



MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
River and Plateau (RAP) Committee Meeting
January 7, 2020
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary	
Opening.....	2
Workforce Planning and Development Draft Advice.....	2
Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Cleanup Priority Draft Advice.....	4
324 Building Status Update.....	6
Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF).....	8
Open Forum.....	10
Committee Business and Wrap Up.....	10
Attachments.....	11
Attendees.....	11

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

Opening

Jan Catrell, Public-at-Large and RAP chair, welcomed meeting participants and invited those in the meeting room and those on the conference phone to introduce themselves.

Approval of September, October, and November 2019 RAP Meeting Summaries

Before asking for formal approval of the three meeting summaries, Jan Catrell initiated a discussion of how the summaries are used, how much detail should be included in the summaries, and the length of the process for getting the drafts to committees for approval. General comments and concerns from the group included:

- How much of committee conversations should be transcribed in the summaries verbatim?
- A concern by at least one committee member that it appeared that some additional information had been added to some of the summaries after the meeting that may not have been a part of the meeting. What edits are being made outside of the meeting?
- The desirability (or not) of including copy/paste from presentation slides.
- When it is appropriate to attribute comments from specific people in the meeting?
- How or if to include presentations from committee members and non-Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agency staff that are referenced in the summaries. This question was initially raised specifically in relation to a committee member presentation made at the October RAP meeting.
- Whether or not committee meetings should be audio-recorded.
- The length of time between meetings and when draft summaries are made available to committee members for review. It is taking too long.
- The quality of the meeting summaries.
- Consistency in the format of and depth of information in meeting summaries.

JoLynn Garcia, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) explained that the draft RAP meeting summaries for October and November are still under review by DOE subject matter experts.

The RAP meeting summary for September 2019 was adopted with the specific addition of a dated footnote that clarifies that the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) report cited in the summary is actually a CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) document.

Workforce Planning and Development Draft Advice

Jan Catrell introduced Emmitt Jackson, Non-Union, Non-Management, and Lead Issue Manager for the draft advice on workforce. Emmitt invited questions and comments on the draft advice.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: “Considering there will be contracting transitions, will that be discussed in here?”

R: “This was presented in our discussion for DOE in our last HAB meeting in December. We feel the transitioning of IDIQ [Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity] process is important and how it will affect the future workforce. Part of it is recruiting, retention, aging workforce, and the demographics changing. We think the emphasis and importance of success on committees and work that is going to be done is more important than what is in the contracts.”

Q: "Could you explain in more detail how the draft advice applies to defining how IDIQ will work in actual practice?"

R: "IDIQ process as we understand it, we want DOE to present on how they will transition and how that process works. The IDIQ will be more task oriented and will be a separate company that will administer that process of what happens to current workers benefits, continuity services. We were trying to articulate that this does not need to happen."

Q: "IDIQ as defined means that contracts written with less specificity and special tasks will be sub-contracted?"

R: "It's dependent on what tasks they are trying to accomplish over the year. The overarching model will include some sub-contracted out from overarching contracts."

Q: "How do the advice points [related to the] IDIQ model improve and address some of the issues that we are now discussing?"

R: "One of the things that is happening is there is a reduction in the workforce. When contracts change and we get a new workforce, people get antsy. There is construction that is going on that is required. Who will be doing that as far as skill/labor/workforce? The diversity is low in numbers of people of color, so the workforce is not reflective of those changes."

C: "We are not in the downsizing mode. The budget is growing, and it is not shrinking. The reference to 3116 needs to be minimized and the concern about transition needs to be raised. The IDIQ identifies other pieces of work that isn't fully fleshed out in the proposal."

Q: "Will scope stay inside the fence?"

R: There was no response to this question as the answer was not known at this time.

C: "There is a problem for small contractors and how they keep people stable while you wait for a bid. It is a problem in terms of diversity."

C: "After the COTW [Committee of the Whole], we had a discussion on workforce concern and that is the genesis of writing this advice. DOE adopted the end state contracting approach. At Hanford, we have two contracts that will be part of the end state contracting, because of the end state contracting that will be placed by DOE the structure will be skeletal. The driving force is where we go from here."

C: "Let's keep the workforce moving. I would suggest the second bullet to be drilled in on and get specific about the concern of skill mix and the benefit of pay instead of looking at lessons learned."

R: "Part of the reasons for giving background in some bullets was because DOE asked us to offer suggestions instead of solutions."

C: "For the IIS [Inquiry Into Science] programs, let's add some pages to describe what it was."

Q: "What kind of comments are you looking for, Emmitt?"

R: "Whatever you feel will make this better."

R: “It’s long for advice. Let’s move some discussion to the background and hit on the key points in the advice.”

C: “In addition, I would like to see the graph display percentages and medium incomes for each group.”

R: The Issue Manager lead agreed to look into it.

Fiscal Year (FY) 2022 Cleanup Priority Draft Advice

Jan Catrell introduced Tom Galioto, Public-at-Large, and Lead Issue Manager for the draft advice on FY 2022 cleanup priorities. Tom explained that DOE has raised two concerns regarding the past HAB practice of issuing annual advice on the Hanford budget. First, DOE faces some restrictions about what budget information it can share with people outside the agency. DOE has requested that the HAB refocus on cleanup priorities. Second, DOE has requested that the HAB identify its priorities for cleanup. Historically, the HAB has resisted identifying cleanup priorities because so many things are important and need to be done for Hanford cleanup. DOE has assumed a \$2.5 billion budget for Hanford. Sometimes projects fall “below the line” and do not get funded. Several people on the RAP were concerned about prioritizing cleanup activities. Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy, suggested prioritizing activities in two groups: cleanup activities and supporting activities. This division would keep supporting activities from competing in priority with direct cleanup activities.

Tom Galioto reviewed the background and specific bullets in the advice. He observed that the advice highlights items not identified in The Hanford Site Five Year Plan¹ (also known as “the placemat”). He then invited questions and comments.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

C: “I’m getting serious heartburn over this advice on what to include to DOE’s request. In no way, shape, or form should we be giving up commenting on budgeting itself. It is one of the fundamental things to review the proposal in spring and during the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) meetings. Even if the advice is totally ignored, it is not ignored by Congress and the public, so it shouldn’t be ignored by DOE. This is in response to a request for input on building the budget. Second, as a matter of the law and TPA, there is no embargo in development on sites of the budget request. The only embargo is after the sites send it to headquarters and start reviewing in the executive branch which is after the TPA comment period. We did get to see the exposed list eventually. Third, it is important not to be dropping critical things that support cleanup and public involvement. The advice needs to say funding and expanding the funding. Fourth, it is really important to note that this committee had advice and struggled currently with pushing for much more cleanup. Energy’s plan for cleanup is totally driven by budget.”

C: “This is Dana Gribble; Gerry please submit your membership packet materials.”

C: “Thank you for putting in clear perspective for the prioritization for advice.”

¹ [The Hanford Site 5 Year Plan](#)

Q: "This is such a thoughtful piece of work, and I really want to thank the people who worked on it. Is Advice 302 the matrix?"

R: "This is about the one Gerry had put forward for the BCC [Budgets and Contracts Committee]."

C: "Then absolutely DOE should respond to it."

C: "I have a problem with putting numbers on the priorities. I think there is a work around for this. I would put forward three main points, and we could list items that are not on the placemat that we think are still priorities."

C: "I appreciate this effort and heard not only from Brian Vance and the EM [Environmental Management] too. You guys are making efforts now to get advice before April so that can help us before the budget comes out in April. The embargo piece did occur much late in the process, and one of the ways you have looked at it in the advice is using the new five year planning tool. We did have 2019 listed on there, and the scenarios that were carried over. My hope is to get the advice back from the Board so we can consider it and have public comment where people can contribute individually."

C: "Gerry, I really appreciate your list, and it's so interesting to work on the budget. We need to include those things, and we haven't made a case for those things in the budget. I have and am adamantly opposed to prioritizing. I don't want to see us ever do that because it's implicit that these other things are not important. I like Tom Sicilia's solution a lot. I also think there needs to be more emphasis on bullet A."

C: "I left off that I think the budget advice in Spring should compare the early advice here to what USDOE [U.S. Department of Energy] is proposing with real dollars. If USDOE doesn't share the real dollars, the spring advice can compare to FY 20 request."

Q: "Is that the subtotal of our recommendations for the TWC [Tank Waste Committee] tomorrow?"

Q: "Is this list complete? If you had to pick the top seven what would they be? I'm hearing folks say they do not want to play that game."

R: "I prefer not to do this."

R: "Let's take the numbers out, but something has to be on top."

Q: "What if we divide them up into three categories, then divide based on bundles?"

C: "We should not have bullets under major milestones."

C: "We can have 17 top priorities. Today we should focus on grouping."

C: "I object to prioritization as meaningless. Real life budgeting involves partial funding, whereas our prioritization is a zero-sum game."

C: "We have asked to have input earlier in the budget process, and this is our opportunity. I think three categories is good."

C: “The milestones can change so listing a few top things from the HAB might be a good idea. Just know those things change based on what’s getting completed.”

C: “That’s the trap. If you don’t have something on the list, then it’s not a priority.”

Q: “*What happens if the money in your checkbook doesn’t complete all the milestones that are due?*”

R: “That is why we looked at the 5 year plan to get the key activities done.”

C: “I appreciate the comments. RAP is the first to have a discussion on this, and a lot of people are saying not to prioritize and do not set the stage that we will not comply with DOE.”

Q: “*What about the idea of taking different numbered priorities and lumping together in the heading?*”

R: “I don’t know about the three headings, maybe two. That is us prioritizing for Brian.”

C: “Or you can put as footnote that wasn’t on the initial five-year plan.”

C: “I think it has more weight as its own entity.”

C: “Me too, when I think about characterization from SW-2, very different.”

C: “The TWC can come to their own conclusions.”

C: “Budget information isn’t being referred to as spring budget advice.”

C: “Yes, that was the clear reminder that there is second opportunity for this.”

C: “There is a Tri-Party Agreement requirement for public comment on budget development and submittal. Legal requirement, public relies on us to do this, have been doing this for 25 years. It would be horrible setback to give up our advice on budget.”

324 Building Status Update

Ben Vannah, DOE, provided an update² on the 324 Building.

He began by explaining a contamination incident from November 14th that involved contamination on clothing, face, and neck area most likely due to cross-contamination. The contractor called a stop to the work which DOE supported. Ben further explained that over the past year, there has been a trend of low-level contamination events, about once a month. Even so, 99.9% of workers come out of work clean. The toughest areas are in the airlock and Room 18.

The team is looking at three main areas to prevent future contamination. The 324 building is hard to compare to other places in the DOE complex around the country because Hanford has one of the highest levels of contamination. Even so, DOE is looking at examples from other projects. Worker feedback is an

² [324 Building Status Update](#)

integral part of moving forward, too. At the point where there is a good understanding of why these events are happening and what corrective actions are needed, we anticipate training crews and getting back to work. We believe that work can be started in the February/March timeframe which may impact the TPA milestone by about four months.

The October water sampling results were mainly checking for cesium and strontium. Both are consistent with previous sampling done in the 2010-2014 timeframe, so we are seeing no changes in groundwater.

Theresa Howell, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), expressed Ecology's appreciation of the open communication with DOE and the time taken to ensure that the work is being done safely.

Ben Simes, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noted that EPA was happy with the briefing DOE provided the agency.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: "What kind of low-level contamination are we talking about?"

R: "On their outfit a couple thousand DPM."

Q: "Have you finished drilling the holes?"

R: "No, we have 4 done and 18 left. Our next step is filling in concrete and developing micro piles."

Q: "Room 18 is pretty contaminated, is that from air lock?"

R: "Stuff from the air lock wouldn't move to the Room 18 because they're on different levels. Air lock is contaminated because that's where most of the experiments were brought. They have to do a full body survey before they move to the clean part of the building."

Q: "Have you guys done any looking at the [well number] 399[-4-11] that was demolished before the official confirmation that strontium was announced, and have you done any backtracking on that demolished well?"

R: "The [Sr-90] contamination [detected at 399-4-11] predates 1996 [1986 (the date of the Cs/Sr spill in 324). A Spike of Sr-90 contamination was detected] in the 70s [. Beyond] that don't have too much knowledge on what [the source of the Sr-90] that contamination was."

Q: "Has there been thought of drilling another well?"

R: "If we detect anything on 16 or 15, we would consider it."

Q: "Determine if this is background or if 324 is a big deal."

R: "I would say we have a pretty solid baseline of what the [for what groundwater] contamination is."

C: "I appreciate the open communication and taking the time to close down so work can be done safely."

Q: “Will there be a WIR [Waste Incidental to Reprocessing](#)] for the 324 waste since the contamination is from ground up Cs/Sr [[cesium/strontium](#)] capsules and therefore tank waste?”

R: “A WIR evaluation is not planned for this waste.”

Q: “Can someone talk about where contaminated soil will go?”

R: “We take a sample, and if it’s low enough to ship to ERDF [[Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility](#)] compliantly and safely, we will send it over there. We want to preserve as much space in hot cells as we can. Hot cells themselves will be filled with grout, separated from one another, and shipped to ERDF.”

Q: “How does that affect load for ERDF?”

R: “We will meet the ERDF [[waste](#)] acceptance criteria.”

Q: “If we could get more detailed information about the process for evaluating in what form it will go to ERDF. Will there be a permit modification process for that?”

R: “324 is being taken down under CERCLA [[Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act](#)] and will meet all [[ERDF](#)] waste [[acceptance](#)] criteria which wouldn’t need permit modifications.”

Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF)

Jan Catrell introduced Duane Carter, DOE, to provide an update³ on the IDF permit which is currently being updated from the current permit issued in April 2006. Public comment on this Class 3 permit modification request ends February 14, 2020.

IDF, located on the Central Plateau, is proposing to receive non-tank and low-level waste from various on-site Hanford locations. It consists of two disposal cells with double liners and leak detection, only one of which is currently under permit. In addition to proposing to add the second disposal cell to the permit, the permit modification request also proposes to add a treatment pad and a storage pad. Other improvements to the facility include adding other structures, infrastructure, and facilities that support IDF operations.

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, provided a regulatory perspective on IDF. She explained that Ecology is responsible for the regulatory oversight of the IDF permit. When the original permit was written, they did not have all the information needed to permit IDF to be totally operational. They knew there would have to be a permit modification request in the future, which is what is happening now.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: “Are two cells going to be big enough to handle all of the waste?”

³ [Proposed Class 3 Permit Modification for the Integrated Disposal Facility](#)

R: "Yes, we do have room for expansion."

Q: "How often do you expect to have deliveries?"

R: "We are expecting daily deliveries seven days a week and 1-2 trucks a day."

Q: "Is there secondary contamination in the treatment pad?"

R: "No."

Q: "There's a portion of IDF that's appropriate for glass and a portion that isn't. Is that true and why?"

R: "Currently there is one cell that is approved and one that is not. This permit [modification] request would permit both cells."

C: "I have also heard that the waste needs to be separated."

R: "That comes as more of an operational thing."

C: "Ecology's viewpoint on this is IDF secondary waste needs some mitigation. The mitigation addresses how this can be done. The Performance Assessment (PA) looked at it discreetly. Ultimately in the end, there can be permit conditions and waste acceptance criteria that can be looked at if there is a problem waste stream. Then look at what extra litigation needs to be done."

C: "How much inventory will be in each waste stream? As part of our process whenever there is change in our assumptions, we go back to the PA."

Q: "If the PA is part of the IDF permit, why is it not available for public review as part of the permit? Is there a chapter of the PA that addresses the permit requirements that could be broken out and published?"

R: "No"

C: "There seems to be a disconnect, I think the big PA needs to be a part of the permit."

R: "The permit conditions are in the permit, and they will stay there."

R: "The documents are still being reviewed by headquarters."

Q: "Within the permit, is there a timeline with the waste in place that needs to be covered?"

R: "Once the waste is in place, it is covered."

R: "The amount of soil that's being recycled at ERDF is being reduced."

Q: "It's not a concern with this waste site but it is in ERDF?"

R: "A lot of the dirt that's going to ERDF is from cleanup sites."

Q: "Where are we at with the PA?"

R: "PA has been done we just have to go through the headquarter process."

R: [The permit modification request,] "Ecology will put it out for their 45-day public comment. If there are no major issues, they will permit modification."

Q: "When does the need to be an issue permit by?"

R: “By March 2021.”

A public meeting is scheduled for January 21, 2020 and an opportunity to make public comments into February. Once the comment period has ended, Ecology will look at all the comments collected.

Open Forum

Jan Catrell introduced the topic of Open Forum and members shared their questions and comments.

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

Q: “On the October minutes on page 16 of 18 for the November committee meetings, we had cribs, groundwater update, and the annual report. Someone asked for TPA milestones status for every topic. The Gable Pond was for January, but we are still looking for information on Gable Pond from last summer. Then if we turn to the same document on page 15, we find that Gable Pond was suggested to be on today’s agenda. Even though items have been documented, they are not pushed onto the agendas.”

C: “Every time you have a call there is a topics table.”

Q: “It seems the work plan isn’t something we generate, but the agency approves. Things keep getting pushed back, and now you can see on the work plan how much we have for March. How can we be more effective bringing items to the agenda?”

R: “Maybe there is a way to do bite-sized discussions, so we don’t have to take so much time from other people.”

Q: “What is shovel ready? What would rise to the top and could be up and running if we needed to be?”

R: “There is a proposed plan out.”

C: “Both of the issue manager teams are having a conversation on the 15th.”

C: “The process managers need to tighten things up.”

Q: “How does the budget look for this year?”

R: “The budget is fine. I think we did have some carryover with 18 regular committee meetings. It is possible the full Board for April will be in Seattle.”⁴

Committee Business and Wrap Up

Jan Catrell opened up the topic of Committee Business.

The group noted the following items of interest for the next committee meeting:

- Adoption of October and November 2019 Summaries
- Selection of RAP chair and vice chair
- ERDF

⁴ The week after the RAP meeting, the decision was made to not hold the April HAB meeting in Seattle.

- Canyons Status
- Z Crib Stabilization and Z-9 Crib
- Gable Pond Cap
- DOE Presentation on Water Usage Study in the 300 Area

Committee Member Questions (Q), Responses (R), and Comments (C):

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses.

C: “In March we need to select a committee leadership. This can happen no later than March.”

C: “I want to announce I am happy to be finding a voice in this job. I wanted to also announce my public-at-large role is coming to a close. For me to be in this position at this time would work for my benefit, of course, I would like to continue for another year.” (Jan Catrell)

C: “I want to remind members the membership deadline is coming up. Please check in with Dana or JoLynn.”

C: “I’m concerned with the contract transitions. In early as February, it could be a 60-90-day transition. The outgoing contract dials back a lot of potential hazardous work during that time. Other transition activities will be going on which can influence the process, and we need to be aware of that process.”

C: “This is a potential topic for the full Board in February.”

C: “Maybe we can put together some questions. I would be interested in knowing a percentage of new managers coming into the site and from where.”

C: “In addition to diversity, I would like to see about the aging workforce.”

Attachments

Attachment 1: The Hanford Site 5 Year Plan

Attachment 2: 324 Building Status Update

Attachment 3: Proposed Class 3 Permit Modification for the Integrated Disposal Facility

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Chuck Torelli, Member	Jan Catrell, Member	Tom Sicilia, Alternate
Tom Galioto, Member	Shelley Cimon, Member	Bob Suyama, Member
Charlie Kronvall, Alternate	Emmitt Jackson, Member	Marissa Merker, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Ken Niles, Member (Phone)	Gerry Pollet, Alternate (Phone)
Liz Mattson, Member (Phone)	Jeff Burrigh, Member (Phone)	

Others:

James Lynch, DOE	Tim Proctor, Value Added Solutions	Tom Rogers, WA-DOH
JoLynn Garcia, DOE	Dieter Bohrmann, CHPRC	Ginger Wireman, Ecology
Lindsay Strasser, Northwind	Emy Laija, EPA (Phone)	Dana Gribble, MSA (Phone)
Theresa Howell, Ecology	Ben Vannah, DOE	Ryan Miller, Ecology
Tom Teynor, DOE	Kelsey Shank, Public (Phone)	Cigdeen Capan, Public
Ben Simes, EPA (Phone)	Theresa Bergman, CHPRC (Phone)	Mark Beck, Public
Linda Maiden, Public (Phone)	David Boothroyd, Public	Jasmine Martinez, Facilitation Team
Ashley Herring, Facilitation Team	Ruth Nicholson, Facilitator	Jennifer Colborn, MSA