

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

**RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**

*August 13, 2003*

*Richland, WA*

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions ..... 1  
Constraints and Challenges to Cleanup Team (C3T) Transition ..... 1  
100-N Groundwater Workshop..... 6  
618-10 and 618-11 Workshop Review ..... 8  
Groundwater Protection Project Update ..... 9  
2004 Board Priorities ..... 11  
Plutonium Finishing Plant and 232Z Facility ..... 11  
Long Term Stewardship..... 13  
Committee Business..... 14  
Handouts ..... 14  
Attendees..... 14

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

**Welcome and Introductions**

Committee Chair Pam Brown opened the meeting and introduced the participants. She reviewed the goals for the meeting, which included discussing the upcoming year for the Department of Energy (DOE) and determining which issues will be addressed at the committee meetings. The River and Plateau committee will be the focus of the February Hanford Advisory Board (Board) Meeting.

**Constraints and Challenges to Cleanup Team (C3T) Transition**

John Morse, Department of Energy-Richland Office (DOE-RL), briefly discussed the transition from the C3T Initiative to the new Inter-agency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) working group structure. The new structure is made up of several small working groups, which focus on specific issues of the site. These groups are: The Groundwater Working group; the Central Plateau Regional Closure Strategy Team; the Site-wide Waste Management Strategy Team; The Risk Assessment Coordination Team; and the Vision End-States Team. Like the C3T Initiative, these teams are made up of members from the Department of Energy, Washington State Department of Ecology, Environmental Protection Agency, and the Hanford contractors. There are several goals for these groups including:

- Establishing and agreeing to long-term strategic vision for Hanford cleanup
- Identifying barriers to cleanup, and to establish a path forward for resolving those barriers
- Identifying opportunities to optimize the cleanup process
- Communicating strategies, plans, progress and actions to Hanford stakeholders

Annual public meetings with Northwest stakeholders will be held to report goals, strategies, progress and activities related to cleaning up the Hanford site.

### **Risk Assessment Coordination Team**

John went on to discuss the Risk Assessment Coordination Team. Currently, a wide variety of risk assessments are taking place across the site. This effort aims to identify the current technical framework for the coordination of these efforts and to develop consistency between risk assessment activities. The goal of the team is to develop a risk assessment vision statement which addresses, the relationship to risk management; the inter-relationship of risk assessments related to tank closure; public participation requirements/ and key policy issues. The team will also develop a table of current risk assessments with key assumptions. Related to this will be an analysis of differences and the identification of potential impacts of differing key assumptions. A process to coordinate the Risk Assessment Team efforts with those of the Vision and End-States team will be developed. The team meets regularly and others besides the team members are welcome to attend.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), commented there are many risk assessments occurring on the central plateau and it would be beneficial if they were consistent. The risk assessment and closure processes should be linked.
- Pam Brown noted the risk assessment process appears to be linked to the Risk-Based End-States vision. John replied that there is an overlap between the two but the job of this team is to coordinate the risk assessment work. The End-States team has a much broader scope.
- Maynard Plahuta asked how many risk assessments occur each year? John answered there are about 30 in progress at any given time.

### **Groundwater Working Group**

John Morse discussed the Groundwater Working Group, which is comprised of the members from the C3T groundwater group. The goal of this team is to guide the groundwater actions and activities at Hanford. The work scope for this group will include completing the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) M-24 Milestone change package. Additionally, the group will discuss how to improve the groundwater report in particular, how to make it more readable. This report will eventually become a web-based report

that is updated as needed. The group will also develop an exit strategy, including a decision logic road map for each of the groundwater operable units. This will include a regulatory path forward; time schedules, science and technology needs and unresolved policy issues.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Pam asked if committee comment is requested on the updated plan? John replied that they want comments on the roadmap for cleaning up each of the chemicals. This will be ready for comment in the December timeframe. Dennis added that there is still a goal to return groundwater to its highest beneficial use, which is noble. However, a real answer on the use of groundwater needs to be forced. Hopefully, this strategy will start the process down the path to a final decision.
- John Morse announced that DOE-RL has reorganized and has removed one level of management. Brian Charboneau is the new project manager for the groundwater project.

### **Central Plateau Regional Closure Strategy Team**

Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, discussed the Central Plateau Regional Closure Strategy Team. Regional closures are being studied because they offer economies of scale, can overcome constraints and challenges to cleanup, and because they establish clear goals to measure cleanup progress. The team will develop a “vision statement” for regional closures on the central plateau that articulates a sequencing strategy and links the decisions that will support clean-up acceleration goals. The team will also identify the policy decisions associated with regional closures. The schedule for the development of the closure strategy is as follows:

- Collect background information and review regional closure planning (completed)
- Develop consensus input for regional boundaries and definitions (completed)
- Develop guiding principles for optimization of Central Plateau closure and for development of more detailed regional closure plans (September)
- Identify policy issues and decisions that require resolution to facility implementation of the closure strategy (September)

It is expected that a regional closure strategy will bring the development of an optimized strategy for both decision making and implementation of remediation/decommission and decontamination (D&D)/closure actions on the plateau that is environmentally protective, compliant with regulatory requirements and efficient from a cost and schedule standpoint.

### **Regulator Perspective**

- Dennis Faulk stated he is encouraged that even with the regional closure concept, the high priority sites are not being ignored.

- John Price, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), stated that because there are not many Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones in the 200 area, this strategy will be a positive step in developing a structure for remediation. Overall, Ecology endorses the plan however, it is not the end all be all. There are still many small waste sites in the 200 Area that will be inexpensive to clean up (about 100) and could be completed by 2006. Ecology would like to see these finished.
- Pam asked what the plan is for public involvement. John Price stated that will be held under the End-States discussion. John Morse added that the interim decisions have been made and will not be changing. However, the groundwater issue will need to be resolved. The Board has stated that the groundwater should be returned to drinking water standards by 2018. From a practicality standpoint, this is limited by science and engineering possibilities. The goal cannot be disagreed with but must be viewed with some sense of reality.
- Maynard asked how the orphan sites are being determined. Orphan sites are sites that have been lost in the shuffle of planning and have not been evaluated or included in remediation or clean-up planning. John stated that several areas have been identified where orphan sites may be found. Currently evaluation of the sites is underway to determine where they are specifically and the order in which they will be cleaned up. The main criteria for the order of cleanup are based upon the type of operations that went on at the particular site.
- Gerry Pollet asked what the commitment is and how the maximum risk exposure assessments will be used in this process. He also asked what the review process will be. Mike replied that the current screening tool is the Systems Assessment Capability (SAC). The exposures at this time are slightly more rigorous than they were before and a more rigorous standard is being used as a screening tool. At this stage, modeling methods are still being proposed but it is possible that a more complete SAC will be completed.
- Gerry asserted that the SAC does not utilize the Model Toxic Control Act (MTCA) modeling method assumptions. He would like to see how the SAC incorporates the maximum range of reasonable alternatives as well as how it utilizes MTCA assumptions. John Morse replied that the SAC is used as a screening tool. When the work commences, the Resource, Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) requirements are used. Using the SAC as an initial screening tool helps determine which sites to address first.
- Gerry asked if the term closure in “regional closure strategy” is to mean the same as the term closure in RCRA. Mike stated this is not the case and that the use of the word closure is an opportunity for confusion. This is being used to make decisions in order to achieve the end point more quickly.
- Gerry asked when the East and West waste management zones will be closed. Has this strategy already assumed a cleanup standard and timeline for these zones? John answered this is not the case. The strategy is to optimize the goals and reduce risk. There are preliminary estimates of when these sites would close but nothing concrete.

- There will be a discussion of End-States at the November committee meeting. The U Plant update will be in October along with a tour of Gable Mountain.

### **Site-Wide Waste Management Strategy Team**

Rudy Guercia, DOE-RL, discussed the goals of the Site-Wide Waste Management Strategy Team. The objective is to ensure that a viable disposition path exists for legacy and newly generated wastes. The goals are to work off legacy mixed low level waste in storage, actively manage newly generated waste to prevent future build up of a backlog, and optimize disposal facility use. There are two phases to this strategy. Phase 1 will evaluate alternative disposition paths for legacy waste. Phase 2 will evaluate disposition paths for newly generated waste. The assumptions are that there will be disposal at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), which will be maximized for on-site waste that meets facility waste acceptance criteria. Also disposal of mixed-waste (MW) will continue in the MW trenches until they are filled, after that point, MW will be disposed of at the Integrated Disposal Facility. The schedule for this process is as follows:

- Completion of Phase 1 evaluation – 10/30/03
- Completion of Phase 2 evaluation – 11/30/03
- Implementation – to be determined based on the results of the evaluations

### **Committee Discussion**

- Gerry commented that a large portion of the waste will not be acceptable unless it has been treated. Rudy replied that more than half of the waste will be treated.
- Gerry asked if these assumptions, treatment options, and evaluations will be addressed in the final Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Rudy answered that evaluations will fall under the EIS but, treatment will not be addressed because it falls under ERDF. Something would be developed to address this. Gerry asked when the public will have the opportunity to review the options and impacts for treatment. Dennis clarified that Gerry is concerned that specific waste streams are not included in the EIS. Dave Einan, EPA, stated the waste streams have not been individually analyzed but, the waste has a whole was. Gerry clarified that the treated forms of the waste was not analyzed. There is no integration between the RCRA, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and DOE processes, which have been under discussion for the last year. Gerry urged the regulatory authorities to be cognizant of that.
- Max Power noted two of the headquarters project teams have sent out a data call in an effort to identify orphan streams. He asked if the matrix Rudy is developing is linked. Rudy stated there is a contract to treat the liquid mercury complex-wide in the November timeframe.

## **Vision End-States Team**

Mike Thompson discussed the Vision End-States Team. The team is tasked with clearly defining the various end-states for the Hanford site. This will enable the site managers to effectively facilitate consistent cleanup decisions and activities. A significant portion of the work has been completed by the Future Site Use Working Group, which identified a range of acceptable end-states for the Hanford site. The Vision End-States Team will expand upon the products from the many that have addressed this issue. The team will take the next step of selecting various end-states for specific areas and timeframes. These end-states will address: institutional controls; exposure scenarios for various land uses; remedial action objectives; Human health and ecological protection expectation and the duration of protectiveness required; and statutory and regulatory requirements.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Max asked if the draft end-states vision can be shared with the committee in the near future. Mike stated he believes he can share the progress on the vision end-states work and DOE's work on meeting DOE-Headquarter's policy at the September 10 meeting.
- Dan asked how public communication will be approached. Will it be similar to the EIS path? Dennis stated it will be more like the 100 area workshops from the early 1990's. The final decision on this has not been made.
- Gerry asked if the EPA will, at a national level, develop and lay out a framework for cleanup standards. Dennis stated the EPA has laid out criteria and that improvements continue to be made to the policy.
- Dan Simpson asked when there will be an opportunity for public input in the End-States discussion. Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, stated there should be a product available for the public to review in September. This will be submitted to headquarters at this time with the caveat that it is not closed for public comment.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Max stated that the project manager has shared drafts of the end-states vision with a variety of organizations. DOE has received specific comments that clearly stated DOE is not the only decision maker in this process and that environmental laws must be followed. The three states have provided very detailed comments as well as more general comments. Max would like the Hanford team to give a good deal of thought on how to present this information to the stakeholders. He understands the motivation to standardize some of these processes however he is unsure of the true benefits. There is not enough knowledge to determine if this is a good format.

## **100-N Groundwater Workshop**

Mike Thompson presented a brief overview of the 100-N Groundwater Workshop that was held on August 11 and 12. This workshop was just the beginning of the exchanges between all involved stakeholders. There will continue to be opportunities for discussion

and dialogue in the future. It was somewhat disappointing that there were not more participants however; it is difficult to draw a large crowd in the summer months. There will be a review of the record of decision in 2005 to determine how much headway has been made. Other alternatives for long-term remediation may need to be considered. The objective of the workshop was to work through the conceptual models so all the participants understood the data. This understanding enabled the participants to have an open and frank discussion about risks and risk assessment. All of the materials from the workshop will be made available to anyone who wishes to have them. The objective for the next meeting is to have a dialogue addressing ecological risk assessment. This is the piece that needs a great deal more data. The goal for all the agencies involved is to have more discussion in the future.

### *Committee Discussion*

- Gariann Gelston attended the workshop and commented it was a beneficial experience. All the attendees were able to discuss their concerns and clear up any confusion. Breakout sessions were held that addressed values, risk, what is defined as risk, land use, and end-state vision. That information was pulled together and given to DOE so there is now a basis to move forward on.
- Tom Stoops stated the second day of the workshop was more informative. Productive panel discussions with experts were held and Dib Goswami, Ecology, did a good job keeping the panelists on schedule. The expectation is that there will be additional follow-up with DOE and its contractors.
- Maynard stated he was disappointed that more people from the general public and the Board did not attend.
- Shelley commented that the second day was outstanding. There were three vendors present with intriguing proposals. These will need a great deal of consideration by all involved parties. It was disappointing that there were not more people in attendance.
- Shelley asked when Mike will come before the Board to discuss the possible alternatives. Mike stated as soon as possible, however, John Price stated first it must be determined which options will be safe for human health and the environment. The goal of the discussion was to receive input to make sure the right factors were being studied. While the attendees at the workshop were comfortable with human health risk assessment, they were less so with ecological risk assessment. In order to thoroughly discuss the options, the discussion will need to be a few levels above what the public is comfortable with. The technical staff must be able to explain this to the general public. Mike noted he believes this should be done concurrently but does not disagree that this must be done.
- Dennis hopes a result of this workshop is that DOE will fund the work so bench-scale testing may begin.
- A presentation will be given on the alternatives at the September or October committee meeting. Shelley and Susan will help structure the presentation and will speak to Greg deBruler regarding the content.

- Dennis announced that the EPA Environmental Justice group will be on site at the beginning of September. Anyone who is interested in speaking with them should see Dennis.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- John Price, Ecology, stated the workshop was excellent. There were open and frank discussions about strontium 90 and the risks associated with it. Specifically that the available technologies are unable to remove it all. At the workshop, several possible technologies were discussed. Some had promise and others had to be discounted due to implementation problems. There was a great deal of interest in permeable reactive barriers and the vendors addressed potential issues and implementation problems as well as the benefits.

### **618-10 and 618-11 Workshop Review**

Kevin Leary, DOE-RL, discussed the 618-10/11 workshop that was held on June 9-12. The objectives of the workshop were to evaluate innovative technologies, share lessons learned, brainstorm, and identify issues and potential solutions for waste characterization, excavation methods, removal and handling, packaging and transport, health and safety issues, treatment requirements, final disposition, and regulatory compliance. The workshop included a vendor fair and tour of the burial grounds, lessons learned from other sites in the complex, and discussions of regulatory, transuranic waste (TRU), health and safety, treatment, storage, and disposal issues among many others.

A total of 17 vendors were represented at the vendor fair. 140 people including technical experts from many DOE sites, academia and industry attended the workshop. The discussion from the workshop will assist in formulating a remediation project that has a safe work environment, will be cost effective enabling project completion, and will utilize the best available technologies. This discussion will also enable the future remediation project to be faster, cheaper, better, safer, and compliant with regulations.

Kevin briefly discussed the EM-50 Technology Development Status. The announcement for a Technology Development Project focusing on In-Situ TRU-Waste Characterization and Waste Removal was made in May 2003. A pre-bidders conference was held on June 13, 2003. The proposal submission date was extend until July 9, 2003. The proposals submitted range from small, local businesses to international corporations and include a wide variety of technologies. No selection has been made to date and it is possible that multiple awards will be made. A final award will occur on or before September 30, 2003.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Maynard asked if any vendors dismissed themselves? Kevin answered that most of the vendors had a good understanding of the challenges. In the submitted proposals,

there was evidence of good partnering between companies. This is a diverse project and it is important to have multiple viewpoints.

- Kevin noted the public can help by looking over the workshop summary and communicating any issues or concerns.
- Pam asked if part of the problem is lack of funding. Kevin stated if the project asks for large amounts of money, it would affect the funding of other projects. The other issue is the M91 remote handled TRU facility issues.
- The committee decided this would be a good briefing to bring forward to the HAB in November.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

- Dennis noted that a factor in every lesson learned was that over-engineering hampered progress. It is especially important to look at the contract carefully as well as how the contractors are hired. Dennis added that a discussion on N area had begun a few years earlier and then had stopped. Now the department is funding the work and he would like to see the work begin before 2012. What is holding up the process however is treatment capacity. This needs to be focused on in the near term so it can be completed in the long-term.
- Dib Goswami, Ecology, commented the workshop was a great brainstorming event and was pleased by the outcome of the discussions. One of the issues that came out was how to best deal with the unknowns in health and safety. Many other issues were discussed such as how to do characterizations, how to control dust during any excavations, and how to obtain funding for this project.

### **Groundwater Protection Project Update**

Dick Wilde presented a brief update on the Groundwater Protection Project (GPP). He has been promoted to manage both the waste management project and GPP. Bruce Ford has been promoted to oversee GPP. Several activities have started or will be starting shortly. These include:

- Drilling of characterization wells in the B/C Crib and trench area.
- The first contract for D& D of wells to eliminate recharge has been issued.
- In September a contract for 100 wells will be issued. 25 of the 57 wells contracted to date have been completed.
- 34 monitoring wells will be drilled this year and so far these are on or ahead of schedule.

Dick went on to discuss the work that is being done to decommission old wells. Some of the wells that were constructed years ago can be difficult to decommission. It is difficult to know what is underground on the site and the workers must be cautious to not hit power lines or other utilities. During decommissioning, great care is taken to ensure the contaminated soil that is removed is properly filtered and disposed of. There are special trucks equipped with vacuums and hepa filters assigned to this task.

## **U Plant Geographic Area Closure**

Kevin Leary discussed the U Plant Geographic Area Closure process. The accelerated cleanup and area closure concepts were developed in DOE's "Performance Management Plan for the Accelerated Cleanup of the Hanford Site" and were further defined in the Hanford groundwater plan. The goal is to remediate the high-risk sites and to demolish U Plant and the associated ancillary structures. This would be used as a pilot project to demonstrate the concept of area closure on the central plateau. These activities are intertwined with the IAMIT teams, which were discussed earlier. This project would accelerate the U-Plant area cleanup by 13 years and would move the area into a condition for long-term stewardship.

The scope of work for this project will include:

- Disposition of U-Plant canyon
- Disposition of the U-Plant ancillary facilities to slab on grade
- Remediation of waste sites and pipelines
- Other activities such as, well decommissioning and rerouting water lines

For the project to move forward it must meet regulatory requirements and there are several ways to do this. There are currently four CERCLA evaluations being proposed.

- CDI feasibility study/proposed plan leading to a record of decision
- Waste Site's Feasibility Study (FS) and Proposed Plan (PP) leading to a record of decision (ROD)
- Engineering and evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) and an Action Memorandum (AM) for D&D of U-Plant ancillary facilities
- EE/CA and AM for the pipelines and some miscellaneous waste sites

The project faces many possible issues between the start and completion including meeting RCRA requirements, Pipeline Characterization in the 200 Area, and how to integrate multiple activities such as exposure scenarios and risk assessments to support an accelerated closure.

Under the current timeline a ROD will be issued in June 2004 and remediation of the waste sites outside of the U-Plant footprint will be completed by September of 2006. A ROD for closure of U-Plant facilities will be signed tentatively in April 2004 and 224-U and U Plant ancillary structures will be demolished by September 2006.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Pam asked if the team has talked with the contractors who worked on the lines by the river. Kevin stated they are speaking with them because they don't want to make the same mistakes. Maynard added a lot of work has been done on the pipes in the 300 area. Kevin replied that currently work is not being done on the Office of River Protection (ORP) pipelines. This project will set a precedent for many other projects and the team wants to make sure they do the correct thing for regulations, human and environmental health, and the taxpayer.

- Tom commented he is concerned there is not an adequate understanding of the inventories in the closure concept. Not knowing the true inventory would result in an incorrect estimate of risk reduction. Kevin replied that there is some remote handled TRU that will need to be removed but believes DOE can handle the situation. Tom clarified he is more concerned about the environmental impact. Kevin noted there will need to be a lot of characterization in the surrounding areas as well as confirmatory sampling in the areas where there is little data.
- Craig Cameron, EPA, stated the EPA is interested in studying each ancillary facility individually. Discussion will be needed with Ecology and DOE to determine what information is needed and how to approach each of the buildings. The progress is a little further behind with the buildings than it is with the canyons. There is a lot of work to do but progress is moving forward. Kevin added that there are issues to be worked out in relation to the caps and barriers that are in place and will be put in place. One such issue is how to wick water away from the caps so it doesn't push the contaminants around.
- John Price noted this project is a prototype for the rest of the area, which helped bring many issues to the forefront at this time instead of in 2008.

### **2004 Board Priorities**

Todd Martin briefly reviewed the priorities for fiscal year 2004. The River and Plateau are involved with several of these. The schedule for when these issues will be addressed is still murky but will become clearer over the next few months. This list is not exhaustive and other issues will be added as needed over the year. Pam added that the list was developed using DOE 2004 planning documents. Other issues may need to be added in light of today's discussion on the end-state vision for Hanford.

Dennis commented that the regulators were in sync with the Board last year and it was because the Board's schedule was a driver. It is helpful for the regulators to be aware in advance of what the Board is going to address each year.

Yvonne Sherman, DOE-RL, stated she has received input on 2004 priorities from the IAMIT process, DOE-ORP, and C3T. She still needs to receive input from DOE-RL. This information should be pulled together by 8/28/2003 and will be ready for the Board meeting.

Todd Martin commented the major issue at the national level is the situation with the Idaho Citizen's Advisory Board. There will be a call next week and a meeting at the end of September for the chairs of all the site-specific advisory boards. There is a rising sense of concern over the future of the public process. The situation is not positive at a lot of sites but for the time being it is okay at Hanford.

### **Plutonium Finishing Plant and 232Z Facility**

Larry Romine, DOE-RL, announced that Stacey Charboneau will be the new manager for the Plutonium Finishing Plant Project (PFP). Larry went on to discuss the progress at PFP. All that is left to package are the oxides and this task may be completed by the tail end of December or early January. Section Eight of the TPA describes the transition of facilities from operations to decommissioning. There are three phases to decommissioning following shutdown of the facility. PFP is currently undergoing transition and some disposition, the dismantlement of facilities. The transition has been through non-CERCLA activities and the disposition has been under CERCLA authority. The PFP regulatory strategy was developed through a working group. The transition activities began in FY02 under a non-CERCLA framework using RCRA, NEPA, and Clean Air Act (CAA). In parallel with this work, CERCLA documents were planned and the writing of these has been initiated. The working group suggested preparation of a deactivation environmental assessment (EA) as a contingency measure pending the development and approval of the CERCLA documents. This was done because when the EIS was written, it did not necessarily go far enough. The environmental assessment is to be used as a bridge document so work may continue while the CERCLA decision document is developed. This assures there is NEPA coverage while the CERCLA documents are prepared and approved.

### *Committee Discussion*

- Pam asserted the EA is a binding document between regulatory authorities to ensure there is regulatory continuity. Larry replied that work needed to continue on the project while moving towards de-activation and characterization. The EA was developed to bridge the gap between the EIS and the CERCLA document. Pam added there was a lot of frustration because the committee could not obtain information on what the EA included.
- Tom asked if there is a driver to put a building into the CERCLA program if, after D&D, it is contaminated. Larry replied that there is guidance from the EPA on how to handle this situation.
- Pam asked if DOE is still uncertain where the plutonium will be stored and if the Hanford site is waiting for national policy to determine the final storage site. Larry stated a decision is expected next week and that the hope is the plutonium will be consolidated in South Carolina. Preparations are underway so the material will be ready to ship by mid-November. If this does not happen, arrangements will be made for on site storage.
- Pam asked if Kaiser Hill staff have been hired at Hanford. Larry replied that Fluor has hired as many people as possible.
- Maynard asked if it will still be a security issue when the plutonium leaves the site. Larry responded the goal is to reduce the protected area at PFP by December 2005. Until the last container is removed, the guards will need to remain. There is still legacy holdup but hopefully, that will be completed at the same time as de-inventory. A protected or limited area may still be needed for some time.

## **Long Term Stewardship**

Jim Daily, DOE-RL, presented a brief overview of the long-term stewardship plan, which will soon be released for public comment. This process started two and a half years ago with a blank sheet of paper. Two workshops were held, one in April of 2002 and then one in November, which helped to develop the foundations of the document. Those individuals who provided comments during the development phase will receive their own copy of the document as well as a response form and there will be a public comment period for the final document once it is released. The comments that were received focused on the idea that the concept of stewardship was understood but questioned how it would be applied to Hanford. There is one section of the plan devoted to this that identified 16 action areas and contingency and emergency responses for each of these. The Environmental Manager, Jessie Roberson, helped to define these areas and responses. The basic concept is that stewardship begins when the EM mission ends. Discussions on how the turnover process for the site will also need to take place. Several issues that will need to be addressed are the development of acceptance criteria, identification of information management requirements, and obtaining input into cleanup decisions. The River and Plateau Committee is welcome to take part in the turnover process discussions.

## **Committee Discussion**

- Maynard asked why this project isn't done on a trial basis with the Port or the Department of Fish and Wildlife. Their concerns will need to be addressed and may differ. Jim stated the turnover process will take into account the state of the site. There are both simple and complex turnovers that will occur. The Office of Legacy Management will inherit the site in whatever state it is in.
- Dennis commented that it will be interesting to see which agencies pick up the different pieces of the site.
- Pam commented that at the last workshop Jim and his staff were confronted with individuals who had strong views on how things should be. She asked if he had found it possible to flesh out the concerns to the level the public had hoped. Jim replied that there is more information included than what was originally planned. This is the result of the workshops and public input. However, because this is an EM1 funded organization, the emphasis is on acceleration, which includes helping the site reach closure, and turning the land and facilities over to the new agency. Even with the limited budget and staff, all the activities should be accomplished.
- Jim thanked all those who had given input into this document. He stated it made the development and writing of the plan proceed much more quickly than anticipated.

## **Committee Business**

Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues, discussed the process for committee leadership selection. Pam and Susan Leckband were nominated to continue in their current roles of chair and vice-chair. The committee reached consensus this should continue.

The committee also discussed a letter sent by Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, to the River and Plateau committee requesting interviews with committee members. This would be a discussion in regards to the DQO process. Gariann, Greg deBruler, and John Stanfill were asked to participate in these interviews.

## **Handouts**

- River and Plateau Committee Agenda, August 13, 2003
- Hanford Long-Term Stewardship Program, U.S. Department of Energy, August 6, 2003.
- U Plant Complex Handout, August 13, 2003
- Data Quality Objectives Letter, Matt McCormick, August 8, 2003.
- Definition of EM Completion and DOE Site Closure, Office of Environmental Management, January, 2003.
- Hanford's Groundwater Management Plan, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Office, March 2003.
- 618-10/11 Workshop Results, Kevin Leary DOE-RL, August 13, 2003
- U Plant Geographic Area Closure, Kevin Leary DOE-RL, August 13, 2003
- IAMIT Group Charters, IAMIT Teams, August, 2003.
- IAMIT Site Wide Waste Management Group, Rudy Guercia, August 13, 2003.

---

## **Attendees**

### **HAB Members and Alternates**

|                          |                 |               |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Madeleine Brown          | Harold Heacock  | Dan Simpson   |
| Pam Brown                | Todd Martin     | John Stanfill |
| Shelley Cimon, via phone | Maynard Plahuta | Tom Stoops    |
| Gariann Gelston          | Gerry Pollet    |               |

### **Others**

|                          |                         |                            |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| Beth Bilson, DOE-RL      | Rick Bond, Ecology      | Nancy Meyers, BHI.         |
| Brian Charboneau, DOE-RL | Joe Caggiano, Ecology   | Robert Day, CH2MHill       |
| Stacy Charboneau, DOE-RL | Dib Goswami, Ecology    | Liana Herron, EnviroIssues |
| Jim Daily, DOE-RL        | Fred Jamison, Ecology   | Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues  |
| Bryan Foley, DOE-RL      | Brenda Jenston, Ecology | Tom Fogwell, Fluor         |
| Rudy Guercia, DOE-RL     | Max Power, Ecology      | Bruce Ford, Fluor          |
| Kevin Leary, DOE-RL      | John Price, Ecology     | Andrea Hopkins, Fluor      |
| Ellen Mattlin, DOE-RL    | Ron Skinnardan, Ecology | Larry Hulstrom, Fluor      |
| John Morse, DOE-RL       | Craig Cameron, EPA      | Rob Piippo, Fluor          |
| Larry Romine, DOE-RL     | Dennis Faulk, EPA       | Jeff Shearer, Fluor        |
| Yvonne Sherman, DOE-RL   | Dick Jaquish, WDOH      | Barb Wise, Fluor           |

|                          |                   |                      |
|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Michael Thompson, DOE-RL | Mike Priddy, WDOH | Mark Tripplett, PNNL |
|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|