



MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB)
River and Plateau (RAP) Committee Meeting**

September 22, 2020

Virtual Meeting via Teleconference and GoToMeeting

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 2

B Plant..... 2

Committee Business..... 3

B Plant Advice 4

Attachment..... 6

Attendees 6

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.

The RAP committee adopted the meeting summary for its May 2020 virtual meeting.

Jim Lynch, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), announced that Stan Branch, DOE, will be assuming the role of Deputy Designated Federal Officer (DDFO) for the HAB at the October full Board meeting. He also introduced Gary Younger, DOE, who has replaced JoLynn Garcia, DOE, as the Federal Coordinator for the HAB.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) staff have been informed that they will be teleworking through June or July 2021.

B Plant

Patty Ensign, DOE, provided the committee with an overview of the B Plant project in the 200 East Area of the Hanford Site. It is the last Canyon facility for which DOE is pursuing removal action. The current removal action is based on an Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) that outlines three alternatives. Major objectives of the project are to reduce potential threats from radioactive substances, minimizing damage to wildlife, and reduce surveillance and maintenance costs. DOE wants to perform this activity as a non-time-critical action.

The first alternative is the “no action” alternative and provides a point of comparison for the two action alternatives. Alternative 2 provides for surveillance and maintenance of B Plant structures, hazard abatement for the 221B Building, and demolition and grouting of the 291B Building ventilation system. Alternative 3 includes the three components of Alternative 2 with the addition of demolition preparation of the 221B Building.

The EE/CA concludes that Alternative 3 is preferred because it is both technically and administratively feasible, supports future remedial decisions, and provides the best combination of activities to protect workers, the public, and the environment.

One of the concerns Patty has heard from HAB members concerns the 291B Retired Ventilation system. She clarified that the proposed grouting would prevent the possibility of the structure collapsing. It would also provide a more stable structure as the remedial action continues. It is consistent with future planning.

The public comment period for this project ends on October 14, 2020.

Regulatory Perspectives

Craig Cameron, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), explained that his role is one of a supporting role for Ecology. He noted that there are a number of situations at Hanford that involve grout. He expressed concern that the air filter bags appear to be over the Class C standard, and they cannot be disposed of at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) under the current waste acceptance criteria. Some high-level agreements would need to be made between the Tri-Party Agreement

(TPA) agencies if the grout were to be left in place. Craig emphasized that we do need risk reduction in the Canyons, especially if remedial actions cannot occur right away.

John Temple, Ecology, agreed with Craig that Ecology is also concerned that the waste is greater than Class C and should be re-characterized.

Committee Discussion

In response to committee member questions about structural risk and available documents, Patty clarified that there was a potential structural risk at B Plant, but there has not been a structural risk evaluation or review, so those documents are unavailable.

Another committee member concern was about the need for grout when gravel could also be a possibility. Patty expressed her appreciation for the comment and indicated DOE would take that into consideration. The conversation regarding grout continued with members expressing concern about the timeline, how it fits in with characterization work, and if grouting would result in DOE deciding in the future to just leave it there without further remedial and removal work. Patty clarified that grouting would not preclude future characterization.

In responding to committee questions about the EE/CA and the future Record of Decision (ROD) for the final remedial action, Patty explained that an EE/CA action memorandum allows DOE to remove hazards without precluding a final remedy selection. The final decision document for remedial action under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) is a ROD that is the result of the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS). The trigger for the EE/CA was the realization that surveillance and maintenance costs were increasing, work was being deferred, and the threats and hazards at B Plant needed to be minimized until the final work could occur. The characterization would go along with the removal action.

More questions were raised by committee members regarding the air filters and grouting. Members were concerned that grouting did not make sense. DOE staff explained that in the 291B Building, they are trying to stabilize the structure, not just the air filters.

In response to additional questions about the timing and sequencing of the work, Craig Cameron explained that an EE/CA is like an abbreviated form of a Record of Decision. The analysis requires EPA approval at some point. The timing is unclear as to how fast or aggressive the removal action will be.

Committee Business

The committee discussed the recent Leadership Workshop and the HAB work plan and calendar which were the products of that meeting. The question was asked that about reconciling the topics in the HAB work plan with the list of topics that RAP has requested. Are the TPA agencies prepared to support the topics that RAP has requested? Jim Lynch, DOE, explained that there was a lot planned last year, they did not get through everything, and some priorities have changed. Going forward, committee agendas will include time to look at future meetings and requested topics.

Nominations for HAB leadership are now open for HAB chair, HAB vice chair, and national liaison. The process is that the HAB makes its selections at the last full Board meeting of the calendar year, and the new leadership are seated in their new roles at the first HAB meeting of the next calendar year. In this case, elections will be at the December HAB meeting, and the new leadership will assume their roles at the March HAB meeting.

The HAB membership package to appoint returning and new members is still working its way through the DOE-Headquarters approval process.

Committee members identified a number of topics of interest for the RAP work plan:

- Canyon facilities, including the order in which they will be demolished
- Greater than Class C waste and its final disposition
- Waste Encapsulation Storage Facility (WESF)
- Technical Impracticability for iodine on the Central Plateau
- 324 Building
- Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) below grade, demolition status, slab sampling status, grouting status
- T Plant
- Status of TPA agency responses to HAB advice
- Update on uranium sequestration and flushing
- ERDF and clean fill issue
- Budgetary impacts on River and Plateau work (joint topic with the HAB Budgets and Contracts Committee)
- 300 Area
- Orphaned waste

B Plant Advice

The goal was to have the draft advice on B Plant ready for consideration at the October HAB meeting.

The committee discussed a number of issues related to the draft advice from the Issue Manager team. Key areas of concern included:

- The apparent lack of documentation of any structural risk or risk of liquids leaking from the piping in the plant that would support use of a removal action

- Justification for the use of grout
- Potential conflicts as regards to characterization because demolition would require strict controls over access to the area and suspend other work, such as characterization and investigation
- Confusion over the timeline for characterization and how a decision to grout could be made before knowing contamination levels
- Concern that use of grout would stop any chance of remediation
- Writing the draft advice so that new HAB members would understand the issues and concerns
- Evaluation of how the filters, which are likely Greater Than Class C or High-Level Waste, will be removed and disposed
- The confusion resulting from related but separate decisions with regards to communicating with the public so that it understands and can comment on the proposed actions

The committee revised the wording in the draft advice and came to consensus that it was ready to send on to the full Board in October.

Attachment

Attachment 1: [EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis on Proposed B Plant Complex Removal Action](#)

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates:

Jan Catrell, Member	Pam Larsen, Member	Marissa Merker, Alternate
Shelley Cimon, Member	Liz Mattson, Member	Vince Panesko, Alternate
Tom Galioto, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Gerry Pollet, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member		Tom Sicilia, Alternate

Others:

Patty Ensign, DOE	Lindsay Strasser, AttainX	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald
Jim Lynch, DOE	Dieter Bohrmann, CHPRC	Wayne Barber, Weapons Complex Monitor
Gary Younger, DOE-ORP	Bob Capell, CHPRC	Frank Carleo
Theresa Howell, Ecology	Coleen Drinkard, MSA	Larry Haler
Ryan Miller, Ecology	Ashley Herring, ProSidian	Andy Wiborg
John Temple, Ecology	Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, ProSidian	
Bridget Weese, Ecology		
Craig Cameron, EPA		
Emy Laija, EPA		
Tom Rogers, DOH		