



Hanford Advisory Board

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

September 14-15, 2016

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Executive Summary	1
Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements	3
Draft Advice: 100 D/H Proposed Plan.....	4
Roles and Responsibilities of Effective Board Members	7
Board and Committee Reports.....	9
Public Comment.....	12
Board Business.....	12
Attachments	16
Attendees	17
List of Acronyms	19

This is only a summary of issues and actions presented at 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.

Executive Summary

Hanford Advisory Board Action

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) adopted one piece of advice providing comment on the Proposed Plan for the remediation of the 100 D/H Area.

Hanford Advisory Board Business

Board members adopted the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 HAB Work Plan and provisionally adopted the FY 2017 HAB calendar. Board members also approved a letter to David Borak, Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific

Advisory Board (SSAB), requesting approval of changes to the HAB Operating Ground rules that would remove term limits on HAB leadership positions.

Presentations and Updates

The Board received the following presentations and updates:

- Roles and responsibilities of HAB members
- Board committee reports
- The nomination process for a HAB chair, vice-chair and national liaison

Public comment

One public comment was provided.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

September 14-15, 2016

Richland, WA

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch and Board chair, called the HAB meeting to order. The meeting was open to members of the public and offered opportunities for public comment.

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements

Dawn MacDonald, DOE Office of River Protection (ORP) and co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer for the HAB, noted that the Board was meeting in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Cathy McCague, HAB facilitator, provided members with an overview of the meeting agenda, objectives, and provided documents. She noted that the annual agency reports that usually occur at the September Board meeting would be held at the December 2016 Board meeting due to scheduling conflicts with senior agency staff. Cathy directed Board members to the meeting room's back table, where members were encouraged to share additional information that may be useful to HAB work. Finally, she also encouraged Board members to stay for a Board photo following the close of the first day of the meeting.

Steve led new Board members in a round of introductions. He reminded new Board members that their second orientation session was tentatively planned in conjunction with November committee meetings. New members attended an initial orientation session in August 2016.

Steve confirmed the adoption of the June 2016 Board meeting summary. He encouraged HAB members to continue reviewing future meeting summaries and providing edits or clarifications to the facilitation team as appropriate and within the designated timeframe.

Announcements

Shannon Cram, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington, noted that the Hanford History Partnership from Washington State University Tri-Cities is seeking oral histories from people who have connections to the Hanford Site. She said that additional information was provided on the back table for interested Board members and meeting attendees.

Draft Advice: 100 D/H Proposed Plan

Dale Engstrom, Oregon Department of Energy and issue manager, introduced draft advice on the 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan¹ to members of the Board. Dale noted that HAB members had previously reviewed a draft of the advice on the 100 D/H Proposed Plan at the February 2016 Board meeting. He reminded Board members that, if approved, the 100 D/H Proposed Plan advice would be provided to DOE as input during the official public comment period for the Rev 0 version of the document.

Dale highlighted that, overall, the advice was generally supportive of the alternatives analysis completed within the Proposed Plan, and that members were most supportive of Alternative 3 (the preferred alternative). He noted that Alternative 3 includes Remove, Treat, and Dispose (RTD) strategies for remediation of remaining waste sites contaminated with hexavalent chromium, as well as enhanced pump-and-treat for groundwater remediation coupled with additional monitoring wells to track cleanup progress. Dale also highlighted the success of the “big dig” efforts that helped to address large plumes of hexavalent chromium contamination.

Dale said that the draft advice also highlighted Board concern with several parts of the Proposed Plan. First, he noted that Plan should ensure that reinjected groundwater not contain concentrations of co-extracted, non-chromium contaminants, like strontium-90, at levels higher than drinking water standards. Second, the draft advice encouraged the Proposed Plan to account for updated Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) freshwater sediment standards when planning for remediation goals for river sediments in the River Corridor. Finally, Dale noted that the advice called out seven deep decision units (waste sites more than fifteen feet below the ground surface) with isotope concentrations that exceed risk levels, noting that length of time required for isotope decay is too long for institutional controls (IC, e.g. fences, policy measures) to be an effective remediation strategy.

Agency Perspectives

Steve Balone, DOE Richland Operations Office (RL), was appreciative of Board member’s efforts in drafting the 100 D/H Proposed Plan advice. He thanked members for their efforts and noted that he was available to answer questions and provide any necessary clarifications.

Regulator Perspectives

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noted that there are approximately 300 waste sites within the 100 D/H Area that had already been cleaned up under interim actions. Dennis said that, under current exposure scenarios, the compliance point for remediation depth is 15 feet (meaning that contaminants below 15 feet of depth are considered safe to leave in place unless they could impact ground water). Dennis stated that, for this reason, the Proposed Plan did not highlight remediation alternatives for the seven noted deep decision units. Dennis said that, if the Board were interested in seeing deep decision units remediated, DOE would utilize RTD strategies.

Attachment 1: Hanford Advisory Board Draft Advice, Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 100-DR-1, 100-DR-2, 100-HR-1, 100-HR-2, and 100-HR-3 Operable Units

Nina Menard, Ecology, noted that Ecology is pleased with the 100 D/H Proposed Plan. She stated that additional evaluation of the deep waste sites could be considered in the Record of Decision (ROD) for the 100 D/H Area if the Board feels that remediation of these sites is important. She also noted that the point advising that re-injected groundwater not contain contaminant levels exceeding standards was a good consideration to include.

Board member questions and responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. There appears to be an upward trend in the length of time considered to be acceptable for monitored natural attenuation and ICs—the State of Oregon feels that the time frames included within the 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan (112-187 years) are too long. As cleanup continues at Hanford, the Board needs to be cautious of these lengthening time frames for cleanup.

Q. Regarding strontium-90—no alternatives actually remove it from the groundwater. Why are the timeframes for remediation of strontium-90 so different between the different alternatives included within the Proposed Plan? What about nitrate?

R. [Ecology] Pumping groundwater at different rates dilutes strontium-90. As groundwater is moved through the pump-and-treat facility, trace amounts of strontium-90 are picked up and redistributed throughout the aquifer. As the strontium-90 moves around, it becomes less concentrated. Alternative 3 is the fastest remediation time for strontium-90 because it is the alternative that has the most wells. Nitrate is not removed by any alternative, either; it is also diluted and redistributed at different rates.

C. In the first advice bullet, “drinking water standards” and “screening levels” should be changed to “maximum contaminant level goals” (MCLG) to better reflect Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) language.

Q. DOE orders require that a performance assessment be completed whenever materials are left in the ground. This performance assessment helps to determine whether contaminants will impact public health or groundwater quality. Has a performance assessment been completed for deep decision units where isotope concentrations exceed the risk level? It seems like leaving this material in place does not comply with DOE orders.

R. [EPA] There was a CERCLA risk assessment conducted, not a performance assessment. DOE would likely say that the risk assessment meets the intent of the agency’s internal orders. Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies know that these isotopes will not impact groundwater. Under current exposure scenarios, materials will not be brought aboveground provided that ICs are enforced. These contaminants would only pose a risk if they were brought to the surface, and ICs will stop this from occurring.

Q. When were the applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) for the cleanup action developed? The CERCLA process is linear, how can new ARARs be added at the end of the process?

R. [EPA] Original ARARs were developed in the 1990s, and the final ARARs will be adopted when the ROD is signed in a few weeks. With regard to adding a new ARAR (the new Ecology sediment standards could qualify as an ARAR, for example)—if any new standards are applicable, they would become part of this decision moving forward. The ROD will memorialize the most up-to-date standards.

R. [Ecology] Ecology is reevaluating all ARARs to ensure that the most up-to-date versions are included in the ROD. The new sediment standards will be incorporated.

C. There is some Board member concern regarding the performance monitoring not indicating that rebound following pump-and-treat is likely to occur. Hopefully the Board and the public will have opportunities to weigh in on future evaluations and monitoring through CERCLA Five-Year Reviews.

R. [EPA] There will be opportunities to discuss this in the future. One reason that it's not currently applicable is because the process is not there yet. It takes regulators a long time to know that enough is enough—we will not look only at a short rebound time.

Q. What are the use implications of the deep decision units? These are areas where wells cannot be drilled for an extended period?

R. [EPA] Yes, this is correct. For the seven deep decision units, no wells, pits, etc. may be excavated—any activities that would impact the deep contamination are not allowed.

C. Tribal use scenarios indicate that there is a loss of traditional cultural use of the property. There are many resources that cannot be used by tribal members once the Hanford Site is remediated. Tribes may be able to visit the lands, but traditional uses are limited. Approximately 50% of the cancer risk comes from hexavalent chromium—this should be removed to protect human and river health. More data is also needed on the low-level polychlorinated biphenyl contamination that has been discovered across the site.

C. River and Plateau Committee (RAP) members did not call out the adjacent orchard lands, which are contaminated with lead and arsenic, in this advice. What is the plan for cleanup of this area?

R. [Ecology] The orchard lands sit within the 100 Area outside of the various Operable Units (OU) that are associated with the reactor areas; therefore, DOE has classified the orchard lands as a distinct OU (100-OL-1). Ecology approved a work plan that will allow DOE to develop the conceptual site model to determine how widespread the lead and arsenic contamination is (this includes areas inside of the 100 D/H OUs). This will move to a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) and a Proposed Plan that the Board and the public will have the opportunity to review. The field work on this was completed in summer 2016, and DOE is working to put together the RI/FS. DOE believes that they can have a copy to Ecology for review in spring 2017. Beyond that point in the process, the timeline is still unclear.

Q. Arsenic was used throughout the Columbia River Valley as a pesticide for orchards. Why is DOE responsible for the cleanup of this contaminant?

R. [EPA] The Hanford Site is on the EPA national priority list. Therefore, DOE is responsible to mitigate any risk on-site, regardless of its source. DOE could, in turn, go after the entity that is responsible for applying the arsenic pesticides.

C. Why is the exposure scenario based on the subsistence farmer scenario as opposed to a tribal use scenario?

R. [EPA] One reason TPA agencies are using a subsistence farmer scenario is because there was no tribal use scenario when the original RODs were issued. The subsistence farmer scenario was chosen in order to restore the land to its use at the time of the Hanford Site's development, and it is relatively conservative as far as remediation goes.

Q. Are there any cost estimates for digging up deep decision unit contaminants and disposing of them?

R. [EPA] it is very expensive to dig down so deeply (20-40 feet). More specific information is not available at this time, but EPA could work to pull together a rough estimate.

C. At this month's Public Involvement and Communications Committee meeting, there was a proposal to add additional background and an advice point that encourages the TPA agencies to work with the Board and the public to produce clear engagement materials that help to set the context for effective involvement. This information is important, especially along the River Corridor, where so many waste sites have been remediated as interim actions.

Board members added the advice bullet highlighting the need for effective public informational materials. Board members also decided to change "drinking water standards" to "MCLGs," and wished to remove references to decommissioning pump-and-treat operations once contaminant rebound seems unlikely. Additional minor wording changes were also incorporated.

Following the incorporation of agreed upon revisions and minor wording changes, the Board approved the advice. Members agreed to send the advice to local TPA agency managers.

Roles and Responsibilities of Effective Board Members

Steve, Susan Leckband, Washington League of Women Voters, and Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, provided Board members with a brief presentation² on strategies for performing Board duties productively and effectively.

Susan provided a brief history on the makeup of the Board, underscoring that it is a Board represented by diverse interests invested in Hanford Site cleanup, as stipulated by FACA. She also stressed the importance of the HAB's consensus-driven decision-making process. Susan stated that as the Board

Attachment 2: Hanford Advisory Board Roles & Responsibilities (presentation)

works to achieve consensus, it challenges all members to continually strive for common ground. It also provides all voices with equal weight and value.

Steve elaborated on the HAB's consensus model, noting that other EM SSABs are voting boards, where each member is given an up or a down vote on issues. He identified that the consensus model often presents challenges to reaching agreement; however, he noted that HAB members repeatedly demonstrate the ability to overcome differences in opinion by remaining open and educated. Steve encouraged all HAB members to consider getting involved in committee work, volunteering as an issue manager, and reviewing meeting summaries and other Board products.

Steve also encouraged Board members to continually share information and expertise with one another. He identified loss of knowledge and experience as a potential hurdle that the Board may face in the coming years, and he was hopeful that Board members could work to share their perspectives and knowledge and recruit new volunteers for the Board.

Liz encouraged HAB members to consider their own experiences with the Board and to share responses to the following questions:

- What does it mean to you to be an effective Board member?
- What lessons learned can you share that has helped you to be actively engaged with the Board and its activities?

In response to the posed questions, Board members identified the following strategies, practices, and lessons-learned:

- Get involved with constituencies—share information with them and bring their perspectives back to the Board
- Get involved in HAB committee meetings and add your voice to the committee process
- Build relationships with other HAB members
- Volunteer as an issue manager and draft a Board product
- Do not be discouraged if committee and Board members alter your advice or products during the review cycle
- Ask questions of fellow Board members and agency staff
- Do not advocate for a position at the expense of facts
- Respect the views of other Board members, the constituencies that they represent, and the topics that are most important to them

Steve thanked Board members for their insights into Board processes. He encouraged HAB members to continue working together in the coming years to share information and develop consensus-based products and advice.

Board and Committee Reports

Board and committee leadership provided annual reports, focusing on work that the committees have accomplished in the past year in addition to upcoming events and anticipated products.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee

Becky Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council and Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) chair, said that the committee worked in FY 2016 to draft HAB Advice #285, which advised DOE to make transportation infrastructure improvements. The committee also tracked safety culture at Hanford in conjunction with the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) and supported a sounding board on the topic at the June 2016 Board meeting.

Becky was hopeful that the HSEP committee could connect soon to follow up on the results of the June 2016 HAB sounding board on safety culture, consider tank farm vapor mitigation, and receive an update on the corrective action plan for the Beryllium program.

Budgets and Contracts Committee

Don Bouchey, Tri-City Development Council and Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) vice chair, said that the committee had worked in FY 2016 to draft HAB Advice #288 on the FY 2017 budget and the FY 2018 budget input request and HAB Advice #289 on the Office of Hanford Acquisition's Master Acquisition Plan.

Don noted that BCC members will hold a call on October 11, 2016 to discuss the potential need for authoring a letter to follow up on budget priorities for FY 2018 initially called out in HAB Advice #288. The committee will also plan to review the anticipated DOE response to HAB Advice #289 and check on the status of the draft Master Acquisition Plan.

Public Involvement and Communications Committee

Liz Mattson, Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC) chair, said that the PIC committee recently met to discuss re-adding public involvement language into the draft advice on the 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan, as well as looking at potential needs for advice on planned State of the Site meetings and overall TPA public involvement strategies.

Liz said that PIC members would likely convene on December 6, 2016 for a full-day meeting. To plan for this meeting and to clarify the potential need for advice and resulting issue manager work, PIC members will hold a call on September 28, 2016 (with the potential for additional issue manager calls, as needed).

Liz noted that she was interested in potentially changing the PIC call placeholder time to allow for greater committee member participation.

Tank Waste Committee

Bob Suyama, Benton County and TWC chair, said that committee members worked in FY 2016 to author two extensive white papers on cesium management and disposition and the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) communication approach. In addition, recent TWC meetings looked at vapor monitoring technology, tank integrity, WTP technical issue resolution, and the planned Effluent Management Facility (to support the Direct-Feed Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System).

Bob said that TWC members planned to convene with HSEP members on October 5 for a morning site tour on tank vapor monitoring technologies and an afternoon committee meeting to discuss streamlining regulatory and permitting processes and to frame future critical infrastructure discussions.

River and Plateau Committee

Jan Catrell, Public-at-Large and RAP vice chair, said that the committee has recently been working to draft the adopted advice regarding the 100 D/H Area Proposed Plan. She noted that the committee has also been involved in authoring HAB Advice #287 regarding the Central Plateau Milestone Series Change Package. Jan also said that RAP is tracking the 324 Building remediation, and noted that members took a site tour in June 2016.

Jan said that RAP planned to meet on October 4 to receive updates on demolition efforts at the Plutonium Finishing Plant, groundwater remediation, Washington Closure Hanford's contract, PW 1/3/6, and the 324 Building.

Executive Issues Committee

Steve said that the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) meets monthly to ensure that HAB meetings are coordinated effectively and to strategize effective communication strategies. He said that EIC members examine the need for different ways for Board members to provide feedback to the TPA agencies (such as white papers, letters, and sounding boards).

Steve noted that the planned internship that the Board was trying to coordinate with Washington State University had not gained any traction and would not be pursued further.

Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board

Steve and Susan provided Board members with highlights from the recent EM SSAB chairs' meeting, held in August 2016 in Las Vegas, Nevada. Steve said that Monica Regalbuto, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, shared with chairs her vision for what she hoped SSABs would be able to produce in the coming years. Steve noted that Assistant Secretary Regalbuto was interested in seeing boards produce more information that is useful and accessible to constituents and other members of the community. Other topics covered at the recent chairs' meeting include the role of advisory boards with respect to a loss in site institutional knowledge as well as procuring adequate funding for risk reduction.

Steve provided an update on New Mexico's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). He noted that WIPP would remain closed to accepting new waste for quite a while, as DOE was proceeding very cautiously.

Susan also noted that she requested additional information from DOE staff regarding potential safety enhancements that could be garnered by reclassifying nuclear waste based on its radioactivity resulting in clearer, safer remediation and disposition. She noted that DOE staff said that it likely would not; however, the nuclear energy component of DOE is looking into potential strategies for changing policy to reclassify waste based on what it is instead of how it is produced.

Susan also went into detail about the recent DOE EM restructure, and she noted that the reorganization is likely a very good thing for EM sites across the country. Susan noted that Stacy Charboneau, former Manager of RL, is now in charge of all fieldwork operations across the EM complex.

Susan closed by noting that the EM SSAB chairs will meet at Hanford in fall 2017.

Board member questions and responses

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The DOE response to HAB Advice #288 was disappointing. The response made claims that were so generalized that they were inaccurate. BCC members should plan to follow up on the response and request additional detail and clarity in a follow-up response.

C. HAB Advice #288 was formatted in exactly the way that the EM SSAB requested from individual boards. Congratulations to BCC members for creating a very useful piece of advice. Because of the White House Administration change that is upcoming, DOE will not plan to forward a budget request to the U.S. Office of Management and Budget until after Inauguration Day. Therefore, there is anticipated to be a Continuing Resolution in the interim.

Q. There are trenches underneath the Plutonium Finishing Plant that are contaminated with plutonium and americium. What will happen to this contamination following the PFP being demolished to slab-on-grade?

R. [EPA] The current TPA milestones only call for PFP to be demolished to slab-on-grade. The sub-grade structures will be rolled into the 200-WA-1 OU, and the agencies will talk about this contamination more as the RI/FS Work Plans are completed.

C. It is likely that DOE will eventually have to actively ventilate all tanks to ensure effective mitigation of tank vapors. In addition, DOE will eventually have to construct new double-shell tanks for the interim storage of waste as it awaits treatment and disposal.

Public Comment

Kristin McNall provided comment. She invited Board meeting attendees to the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board meeting in The Dalles, Oregon, on September 26 and 27. She highlighted that the meeting would include TPA agency briefings on the Plutonium Finishing Plant status, Hanford Site groundwater remediation, and an 11-year retrospective on the work of Washington Closure Hanford as planned agenda highlights.

Board Business

Board member questions and responses below reflect individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

HAB Fiscal Year 2017 Work Plan

Steve requested the Board members review the HAB's FY 2017 Work Plan³, developed in conjunction with TPA agencies at the Board's Leadership Workshop and first presented to Board members in June 2016, and approve it.

C. Can the words "Risk-based" be removed from the title and framing of the "Risk Based Tank Waste Retrieval, Treatment, and Closure" topic? As conceptualized, it is challenging for TWC members to know how they can best offer input on this topic through a white paper. EIC members have discussed this issue—it is challenging for the Board to weigh in on risk-based retrieval which is governed by laws and regulatory agencies.

C. For HAB white papers, the Board should have the ability to turn out advice, a letter, or a white paper—whatever product format is most appropriate for the topic and the committee's findings.

R. The EIC has discussed this, and the outcome of those discussions have been that the flexibility of products is acceptable so long as the committee is balancing the needs and agency expectations that are encompassed within the topic.

C. The scope of the HSEP committee is very small; nearly all of the committee's topics are in the work plan "holding bin." The committee may be interested in authoring a letter that will appeal for the HSEP committee's ability to discuss important cleanup issues such as tank vapors.

R. The challenge for HSEP committee members is to carve out a scope within each of the holding bin topics that keeps discussions outside of any ongoing litigation (e.g. tank vapors). Once the committee is able to connect and accomplish this framing, it is likely that the topics can be elevated.

Board members approved the FY 2017 HAB Work Plan incorporating minor changes.

Attachment 3: Hanford Advisory Board Draft Fiscal Year 2017 Work Plan (updated 8/31/2016)

HAB Fiscal Year 2017 Calendar

Steve requested the Board members review the HAB's FY 2017 Calendar⁴, developed in conjunction with TPA agencies at the Board's Leadership Workshop and first presented to Board members in June 2016, and approve the timing of Board meeting, committee meeting, and committee call placeholder days.

Board members identified that the proposed dates for committee meetings in November 2016 fell over Election Day; therefore, members decided to adjust placeholder dates to November 1-3.

Board members noted frustration that there were only four scheduled Board meetings in FY 2017, due to increased funding constraints. Members of the EIC expressed interest in authoring advice or a letter to highlight the benefits that the HAB provides to the TPA agencies and request adequate funding from DOE in future years to convene at least five Board meetings. Board members discussed the importance of convening regular meetings and making them accessible to members of the public by planning for a diversity of meeting times and places. Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper, Bob Suyama, Benton County, Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, and Emmitt Jackson, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, agreed to participate in advice development as issue managers.

Board members noted interest in holding a Board meeting outside of the Tri-Cities in FY 2017, noting that this was a potential exchange for having four Board meetings instead of five. Members identified that they would like the March 2017 Board meeting to be held in Hood River, Oregon and for the first day to be an evening meeting to facilitate public attendance. Members requested that the FY 2017 Calendar be updated with a footnote underscoring the potential plans for a regional meeting.

Board members incorporated the change in November 2016 committee meeting dates and provisionally adopted the FY 2017 HAB Calendar, pending additional information regarding the potential to hold a regional meeting in March 2017.

Emmett Moore, Washington State University, noted that he abstained from provisionally adopting the FY 2017 Calendar.

Revision to HAB Operating Ground Rules

Bob Suyama, Benton County, provided Board members with a brief presentation⁵ highlighting language within the Board's Operating Ground Rules and the Board's Process Manual that stipulate term limits for Board leadership. Bob noted that David Borak, DFO of the EM SSAB, identified, in conversations with EIC members at the May 2016 HAB Leadership Workshop, that FACA does not stipulate term limits. Given this guidance, the EIC proposed that all language referencing term limits be removed from the HAB Operating Ground Rules.

Attachment 4: Hanford Advisory Board Draft Fiscal Year 2017 Calendar (May 2016)

Attachment 5: Proposed Changes to Remove HAB Leadership Term Limit Restrictions and References

Board members reviewed suggested changes to the HAB Operating Ground Rules and approved of the removal of all term limit language. To update the HAB Operating Ground Rules with this new language, Steve authored a letter to David Borak requesting specific language updates for his review and approval.

Cathy said that the HAB process manual will be reflected to incorporate the changes.

Board members wished to discuss the potential for extending committee chair and vice-chair positions to two-year terms. EIC members planned to track this issue in the coming months.

Review of HAB leadership and national liaison nomination process

Cathy McCague, facilitator, provided Board members with an overview of the upcoming HAB leadership nomination process⁶. Cathy reminded Board members that three positions—chair, vice chair, and national liaison—would be up for a two-year term that would begin in March 2017. Election of the national liaison and board vice chair were planned for the December 2016 Board meeting. Cathy also called attention to the removal of term limit language that the Board approved earlier in the meeting.

Cathy continued, noting that the HAB members would also select a chair for a two-year term. This individual could be selected from within the Board member ranks, or it could be an outsider. At the December 2016 Board meeting, HAB members will select a candidate to be Board chair and then forward this recommendation onward to the TPA agencies per approval, as stipulated by FACA rules.

Finally, Cathy encouraged interested Board members to volunteer for the nominating committee. She noted that these members would coordinate the collection of information from and reviews the statement of interest from each of the nominees. Cathy noted that Board members would see additional information released in the coming weeks, but that interested nominees would need to submit all materials by November 16, 2016.

Preliminary December 2016 Board meeting topics

Cathy reviewed the following tentative meeting topics for the December 2016 Board meeting:

- Annual agency program reports
- Update on the 2016 DOE Grand Challenge
- Review of the Consent Decree
- Potential advice on the planned 2017 State of the Site meetings
- Potential advice on the funding for and frequency of HAB meetings
- Revisit the provisionally adopted FY 2017 HAB calendar for Board approval
- Committee reports

Attachment 6: HAB Leadership Nomination process (presentation)

- Review of nominees and election of Board chair, vice chair, and national liaison

Closing Remarks

Steve thanked Board members for their attendance, thoughts, and decisions. The meeting was adjourned.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Hanford Advisory Board Draft Advice, Proposed Plan for Remediation of the 100-DR-1, 100-DR-2, 100-HR-1, 100-HR-2, and 100-HR-3 Operable Units

Attachment 2: Hanford Advisory Board Roles & Responsibilities (presentation)

Attachment 3: Hanford Advisory Board Draft Fiscal Year 2017 Work Plan (updated 8/31/2016)

Attachment 4: Hanford Advisory Board Draft Fiscal Year 2017 Calendar (May 2016)

Attachment 5: Proposed Changes to Remove HAB Leadership Term Limit Restrictions and References

Attachment 6: HAB Leadership Nomination process (presentation)

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Antone Brooks, Member	Floyd Hodges, Member	Stephen Metzger, Member
Don Bouchey, Member	Becky Holland, Member	Ken Niles, Member
Jan Catrell, Member	Steve Hudson, Member	Bob Parks, Member
Shelley Cimon, Member	Gregory Korshin, Member	Bob Suyama, Member
Alissa Cordner, Member	Susan Leckband, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member
Sam Dechter, Member	Liz Mattson, Member	
Gary Garnant, Member	Kristen McNall, Member	
David Bernhard, Alternate	Dale Engstrom, Alternate (phone)	Alex Nazarali, Alternate
Richard Bloom, Alternate	Charles Johnson, Alternate	Vince Panesko, Alternate
Mike Bosse, Alternate	Mike Korenko, Alternate	Tony Umek, Alternate
Amoret Bunn, Alternate	Phil Lemley, Alternate	Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Garry Busselman, Alternate	Rudy Mendoza, Alternate	Steve Wiegman, Alternate
Shannon Cram, Alternate	Emmett Moore, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Steve Balone, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Jennifer Copeland, CHPRC
Kristen Holmes, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Dieter Bohrmann, North Wind/DOE-ORP
Kyle Rankin, DOE-RL	Randy Bradbury, Ecology	Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues
Dawn MacDonald, DOE-ORP	Nina Menard, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Alex Teimouri, DOE-EM	Tom Rodgers, WDOH	Brett Watson, EnviroIssues

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Patrick Conrad	Kristen McNall	Casey Mitchell, Nez Perce Tribe
Shintaro Ito, PNNL	Patrick Mills, CTUIR	Mark Morrow, UA598

List of Acronyms

ARAR – applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements

BCC – (HAB) Budgets and Contracts Committee

Board – Hanford Advisory Board

CERCLA – Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

DFO – Designated Federal Officer

DOE – U.S. Department of Energy

Ecology – Washington Department of Ecology

EIC – (HAB) Executive Issues Committee

EM – (DOE) Office of Environmental Management

EM SSAB – Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board

EPA – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

FACA – Federal Advisory Committee Act

FY – Fiscal Year

HAB – Hanford Advisory Board

HSEP – (HAB) Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee

IC – Institutional Control

ORP – DOE Office of River Protection

PFP – Plutonium Finishing Plant

PIC – (HAB) Public Involvement and Communications Committee

RAP – (HAB) River and Plateau Committee

RL – DOE Richland Operations Office

ROD – Record of Decision

RTD – Remove, treat, and dispose

TWC – (HAB) Tank Waste Committee

WTP – Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant