunning asked if there was a way under Washington State regulations to ensure that deed records were properly transferred. Mike Goldstein replied that the plan was set up to outline all of the administrative controls in place at Hanford that prevent access and preclude any contact with hazards. Most of the 100 Area RODs were written with a focus on preventing access to any of the problems until they were cleaned up. The plan shows ways Hanford would have a lot of administrative controls in place. Many CERCLA OUs in the 100/300 Area have specific controls called out. DOE's next step was a self-assessment to see if any of its controls were failing.

Mike Goldstein clarified that this presentation to the committee was providing EPA's 30-day notice that the plan would be coming out for public comment. Mike and Jim Daily will meet with Susan Leckband, issue manager, and make sure she understands what has changed from the version she saw in the fall. She can then make a recommendation to the committee on whether she thinks there was sufficient interest for EPA to give another briefing. Dennis Faulk hoped the committee would issue advice on the plan, since it will be a living document and a starting point for how the agencies will conduct business. The committee requested all members receive a copy of the plan when it is ready.

Mike Goldstein noted that most sites would be going in this direction, but Hanford would probably be the first site with such a plan.

Committee Discussion

- Dirk Dunning asked if the ICP also included herbicide/pesticide spraying. Jim Daily responded that the work plans covered that, not the ICP. Mike Goldstein added that the main focus of the plan was to demonstrate radiation area remedial action (RARA), a surveillance and maintenance system on waste sites. The plan was written with the intent of demonstrating requirements for site-wide ICPs from a couple of CERCLA RODs. Jim told Dirk there were a lot of other controls besides those specified in the CERCLA RODs, so it was a good exercise in integrating a lot of different types of controls on-site. Dirk asked if they would be able to recognize those linkages within the plan, and Mike encouraged him to ask that as part of the comment process.
- Dirk Dunning asked how the plan would tie to long-term stewardship issues. Jim Daily replied that one difference between this draft and the prior one was that this one had more background information on what was in the contracts and how they were selected. There was more tutorial on how things might change over time and what issues needed to be resolved on a national level. The Long-Term Stewardship Plan (LTSP) covered the full spectrum of issues for the long-term on the site. This plan focused on complying with CERCLA requirements for institutional controls. They could be separated into two documents, but DOE had made a commitment to HAB that this would be an appendix to the LTSP. Mike Goldstein added that responsibility for implementing current administrative controls on site lay with the assistant managers responsible for cleanup of the 100, 200 and 300 Areas – Pete Knollmeyer and Beth Bilson. Maintaining administrative controls would shift to long-term stewardship in the final RODs.
- Dan Simpson asked if there was any comparison of this program to the Environmental Management (EM) list showing all of the laws and regulations that were to be observed. Jim Daily answered that the plan had a list in the back documenting the RODs and requirements and which section of the plan dealt with the requirements. Dennis Faulk clarified that the plan did not look at all of the requirements that were out there, but at Superfund RODs specifically.

Solid/Hazardous Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS)

Mike Collins, DOE-RL, Document Manager for the Solid Waste EIS, informed the committee that the purpose of the EIS had not changed. It was designed to update the

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation for existing waste management activities, provide NEPA documentation for planned waste management activities, and create Hanford-specific implementation of Waste Management Programmatic EIS (WM PEIS) decisions. The EIS looked at three waste types – Low Level Waste (LLW), Mixed Low Level Waste (MLLW), and “Post-1970” Transuranic Waste (TRU Waste). Mike said that there had been two major changes since his last presentation. DOE-RL has received approval authority from headquarters, and Keith Klein would approve the document. In addition, DOE-RL had been looking at partial TRU retrieval scenarios, but that discussion was now being deleted. The assumption was that the EIS would be consistent with the Hanford Waste EIS, and all of the “retrievably-stored” TRU waste would be removed from the low-level burial grounds (LLBG).

Dirk Dunning asked if it would be a reasonable alternative that Hanford accept no outside waste. Mike Collins told him that was the lower bound volume. Dirk suggested they also look at siting for potential LLW disposal facilities.

Mike Collins called the committee’s attention to the M-91 treatment facility, which was a series of milestones for dealing with waste they could not treat. DOE was looking into whether it could treat all the waste or send it offsite. Mike explained an odd no action alternative under the TRU waste alternatives. The decision had already been made to retrieve as part of no action, but DOE did not have the facility to treat it. No action included the action to have more storage space, so DOE would be doing action in the no action alternative.

A committee member asked if the mega trench concept was in this analysis. Mike Collins told him that for MLLW, they were looking at a single mega lined trench. For LLW, there would be bigger, wider, deeper trenches placed here and there within existing trenches, so there would not be one trench.

One other analysis was construction of a rail spur. They knew the rail system was coming back online, but there was still a question of whether they needed a rail spur. The analysis is limited to construction, not operation, of the spur. They would need more NEPA documentation to operate the spur. The analysis would also look at shipping waste from other sites to Hanford.

Mike Collins presented the EIS schedule. DOE is still looking at April 2002 to have the draft approved. It had more confidence now in that date because of its delegation authority. Public meetings would follow in April/May 2002, and DOE would give at least a 60-day public comment period. It was looking at Fall 2002 for the Final EIS and late 2002 for the ROD.

Committee Discussion

- Dave Johnson asked if there was any provision for taking into account flooding during the next Ice Age. Mike Collins told him there was not. The groundwater analysis went about 10,000 years into the future. Transuranic waste should all be taken out and sent to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).

- Pam Brown wondered how DOE had generated information so quickly. Less than a year ago when it looked at doing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for additional burial grounds, it did not even have a preliminary analysis about the land carrying capacity. Mike Collins replied that DOE's problem had been trying to make the EIS legally bulletproof.
- Dirk Dunning commented that the original scoping did not include the Programmatic EIS.

Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) and M-91 Milestone Negotiations

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, presented on the PFP and M-91 milestone negotiations. Over the last several weeks, DOE had divided the effort into six sub teams. Each team crafted milestones for its area, which were combined into the first generation package. The working second generation comes Tuesday morning – to put the proposal on the table in the next week or week-and-a-half.

Laura Cusack, Ecology, mentioned that one public comment was the desire for more information on the milestones. There were probably 12 or so milestones to cover the period between now and 2016 when there is currently an endpoint to have slab on-grade (which means no visible structure at ground level). Three of the milestones dealt with documents, and one dealt with NEPA documentation required to finish Ecology's plan. Ecology made a NEPA decision point and may have to renegotiate the milestones.

Committee Discussion

- Dirk Dunning asked if they were looking at having a vault on-site. Larry Romine replied that the current baseline is that the material ships to Savannah River. Since the mobilization facility has been discontinued, however, they will have to discuss the best path for that.
- Dennis Faulk asked if they could take down the entire PFP facility, excluding vaults, and have the vaults sit for a longer period of time. Larry Romine told him they could, but they were also looking at a cheaper alternative to the vault building.
- Dirk Dunning commented that in a lot of cases the pipes were part of RCRA. He wondered how those were being dealt with as opposed to the rest of the sites. Laura Cusack answered that they would be flushed and cleaned, and the pipes would be left. Larry Romine added that they had devised a flushing process for Plutonium Uranium Extraction (PUREX) and then sampled to make sure the dangerous waste constituent was below the necessary threshold. The current thinking was to take that particular aspect clear to closure, but the pipes would be flushed and sampled and isolated until final remediation.
- Dirk Dunning asked why the metallurgical lab was not included in the plans to take things across Tank 231-Z. Larry Romine replied that it was being treated under what was the 200 Area Accelerated Disposition Program. Dennis Faulk added that all of those types of baseline programmatic discussions still had to occur. Dirk commented that this was a plutonium structure just like those to the south of it and wanted to know why it wasn't included in the plan. Larry told him this was a Type 1 facility, so the personnel risk was not necessarily there. The facility was contained well enough

that it was not viewed as an environmental risk. It was a question of where to put resources with the dollars they had.

- Pam Brown asked when RAP needed to look at this for advice. Laura Cusack told her that the schedule was to finish milestones by the end of February, so the draft would realistically be ready for the agencies to look at by the end of the month. It would probably be ready for public comment during the middle to end of March. Pam remarked that the committee should look at this during the April meeting, in preparation for the June HAB meeting.
- Shelley Cimon asked how the negotiations had gone. Laura Cusack responded that they had dealt well with a lot of really difficult issues. They spent a lot of time at the beginning working on communication and relationship issues, which paved the way for being able to have more constructive conversations at the end.
- Pam Brown asked if they were dealing with M-91 negotiations. Laura Cusack said they were in dispute and had elevated it to the Interagency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) level. The budget did not support everything DOE wanted to do; so going after the \$800 million was part of their strategy. Ecology was maintaining the dispute process as a driver to get Jessie Roberson to look at M-91 and make a decision. Pam suggested Harold Heacock tell the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) to develop advice on the need for the M-91 facility. Dennis Faulk noted that many EPA projects were reliant on this facility. EPA would use its authority under Superfund to get it built. Laura commented that they would also run into storage problems if the facility were not built. Ecology felt DOE's proposal to get part of the \$800 million was supported from the Top-to-Bottom Review, which identified TRU removal as one of the priorities.
- Dennis Faulk commented that PFP is a very important project at Hanford, and it behooved Hanford to look at that if Jessie Roberson wanted it cleaned up in the most efficient manner. Dirk Dunning remarked that the current year's budget was \$118 million on spent fuels. Next year it goes down to \$90 million. This would mean firing a whole bunch of people that would need severance pay. The net result would be to take the real budget down to around \$60 million.

Committee Business

Pam Brown discussed the March RAP meeting. The committee will look at the advice Dan Simpson, Dirk Dunning and Shelley Cimon develop on the 200 Area change package. They will get an update on the Canyon Disposition Initiative. Jane Hedges will also talk about Ecology's work on coordinating monitoring wells and the need for new wells as part of C3T. The request would be to have the meeting after the task force meeting, which is not yet scheduled. Dirk, Dennis Faulk and Gordon Rogers could discuss their trip to Savannah River in April.

Dirk Dunning recommended they talk about K-Basins and the spent fuel project in March, April or May (preferably April). It was almost on schedule, but their process rate was well below what it needed to be.

Dennis Faulk suggested the committee discuss the ICP and 200 Area draft advice if they only had a half-day meeting in March. It would also be really informative at some point for the committee to hear how DOE handled the F-Basin fuel.

Penny Mabie reminded the committee that the Executive Issues group call is Thursday, February 21 at 3 p.m. Pam Brown, Susan Leckband and Dan Simpson should be on the call as advice writers. The committee decided they did not need a committee call the following week.

Shelley Cimon asserted that she was ready for a site tour. Pam Brown said they could plan to do that in conjunction with the April committee meeting. Penny Mabie suggested they tentatively plan to do the tour in conjunction with the April or May committee meeting, but they should wait and see what the work plan is for the task force.

Harold Heacock reminded the committee that BCC was meeting in the afternoon. The two main topics would be the budgets for FY2003 and FY2004 and the Top-to-Bottom Review. He noted that copies of the Review and annotated notes developed last Wednesday night were on the back table.

Handouts

- River and Plateau Committee Draft Meeting Agenda; February 13, 2002.
- Hanford Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Environmental Impact Statement (HSW EIS), Michael Collins, DOE-RL; February 13, 2002.
- Table 2-1: Sitewide Institutional Controls, DOE-RL; February 13, 2002.
- RL Life Cycle Cost Baseline: Life Cycle by PBS FY02-70, DOE-RL; December 12, 2001.
- Central Plateau TPA Negotiation Update: DOE Perspective, Author; February 13, 2002.
- Tri-Party Agreement: Tentative Agreement on Negotiations for the Central Plateau Project, Ecology, EPA and DOE; February 13, 2002.

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Marty Bensky	Pam Brown	Shelley Cimon	
Jim Curdy	Dirk Dunning	Jim Hagar	
Harold Heacock	Dave Johnson	Maynard Plahuta	
Dan Simpson	John Stanfill	Dave Watrous	

Others

Mike Collins, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Nancy Myers, BHI
Jim Daily, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Dave Evans, DOE-RL	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology (phone)	Natalie Renner, EnviroIssues

Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Barb Wise, FH
Larry Romine, DOE-RL	Mike Goldstein, EPA	John Stang, Tri-City Herald
Dick Jaquish, WDOH		