

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

*February 7 – 8, 2008*

*Pasco, WA*

**Topics in This Meeting Summary**

Executive Summary..... 1  
Welcome, Introductions and Announcements ..... 3  
September and November Meeting Summaries ..... 4  
Draft Letter to Jim Rispoli, DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management ..... 4  
2007 Annual Report and Board Self-Evaluation ..... 6  
Board Process Manual..... 7  
Tri-Party Agency Public Involvement Strategy..... 8  
Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System Update..... 11  
Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) Update ..... 13  
Board Budget..... 15  
FY 2009 Budget Appropriation..... 17  
Site Specific Advisory Board Update..... 19  
Agency Updates ..... 19  
Committee Reports..... 22  
Public Comment ..... 24  
Board Business ..... 24

*This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.*

**Executive Summary**

**Board Action**

The Board adopted a letter to Jim Rispoli, Department of Energy (DOE) Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, emphasizing the Board’s support for a lifecycle cost and schedule report.

**Board Self-Evaluation**

The Board conducted its annual self-evaluation process.

**Tri-Party Agency Public Involvement Strategy**

The Board heard about the draft Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies FY 2007/2008 Communications and Public Involvement Strategic Plan and discussed upcoming priority activities.

**2007 Annual Report and Board Process Manual**

The Board received the 2007 Annual Report and reviewed minor changes to the Board Process Manual, a living document.

**Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System Update**

The Board received an update on the demonstration bulk vitrification system (DBVS).

### **Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement Update**

The Board received an update on the status of the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS).

### **Board Budget Update**

Rick Jansons, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), provided an update on the Board's budget constraints.

### **Board Business**

The Board will have committee meetings and calls in February and in March. The Board will meet in April.

## **HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

*February 7-8, 2008 Pasco, WA*

Susan Leckband, Hanford Work Force (Non-Union, Non-Management Employees) and Board Chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) to order. The meeting was open to the public and offered ongoing opportunities for public comment.

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are members of the public. One seat was not represented: Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government).

### **Welcome, Introductions and Announcements**

Susan welcomed the Board to Pasco. She congratulated Shirley Olinger in her new role as manager of the Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP). She also welcomed DOE-ORP's new deputy manager, Hugh Taylor. Steve Wiegman is the new deputy designated federal official (DDFO) for DOE-ORP and Doug Shoop is the new DDFO for the Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL).

Susan thanked Karen Caddey, CH2M Hill, Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP, and Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues, for obtaining the meeting space at Columbia Basin Community College (CBC). She said the Board needs to be fiscally responsible with its budget and CBC offered the room for free. She encouraged everyone be good stewards of the space.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large, introduced and welcomed a new alternate for a Public-at-Large seat, Mike Korenko.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland, introduced Julie Jones, a member of the West Richland City Council who will be an appointed Board member soon representing the City of West Richland.

Jane Hedges, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), thanked Ken Gasper, Benton County (Local Government), for helping Ecology with its hiring process for a tank waste section manager. Many candidates told her it was refreshing to have an outside perspective on the panel. Jane announced that Suzanne Dahl was hired for the position; she was the project manager in that section for a number of years and will do a great job. Among other responsibilities, Jane said the section covers permitting for the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP), permitting and operation of Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF), and bulk vitrification.

Regarding past advice on the readability of technical documents (HAB Advice #202), Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), thought it was good follow-up to see a letter from DOE managers to their contractors regarding the advice in the Board packet.

Greg deBruler, Columbia River Keeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen), wished everyone a happy Chinese New Year.

Ginger Wireman, Ecology, announced a free E3 Washington summit on February 28 in Walla Walla. E3 stands for education, environment and economy, and the initiative's goal is to create a more sustainable citizenry. Ginger left invitations and background information on business sustainability on the back table.

Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues, confirmed changes to committee week. The Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) will meet on Monday, February 11 at 1:00 pm. The River and Plateau Committee (RAP) will meet on Tuesday, February 12 at 9:00 am followed by a DOE-RL briefing on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 allocation and the FY 2009 president's budget request.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, announced that the Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) plans to meet during lunch.

Susan announced that the Board 2007 Annual Report is available and thanked all who worked on it. She noted that it is a tool to talk about Hanford with the public. Contact Tammie Holm if more copies are needed.

Joe Giitter, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), described NRC and their current role at Hanford. NRC is an independent agency and is not associated with DOE; NRC reports to the U.S. Congress. Congress asked NRC in their omnibus 2008 peer review to conduct a regulatory review of the processes at the WTP in coordination with DOE. NRC has 180 days (until the end of June) to complete and submit a report to Congress and the Secretary of Energy. Joe said ordinarily they would have asked to be on the Board's agenda in advance, but they wanted to announce a public meeting next week at the Hanford House Red Lion on Wednesday, February 13 (6:00 to 9:00 p.m.) to discuss the scope of NRC's review. Joe provided handouts with meeting information and agendas on the back table. NRC believes in transparency and openness and wants public input, which is why it is hosting the public meeting. He repeated that the review is independent but they are working and meeting with DOE staff.

Pam shared information from around the DOE complex. For several years, DOE has met with intergovernmental associations. Inez Treay, DOE-EM, made a commitment to have an open budget process throughout the DOE complex, and Hanford was cited as an example of a good budget process. Pam said there has been no budget guidance given to DOE-RL or DOE-ORP since that commitment and conference. She will follow up with Inez in the next couple weeks, and is hopeful for a good budget process like DOE-RL's process last year.

Susan reviewed the meeting goals:

- Consider a draft letter from BCC to James Rispoli, DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM), about Hanford cleanup baselines and development of a proposed lifecycle cost and schedule report;
- Conduct the Board's annual self-evaluation;
- Review changes to the Board Process Manual;
- Hear about the status of the Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System (DBVS) test results and the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS);
- Learn about the public involvement strategic plan from the Tri-Party Agencies; and
- Have a discussion about recent Board budget allocation and possible implications.

Susan announced that the film *Arid Lands* is playing at the Carmike Theater in Kennewick.

The League of Women Voters provided their free citizen directory on the back table.

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

### **September and November Meeting Summaries**

Changes submitted on the September meeting summary were incorporated, as were non-substantive changes to the November meeting summary.

The September and November meeting summaries were adopted.

### **Draft Letter to Jim Rispoli, DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management**

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), introduced the letter to Jim Rispoli, DOE-EM Assistant Secretary. The letter is to reinforce the Board's support for of a lifecycle cost and schedule report.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America NW (Regional Environmental/Citizen), noted that a DOE letter to the *Tri-City Herald* primarily addressed baselines and DOE's commitment to Hanford cleanup, but not a lifecycle cost report. He said the draft letter to Mr. Rispoli agrees that baselines are important, but the next step should be a lifecycle cost report. He said the Board needs to be clear that accepting delays to the Tri-Party

Agreement (TPA) without first doing a lifecycle cost and schedule report goes against recently adopted Board advice (HAB Advice #203).

#### *Agency perspective*

Doug said DOE thinks a lifecycle report is valuable, but it is still subject to negotiations with Ecology and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). He said a common understanding of what this report could or could not do is needed; its role must be defined.

Steve Wiegman thought it is very valuable to discuss a lifecycle report, but reminded the Board that negotiations have to play out including an agreement on a path forward.

Nick Ceto, EPA, confirmed that a lifecycle report is included in the current negotiations which EPA supports. EPA thinks it should be required and there is some expectation beyond the negotiations to do this. Nick further explained that the pace of cleanup is driven by the budget. EPA wants DOE to “pull back the curtain” on what scope and budget expectations are for a given project activity. In addition to baselines, EPA wants some agreement on what the scope, budget and schedule may be. EPA is suggesting that those estimates are balanced and based on broader planning discussions. EPA’s goal is to inform the public about lifecycle costs to ensure a good, long-term and robust budget. Regarding risk management, Nick said it is part of their statutory requirements to look at risk, which helps inform the scope directly relating to the budget and schedule. Nick thought the Board should continue to request a lifecycle report.

Jane Hedges, Ecology, agreed with Nick about the importance of a lifecycle report being necessary to give people a good picture of what Hanford cleanup looks like. She suggested including a statement in the letter about the lifecycle report being a living document. A lifecycle report should change as scopes change and new issues are learned. She did not want a report to be out of date in a few years.

#### *Discussion*

Susan advised using the term “independently reviewed” instead of terms like “verified” or “validated” because such terms have specific implications and requirements for DOE. Gerry thought the term “review” is less rigorous than “verified” or “validated.” Doug noted that the term “validated” is used in reference to construction; “certified” is used in reference to operations. He thought DOE would understand what the Board is saying. Susan agreed that they should use the term “validated.”

Ken Niles thought the Board should say it is concerned about the budget gaps based on the president’s recent budget request; it could serve as a placeholder as more advice to come.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), thought it is more important to identify activities that need to happen as well as cost; he questioned how meaningful it is to identify a lifecycle cost for activities scheduled 30 years down the road. He thought it opened DOE up to criticism when costs change when predicting that far into the future.

Gerry said they could have a full discussion on what a lifecycle costs mean when the Board has a workshop on the scope of the report, as DOE recommended. He said BCC is on the path forward to identify what is credible for a lifecycle report, including cost components, long-term stewardship and more.

Susan said the Board hopes to be involved with the construction of the lifecycle report. She agreed with Rob that cost credibility is difficult when estimating far into the future. But if DOE decides to do that, they will involve the Board in the report construction to make it more meaningful.

Harold said “lifecycle cost” can mean many things, such as the cost to build or the cost to operate, and the Board should help DOE figure it out. He commented that waste sitting in tanks also costs money, and a lifecycle report could include such costs.

Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, said lifecycle costs are usually balanced against other functional criteria like risk. He asked if discussions have been based on a risk-based approach linked to lifecycle costs, such as the cost of cleaning out a tank versus the cost of leaving it there, and the cost of when it leaks.

Gerry thought lifecycle costs mean different things to different people. For example, the traditional way of presenting cost of capping a burial ground is the cost of the fill, putting the cap on and certifying the work. However, the lifecycle cost could include 300 years of monitoring, and the cost of additional work if monitoring shows cap failure.

Mike Korenko thought Hanford is more complicated than other sites and has more liability and risk costs. Gerry said the regulators have discussed the cost of delays and agree that they need to be considered.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), thought this discussion represents the value of a lifecycle cost study. He envisioned the study to be a living document that is not too prescriptive. With further study and discussions, he thought they could learn what should be covered. He thought this is a good start to an evolving and collaborative process.

Ken Niles noted another nuance to evaluate when looking at potential lifecycle costs; under natural resource damage assessments (NRDA) there could be a cost involved with the lost use of a resource (e.g. groundwater) if cleanup is delayed. It could be substantial and should be considered as part of a lifecycle cost.

Susan asked if the Board wanted to add language about the lifecycle report being a living and renewable document; the Board thought that was implied and did not add such content to the letter.

Susan suggested referring to the FY 2010 budget as well as the FY 2009 budget.

The letter was adopted.

### **2007 Annual Report and Board Self-Evaluation**

Susan discussed the 2007 Annual Report, Board self-evaluation, and Board processes. Board and committee processes have been developed over time to make the Board as productive as it can be. Some processes inform the Board and enable it to reach consensus, which Susan considered to be the biggest strength of the Board. She asked the Board to remember that processes are not stumbling blocks created to make the Board inflexible; they have been carefully thought through over time. Susan said it is her responsibility as chair to help guide the Board using its processes to reach consensus on important issues.

Susan said the coming committee week is an example of where process was not followed, along with the changes made to the August 2007 committee week that was postponed to accommodate individual committee members. She encouraged flexibility, but cautioned against changing meetings because one person cannot attend. The Board, public, agencies and facilitators struggle when committees ask to meet outside of committee week. It has a ripple effect that Susan wanted the Board to be aware of. She said it is essential that committee chairs make themselves available for Executive Issues Committee (EIC) calls so they can prepare for coming Board meetings, ensure time-sensitive issues are addressed and to prevent resource conflicts.

The Board evaluates itself and its processes annually. Susan said the groundwater flow chart is an example of a successful process and product that the agencies found valuable. Issue managers worked with contractors and the agencies over several months to create the flow chart, which the Board adopted along with accompanying advice. Susan said Board charter revisions are another example of a successful process-driven issue. Susan said the benefits of working together are efficiency and adequate review time. The best advice undergoes a strong review cycle.

Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, described the Board self-evaluation process. The Board was provided an evaluation worksheet and information to guide them:

- Board and committee agendas, a synopsis of meetings and meeting outcomes
- 2007 committee meeting schedule, issues covered and resulting products
- Board support information, including DOE, EPA, Ecology and EnviroIssues
- 2007 Annual Report
- Evaluation worksheet

Susan asked the Board to think hard about the evaluation; the Board will be faced with budget shortfalls and it needs to be deliberate and intentional with its actions.

Cathy asked each Board member to thoughtfully complete the evaluation worksheet. Board leadership and EnviroIssues will evaluate the worksheets and use them as ways to improve the functions and processes of the Board. EnviroIssues will compile all responses to share with the Board on Friday.

### *Discussion*

Susan discussed the evaluation summary and the identified potential action items. Committee leadership and EIC will review and identify implementation of action items at their leadership retreat. They will also discuss how potential items mesh with the Board's 2008 priorities and budget. Susan also recommended that committee leadership discuss the results with their committee members as well. The evaluation is a tool to see how they can improve and be more efficient.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), disagreed with one of the evaluation comments that said committee and issue manager work is too technical. He thought one of the Board's functions is to help the agencies in technical review and bring up questions and concerns early in the process. He said it may be irritating to some committee members, but it is necessary.

Floyd Hodges, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Environmental/Citizen) agreed that technical details are necessary to reach policy level advice. Maynard agreed that committees need to review technical issues, but it may be question of methodology. Board members work collaboratively with the agencies, so they need to know if someone feels irritated so they can identify better ways to delve into technical issues.

Jerri Main, Public-at-Large, thought the Board's advice regarding the double-shell tank integrity report was good and resulted in action.

Harold thought it was incumbent on the committee chair to steer the committee in the right direction, and that the agencies should push back if the committee gets too far into their work. Committees need to identify the goal and purpose of agency presentations and ensure their efforts are productive and policy-focused.

Floyd said it is necessary to understand technical details in order to evaluate policy.

Cathy noted that an issue manager guide was suggested in one of the Board self-evaluations.

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, thanked the Board for using a self-evaluation process. He thought it would be more helpful if Board's comments about the agencies were directed specifically to each one, like to Ecology.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), thought the 2007 Annual Report was very good and user-friendly, and admired the groundwater flow chart and photographs. He pointed out that a radiological crew was misidentified as a sampling crew. He thought communities unaware of Hanford would be able to learn from the annual report. He encouraged the Board to help educate people about the work at Hanford and the people doing the work.

### **Board Process Manual**

The Board reviewed changes to the Board Process Manual received since the November Board meeting. Susan reminded the Board that it is a living document that captures how the Board works. She asked them to review the roles and responsibilities outlined in the manual; it is easy to forget about them when members get deep into issues.

Jason thanked the Board for its comments and thought the manual truly reflects Board processes.

Keith thought the manual should describe how a lack of consensus can block advice.

## **Tri-Party Agency Public Involvement Strategy**

Dennis Faulk, EPA, shared the draft TPA agencies FY 2007/2008 Communications and Public Involvement Strategic Plan. In November, Dennis said Heart of America NW asked for a strategic public involvement plan for 2008. The agencies had done this in the past and Dennis thought it was a good idea. He hoped it could be a tool to help focus on major policy issues; for each issue there is a public involvement component as well as a technical one. Dennis went through the list of activities and their corresponding public policy issues; goals; audience; methods and information; tools and techniques; and point of contact and schedule. Dennis addressed some activities in more depth than others.

### *Level one priorities*

1. TC&WM EIS
  - a. Selecting final cleanup remedy for treatment, closure and disposal decisions: Do the alternatives show delineation among the choices DOE is considering? How do alternatives fit relative to the cumulative impacts? Does this EIS provide the information needed for the State to make permitting decisions?
2. Central Plateau Waste Site Cleanup 200 PW-1, 3, and 6 Proposed Plan
  - a. Selecting a remedy for waste sites that have high levels of long-lived radionuclides: When more than one remedy meets threshold criteria, what is the most important to the public and how should the balancing factors be used to distinguish between remedies? How much should cost play a factor? What impacts are acceptable on the cleanup schedule? Remove, treat and dispose impacts? Relationship to other waste decisions?
3. Groundwater 200-ZP-1 Proposed Plan
  - a. Selecting a final cleanup remedy for groundwater in 200 West Area (first comprehensive groundwater decision): Should natural attenuation be used in the decision process? What is an acceptable timeframe for groundwater cleanup?
4. Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) site-wide permit
  - a. Sets operational and closure requirements for key Hanford facilities: What is included in a permit? What are permit conditions? Have we identified all permit conditions protective of human health and the environment?
5. 2010 Hanford budget and cleanup priorities
  - a. To ensure adequate funding to complete the Hanford Cleanup Mission; seek public input on cleanup priorities and how they should be funded.
6. Negotiations and TPA change package
  - a. No current activity.

### *Other TPA public involvement activities*

1. BC Controlled Area Waste Site Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EECA)
2. Columbia River Component of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA)
3. 100 and 300 Area Component of RCBRA
4. Supplement Analysis (SA) for the Hanford Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) EIS
5. State of the Site meetings
6. HAB
7. Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board
8. Government-to-Government
9. Hanford Communities

### *Non-TPA public involvement activities*

1. Draft Planning Report/EIS Yakima River Basin Water Storage Feasibility Study (FS) [Black Rock]
2. Global Nuclear Energy Partnership
3. Greater than Class C (GTCC) wastes
4. U.S. Ecology

Dennis also described the goals for public involvement that were shared at the TPA Quarterly meeting. Dennis said they were developed collaboratively in the mid-1990s when the TPA Community Relations Plan was revised. Dennis noted that significant changes have occurred since then and he thinks that the TPA agencies do a relatively good job at maintaining two-way communication and dialogue at Hanford.

Dennis asked the Board if there were any other public policy issues or goals that should be addressed in the draft TPA FY 2007/2008 Communications and Public Involvement Strategic Plan.

### *Discussion*

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) discussed the strategic plan. Greg will be the issue manager for the strategic plan.

Susan thought this is a good example of a crossover piece that needs technical policy and public policy review. She asked if there were any Level One Priorities missing.

Nolan brought up some issues from the PIC meeting. For the TC&WM EIS, there was discussion on the context of decision-making, what it leads to and if there is other guidance. The EIS will be used for Record of Decision (ROD) decision-making, so its purpose, goal and limitations need to be clearly identified. The timeline of decisions should be identified as well; Nolan thought a flowchart could help visually convey the timeline and how and where the public can comment.

Jeri said the Board and the public need to participate in, or at least be made aware of, TPA negotiation decision-making. There are policy issues that need to be addressed.

Maynard thought the scope of the TC&WM EIS is a public policy issue and needs to be defined – how was its scope expanded and why? He thought sometimes they make presumptions about what the public understands.

Susan said people have expectations about the TC&WM EIS, and need to know what it is, what it is not, and how fundamental it is to a ROD.

Greg thought it boiled down to transparency. He hoped that through more dialogue they can have public information pieces available to assist the public in understanding the purpose of the EIS, why one is needed and what decisions DOE will make based on it. Greg is the PIC issue manager for the TC&WM EIS so he can help DOE articulate those questions to ensure public and Board understanding.

Susan added that Steve, Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, and others in PIC volunteered to work with the other technical committees to disseminate information internally to the Board and to the public.

Susan Kreid, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), thought the strategic plan matrix was good, but thought it asked for a public input on a wide array of issues. The agencies and the Board have to be clear about what they want from the public – what is the big question you want the public to help answer? Karen Lutz, DOE-RL, said that is exactly what DOE is asking – what does the Board think is missing? What other public policy issues need to be discussed? Susan Kreid also thought they should ask about the overall arching questions behind the issues identified in the matrix. Dennis agreed that they should show programmatic implications of decisions.

Maynard agreed that cooperation between committees is beneficial – he encouraged PIC members to sit in on technical committee meetings. PIC is good at helping technical committees pick out what the public should know about or what should be asked of them. Cathy noted that the facilitators and committee chairs will keep PIC members in mind as they develop agendas; they will notify PIC members ahead of time of agenda items of which they should be aware.

Gerry discussed a few issues he had with the draft strategic plan. He thought it was still constrained by “thinking inside the box” and thought the agencies need to start at a different level for public involvement. Gerry used the example of how single-shell tanks will not be emptied on schedule, and that path-forward decisions need to be made. He thought the matrix attempts to deal with that issue on several fronts, but they are compartmentalized. The goal should be to obtain general public guidance on what to do about not emptying single-shell tanks on time. He said the public needs adequate information to assist the agencies with this issue. Gerry also said, for example, permit decisions should not be made before the TC&WM EIS is prepared. Public involvement activities need to be structured around availability of information to ensure the public is informed before permit decisions are made based on the TC&WM EIS. There should be a

strategic flow to decision-making rather than compartmentalizing issues and asking the public to comment on each specific one without describing how they all relate.

Rob thought the audience should be better defined. “The public” has many sectors and interests. For example, Rob said he did not think any congressional representative gets their information from the Board’s public involvement efforts. Rob also thought the agencies need to evaluate their methods of information and obtaining public comments. He thought they provide more of a public education program rather than public involvement. Rob also encouraged them to seriously take into consideration public comments to rectify the public’s unease of their comments being unaddressed. He suggested using blogs to garner public input.

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Environmental/Citizen), expressed concern over the lack of activity in the TPA negotiations. He said it raised two questions for him: 1) there is nothing going on or 2) the agencies do not want to talk about it. He had hoped to talk about TPA changes this year which would provide strategic direction for the WTP and cleanup work.

Dennis said negotiations are currently on hiatus. The agencies are still committed to obtaining a schedule for the River Corridor cleanup, but it is not being done in the larger construct of negotiations. Karen confirmed that there is currently no TPA negotiation activity.

Jerri noted that they all have to keep the basics in mind – she recently spoke with a CBC student who did not know anything about Hanford existed here and thus did not know anything about it.

Greg said the Board’s focus is policy, and the big policy question is “how clean is clean.” Greg said there is no goal or acceptable agreement right now, and the public should be involved in trying to answer this question. As such, he recommended a public dialogue on “how clean is clean” in the River Corridor.

Susan Kreid thought the public could not answer, and should not be asked, if the TC&WM EIS provides enough information for the State to make decisions. She thought the public could weigh in on values such as the use of natural attenuation in the remedial process. She thought the agencies should help guide the public into the kind of questions that are truly useful and important rather than using the umbrella method of asking for comments.

Steve Hudson thought the matrix was intended for use by the public, but as a guideline for the Board to review and comment on. Rob suggested a public involvement flowchart on how to present issues.

Norma Jean said for all policy decisions, the HAB and other stakeholders should know what the cumulative risk will be to people in the region now and in the future. She thought the public should be educated on risks and trade-offs.

Barry Beyeler, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), thought the matrix should identify questions that the public will likely have.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), proposed that the Board consider requesting another session with the TPA agencies regarding the TPA negotiations. He thought the Board would be missing a very important issue if it does not address the TPA negotiations this year.

Maynard thought they should discuss TPA negotiations at the first opportunity to do so, but thought they should consider timing – if there is nothing that the agencies can or will share, does it make sense to meet? Dennis asked the Board to identify what it wants to get out of a TPA negotiations discussion, and then the agencies can say if they can meet those needs.

Jeff requested an educational discussion with the TPA agencies, public and the Board. He wanted to know where the TPA negotiations currently are, where there is agreement and where there is disagreement.

Todd asked why is there nothing going on if the TPA needs updating and negotiations are not occurring? Jane said Ecology is determining its next steps and will not have any new information until the end of the legislative session in March. She did not know if they would have any new information to share with the

Board in April. Jeff thanked her for the update and will continue to work on this issue through the committees.

Nancy Murray, Public-at-Large, agreed it is overwhelming to ask the public to speak to the huge TC&WM EIS. She thought repackaging to strategic issues like Susan Kreid suggested would be better. She suggested going over comments from the State of Site meetings and to see where the public is and what questions they want answered.

Dennis said the draft strategic plan is focused on decisions that have to be made. He thought the Board can examine issues from a different perspective, but it has to recognize that the agencies have to make concrete decisions. An enduring value is protecting the river and groundwater, but there are many ways to do that. There are trade-offs which need to be framed to make useful discussions.

For the draft strategic plan, Karen said the agencies focused on telling the Board what decisions are coming up this year, which is something many stakeholders encouraged. She considered it a tool for the Board to prioritize its work. She will take back what she hears, but wanted to make sure the Board knew what the intentions were for the draft strategic plan. She said there would be a workshop in March to continue this discussion; she will send out information about the workshop.

Susan said many of the issues are already in technical committee work plans. As the committees continue to discuss the issues, Susan asked them to consider the public involvement aspect and work with PIC as necessary.

Pam commented that public involvement efforts are expensive and the Board is already dealing with budget problems. If a committee is working on an issue that they think the public needs to know about, is there a plan or method to engage people on the issue or should they ask DOE to let people know? Susan said they should bring it to the agencies to determine how it fits into the suite of outreach and the decision-making process. The Board is not going to develop public involvement plans because it does not have the funding. Dennis said they want the Board's help in framing the issues in the draft strategic plan.

Steve said Board members could contact him or Helen Wheatley, Heart of American NW (Regional Environmental/Citizen), if they have an issue needing public involvement work.

Mike Korenko commented that each activity on the draft strategic plan results in an end-state question – what is the end-state for groundwater? For the Columbia River? He thought the public could speak to end-state questions but it would be hard to expect much more than that. He suggested working with the media to reach the public.

Nolan asked the Board to identify a few of the bigger issues that should go out to the communities; having a meeting for every issue in multiple cities is not probably feasible.

### **Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System Update (DBVS)**

Ben Harp, Federal Project Director (DOE-ORP), provided an update on DBVS. His presentation provided a Critical Decision 2 (CD2) status, the latest results from the integrated dryer/melt test, and introduced the Interim Pretreatment System (IPS). IPS received approval, but Ben said to not confuse it with the pretreatment system at WTP. IPS is the system that would allow the early startup of the low-activity waste facility (LAW).

CD2 was presented to the Environmental Management Acquisition Advisory Board on January 8. The validated total project cost for the DBVS project through startup is \$191.2 million and the associated validated schedule period is through February 2011. Ben said they have spent \$100 million to date.

The near term scope for CD2 includes completing the design by incorporating recommendations from the Expert Review Panel, completing the Preliminary Documented Safety Analysis, developing procurement packages for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009, and then initiating construction. Ben reviewed a chart outlining the three objectives of the integrated dryer/melt tests and the results. The three objectives – demonstrate integrated dryer/melt system operations, demonstrate resolution on the molten ionic salt issue, demonstrate

acceptable glass product – were met. Improvements were shown in the leachable material present in the final product.

Ben identified positive outcomes and potential improvements for the Full Scale - 38D test:

*Positives*

- Fully integrated operations demonstrated
- Molten ionic salt migration and rhenium in Castable Refractory Blocks and reduced to insignificant levels
- Maintained excellent glass performance
- Good glass homogeneity
- Good single pass glass retention of rhenium
- Low metal precipitation levels
- Excellent refractory performance/glass containment
- Low contamination levels on lid (cleanest lids seen so far)
- Good rhenium mass balance
- Excellent control of melter operations

*Potential improvements*

- Physical properties of dryer product (pellet)
- Off-gas design modifications
- Rhenium and chromium in melt surface phases

Ben said they are still seeing rhenium and chromium in the final product and outlined some potential paths forward to address this issue.

*Methodology to reduce surface sulfate*

- Laboratory scale testing to understand mechanism
  - Sulfate migration
  - Rhenium concentration
  - Rhenium and technetium similarities and differences
- Laboratory scale testing to screen approaches
  - Increase melt temperatures at end of run to drive off sulfate
  - Modify clean glass batch to incorporate sulfate
  - Chemical additions to drive off sulfate
  - Modify bulk glass formulation to reduce separation of sulfate
- Scale-up of promising approaches as required

Ben described how the IPS system would provide acceptable low activity waste feed for the early operations of WTP and/or the operation of the supplemental LAW immobilization technology. Analysis for this initiative has been developed in the *Evaluation of Starting the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant Low Activity Waste Facility First* study and the *Hanford River Project Low Activity Waste Treatment: Business Case Evaluation (draft)*.

Ben discussed the near term scope: the overall goal in FY 2008 is to prepare documentation to be able to ward an architect/engineering contract in FY 2009. A Mission Analysis report will review feed selection, preliminary determination of location, technology selection, cost estimate, mass balance, and secondary waste management.

*Regulator perspective*

Suzanne Dahl, Ecology, said Ecology is supportive of any early treatment especially since the LAW facility is almost constructed. It is essential to feed that system with an early pretreatment system, and Ecology is glad DOE is moving forward.

Suzanne said it is clear that supplemental treatment is needed to treat waste. Ecology has clearly supported a second LAW facility, but has been working cooperatively to see if there are other technologies such as bulk vitrification that could prove “as good as glass.” There have been a lot of improvements. She said it is discouraging that they did not get the requested funding because it pushes the supplemental treatment decision further out. Suzanne thought it was good to have a test that showed more than just the melter box; Ecology had asked for that and was glad to see it. She would like more tests to ensure problems are solved. The glass was of good quality; the reliable feed system kinks and other challenges have to be worked out in

a cold test. Suzanne said it is the same with the sintered metal filter – there was sediment building in the lines, something she did not want to see in a hot facility.

Suzanne said Ecology would like to see no free technetium plating out anywhere there is possible exposure. She said bulk vitrification was touted as being a good solution for high sulfate tanks, but the waste that was tested has a low level of sulfate. If there are problems with sulfate in tanks with low levels, what will happen when waste with high original sulfate levels is processed?

In summary, Suzanne said, DOE resolved many things in the whole system test, but there are still issues including new issues like the sulfate. Ecology thinks there should be more cold testing to make sure the molten ionic salt and sulfate problems are resolved. Suzanne believes there are solutions to these problems, but the length of time and lack of funding is frustrating.

#### *Discussion*

Mike Korenko asked if there is a pretreatment process to remove cesium, technetium and others. Is a precursory step necessary? Ben said they are looking at all options.

Ken Gasper asked if the need for additional work coupled with loss of funding makes this application of technology no longer feasible or relevant. TWC discussed that and advice regarding supplemental treatment options. Ken said the committee is supportive of DOE looking at early LAW startup and of the plans to do the Mission Analysis Report and Interim Pretreatment System study. TWC looks forward on continued updates and discussions as DOE pursues the studies.

Floyd said other waste components, like selenium, would need to be dealt with at the same time as sulfate. He also asked about crystal formation during cooling. Ben said the test was run at full scale and the box was completely disassembled and sampled randomly. He will look into Floyd's selenium question.

Bob Suyama asked about the funding shortfalls and DOE's plans to deal with funding problems. Ben said DOE requested \$52 million for FY 2009 and received a little over \$1 million, which includes money for procurement and construction. Essentially, Ben said, they are delayed a year. Cold testing will continue at the Horn Rapids site.

Susan thanked Ben for keeping the Board and committees updated.

#### **Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) Update**

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, provided an update on the TC&WM EIS. In February or March, DOE will send out postcards asking how people would like to review the TC&WM EIS – the summary, the entire document, a CD, etc. A page range option will also be available. DOE will also develop a reader's guide for the EIS, a 25 to 30 page accompanying document that includes the summary of alternatives and images that can be reviewed apart from the EIS.

Mary Beth thought it might be worth meeting with TWC to review the decisions and alternatives identified in the EIS. DOE is planning on having the draft EIS available in July or August 2008. A draft workshop will be held to guide people through the 12 chapters and 28 appendices. Mary Beth said they could also walk through some examples to illustrate how the TC&EM EIS will evaluate decisions.

#### *Regulator perspective*

Nolan said DOE has opened up the process, allowing Ecology to help identify stakeholder concerns. Ecology is looking forward to the finished draft.

#### *Discussion*

Gerry asked if there would be enough time to review the TC&WM EIS, prepare for the workshop, digest information from the workshop and then get out to the public. Mary Beth expected that the document would be distributed when the notice of availability is published in the Federal Register. The length of the

public comment period will be decided during the review process. The workshop would be held prior to the comment period.

Gerry asked if she envisioned the document released in August followed by a workshop and public meetings in the fall. Mary Beth did not yet know. They will have further discussions to decide on specific timeframes as DOE gets closer to publishing the draft.

Gerry said public meetings should not be held in the summer. He said adequate information is needed for people to understand the cumulative impacts and how the TC&WM EIS feeds into other decision-making processes. He stressed that there has to be time after the workshop for people to digest the information, prepare materials for the public, and advertise the public meetings. He thought there needed to be at least 30 days after the workshop before the first public meeting. Mary Beth did not think that was conceptually different than what DOE is planning; they just do not have exact dates set yet.

Ken Gasper would like to update the committee work plans when specific dates are available.

Greg asked for more information about the accompanying document. Mary Beth said DOE thought it would be helpful to have an accompanying document containing brief descriptions of alternatives, images, and tables with key pieces of information associated with a particular alternative to refer to while a reader is going through the entire TC&WM EIS. Mary Beth thought it would make it easier for readers and help avoid having to flip back and forth through the TC&WM EIS, looking for particular figures and tables.

Greg wanted to ensure readability and asked who would author the document. Mary Beth did not yet know who would write it. Greg said he is the issue manager for an educational piece about the TC&WM EIS and would like to be involved with the drafting of the accompanying document.

Pam asked if Ecology is a participating agency for the TC&WM EIS; Nolan said they are a cooperating agency, which is a legal term. They are not co-authors, allowing Ecology to make a judgment of its acceptability upon completion.

Pam asked if Ecology felt DOE was responding to their original concerns about the earlier Solid Waste EIS. Ron Skinnarland, Ecology, said they have been working with Mary Beth and her team throughout the process, and have been providing comments and getting their questions answered. He said they are taking a final technical look at major components, such as the cumulative analysis and groundwater modeling. Ecology will review the draft in the next couple months. Ron said their goal is to talk about why the decisions made in the TC&WM EIS are important for Ecology.

Bob Suyama asked if they could see some of the tables or other information that will be included in the accompanying document early in the process. Mary Beth suggested reviewing such information through the committees. Cathy noted that Bob could become involved with the subcommittee that is working on the TC&WM EIS.

Emmet Moore, Washington State University (University), asked where he could find a list of alternatives being considered in the TC&WM EIS. Mary Beth said the short list of alternatives was published in the Notice of Intent for the TC&WM EIS. She said they have not made major changes to the alternatives. Cathy will send the link to the Notice of Intent to Board members.

Jerri thought the presentation from the workshop last fall would be helpful to somebody just coming into the process. Mary Beth thought it is on the DOE-ORP website, but she will find it for Jerri and Bob.

Gerry asked if there is any coordination with the GTCC EIS from DOE-HQ and is DOE using that information in its TC&WM EIS. Mary Beth said that inventory was published in the Notice of Intent and the GTCC EIS will show in the cumulative impact section of the TC&WM EIS. The GTCC inventory information will be included as available in the cumulative impacts section of the TC&WM EIS.

**Board Budget**

Rick Jansons, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), discussed the Board’s budget. He said the FY 2008 budget is less than the Board needs; the Board essentially received the same amount of money as in FY 2007 (excluding the rescission).

Rick showed the FY 2008 HAB Funds Summary that was created by DOE. “PAC” refers to sound services that are provided at Board meetings.

**FY 2008 HAB Funds Summary**  
Reporting Period: December 2007  
(\$000)

<b>Project/Program</b>	<b>FY 2007 Carryover</b>	<b>FY 2008 BA*</b>	<b>FY 2008 Available Funds</b>	<b>FY 2008 Cost-to-Date</b>	<b>FY 2008 YTD Uncosted</b>	<b>FY 2008 Spend Forecast</b>	<b>Planned Uncosted Carryover</b>
Enviroissues	\$ 12	\$ 356	\$ 368	\$ 86	\$ 282	\$ 350	\$ 18
PAC	\$ -	\$ 19	\$ 19	\$ 3	\$ 16	\$ 18	\$ 1
P-Card	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -
Travel	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 92	\$ 4	\$ 88	\$ 92	\$ -
<b>HAB Total</b>	<b>\$ 13</b>	<b>\$ 467</b>	<b>\$ 480</b>	<b>\$ 94</b>	<b>\$ 386</b>	<b>\$ 461</b>	<b>\$ 19</b>

\* The HAB Budget Authority (BA) is based upon DOE's approved funding plan. The Omnibus Bill funded \$471,000 less a .91 percent rescission.

Rick also displayed a bar graph illustrating the total Board budget, with the sound services, reserve, Board member travel and EnviroIssues cost. EnviroIssues current and projected spending for FY 2008 in relation to its original cost estimate predicts EnviroIssues will run out of funding by late summer.

Rick shared some EnviroIssues potential scope cuts and their potential impacts to the Board:

<b>Potential Cut</b>	<b>Potential Impact to Board</b>
No SSAB support	No support for HAB-hosted SSAB meeting in April; no coverage of SSAB planning calls
Reduce direct expenses (mailing packets, board meeting room rentals, etc.)	Board meetings would have to be held at no-cost facilities. Limits flexibility of meeting spaces. Board members receive their packets all electronically – must print their own copies.
Move Richland office to Federal Building	Potential accessibility issues, depending on office location in building. Unknown other impacts at this time.
No senior advisor (Penny)	Lose access to institutional knowledge about facilitation of board’s processes. Lose access to expert consensus-building expertise and advice.
No facilitation support for leadership retreat	Limit’s Board chair’s (or whoever leads the meeting) ability to fully participate in meeting without having to be responsible for running the meeting. Limit’s EIC’s access to facilitation strategic planning expertise.
No note-taker at committee meetings. Facilitator tracks action items and commitments only.	Committee deliberations not captured – only action items and commitments. Committee meeting summaries not available to those who do not attend meetings.
No committee meetings or committee support in September 2008	Committees have only October meeting time to prepare for November board agenda items, discuss issues, etc.
Close Richland office and provide administrative support from Seattle	No ability to drop by office in Richland to pick up files, reports, correspondence, etc. All files maintained in Seattle – not Richland. Turnaround time for document requests not available electronically is longer. No local (Richland) staffer to handle immediate information or service requests.
Provide only one facilitator to support Board and committees	Reduces schedule flexibility, response time, and institutional knowledge

Rick thought the next step is for EIC to review the Board’s budget and potential EnviroIssues scope cuts, and identify a path forward. The FY 2008 budget cannot be changed and Congress is already looking at the

FY 2009 budget; Rick said the next budget the Board can influence is the FY 2010 budget. Rick noted that the federal government looks at spending in two ways – by level of effort or by a particular dollar amount. He thought the Board could potentially change to an activity-based level of effort and funding. He also thought the Board could identify for DOE and Congress exactly where its money goes, such as to issue manager meetings, committee meetings regarding particular issues (such as the TC&WM EIS), etc.

Susan confirmed that the budget for this year, FY 2008, will not change. EIC will work with EnviroIssues to link costs to specific activities and determine which are essential and which are not. Susan said EnviroIssues is the biggest yet invaluable expense.

#### *Agency perspective*

Steve Wiegman said DOE supports the HAB as required by the TPA and the stakeholders it represents. However, what is the appropriate level of funding – is it a particular number? Is it a figure based on activities? Steve said DOE will be able to make a broader evaluation of the funding gaps if it works with the Board to assemble a financial statement based on activities. He urged the Board to put that information together by activity, numbers of meetings, issues to review, and more.

Nolan said Ecology is concerned because DOE committed to fully funding the Board as a Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) Board. There were decisions made about the budgeting process. Ecology does not have any funding with which it can subsidize the Board. Their agreement was not to include Board funding in its budget because DOE bears the cost of the Board. Nolan said he agreed that there should be a planning and budgeting process based on activities.

Dennis thought what Steve said is very important – if there is work to be done, it is incumbent on DOE to find a way to fund the Board. But just as the Board challenges the agencies to be effective, the same should be said for the Board. Dennis thought there were places to find efficiencies without losing an ounce of effectiveness.

#### *Discussion*

Gerry commented that this is not the first time the Board has needed to address its budget and support. He said the current budget does not reflect the commitment DOE made to providing the level of support necessary for the Board to do its work according to its charter. He said the Board should be supported to meet the TPA requirement. Gerry also thought Board funding should be a requirement under the RCRA permit and that Ecology should review this under their budget scenario; Ecology has the authority to charge an advisory board to its permittee (DOE) if that permittee does not pay for a board voluntarily. He asked DOE and the regulators to fund the Board at a level that meets their commitments.

Nolan said Ecology will work with DOE, the TPA and its guidelines to fully fund the Board.

Keith thought DOE should be reminded that the closure of other sites should make funding achievable. He also thought it is important for the Board justify and identify how its money is spent.

Susan said the Board received \$616,000 in 1997 and \$607,000 in 2002. The Board's budget has been the same since 2003 (\$471,000). The Board's budget was even greater prior to 1997.

Pam said there will be expenses for the SSAB meeting even though it is in the Tri-Cities. She encouraged people to carpool to meetings outside the Tri-Cities.

Susan said a budget subcommittee has been working on the issue for some time. She suggested bringing the budget issue to EIC to identify areas where the Board can reduce its costs to meet the FY 2008 ceiling. She would like to see an updated work plan for each committee so they can work with the agencies to identify average costs per meeting and plan for the FY 2010 budget.

Susan said she wanted the full Board to be aware of the budget problems and encouraged members to contact her if they have ideas or questions. She noted that Board funding has been a line item managed by DOE-ORP; in FY 2009 it will move back into a larger fund managed by DOE-RL.

## **FY 2009 Budget Appropriation**

Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, and Doug Shoop, DOE-RL, provided a high-level informational presentation about the FY 2009 budget.

### *DOE-ORP*

Shirley said the top priority for the EM complex is to clean up radioactive tank waste. The top EM priorities in the FY 2009 budget request are:

- Conduct safe operations
- Support post-closure benefits and liability requirements
- Fully establish the disposition capability for radioactive liquid tank waste, special nuclear materials, and spent nuclear fuel
- Dispose of remote-handled and contact-handled transuranic waste (TRU) and low-level radioactive waste
- Continue to remediate contaminated soil and groundwater
- Decontaminate and decommission facilities that are no longer needed

Overall, Shirley said, funding is down for the entire EM complex. The FY 2008 appropriation was approximately \$5.7 billion; the FY 2009 request is approximately \$5.2 billion. DOE-ORP's budget request for FY 2009 is approximately \$1 billion.

Shirley discussed significant changes from FY 2008 to FY 2009 for DOE-ORP, planned accomplishments, and milestones. The budget difference from FY 2008 and FY 2009 for DOE-ORP is about \$9.8 million. DOE-ORP continues to make it a priority to meet the 2019 deadline for WTP and make glass by 2014, retrieve tank waste, and look into accelerating pre-treatment capability at tank farms.

The DBVS baseline was \$54 million but will receive \$1 million in FY 2009. Shirley said DOE will hire an expert panel in 2008 to advise them other factors to consider when DOE evaluates its single-shell tank integrity program; that funding was not in DOE-ORP's baseline.

DOE-ORP FY 2009 planned accomplishments include bringing WTP to 56% completion, 89% design, and 46% construction (based on \$690 million in funding); the LAW facility is planned to be brought to 87% completion (\$160 million). Other WTP facility planned accomplishments include bringing the analytical laboratory facility (LAB) to 55% completion (\$65 million), the balance of facilities (BOF) to 58% completion (\$75 million), the high-level waste facility to 51% completion (\$125 million), and the pre-treatment facility to 49% completion (\$265 million).

Tank farms will receive \$288 million. Tank farm FY 2009 planned accomplishments include:

- Manage tank farms in a safe and compliant manner
- Retrieve one C-farm single-shell tank (eight completed; two in progress; two in preparation)
- Continue conceptual planning and technology development for the interim pre-treatment system and submit critical decision-1 package
- Complete two evaporator campaigns and AP tank farm level rise creating double-shell tank space
- Continue bulk vitrification system cold testing
- Complete TC&WM EIS and issue ROD
- Replace evaporator confinement ventilation system (exhaust side)
- Double-shell tank integrity work (three core samples) and two cross-site transfers
- Continue to perform single-shell tank integrity evaluations (implement expert panel recommendations)
- Replace tank sampling truck
- Complete AP tank farm level rise to create additional double-shell tank space
- Removal of hose-in-hose transfer lines

Shirley noted that there are two FY 2009 TPA milestones at risk due to technical issues (WTP start cold commissioning [M-62-09] and WTP final compliance date [WTP-DWP-32]) and one at risk due to technical and budgetary issues (complete startup and turnover activities for waste retrieval and immobilization systems for selected initial high-level waste feed tank [M-47-03A]).

### *DOE-RL*

Doug said DOE-RL has seen a \$45 million decrease from FY 2008 appropriations of \$983 million to the FY 2009 president's request of \$938 million.

DOE-RL saw increases for:

- Procurement of additional containers to support shipping of special nuclear materials from the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) and increased cost for minimum safe operations in support of shipping special nuclear materials
- K-East Basin demolition and conceptual design effort for sludge treatment project
- Materials associated with construction of a pump and treatment facility in the 100-D Area; increased in-situ remediation activities within the HR-3 Operable Unit, and increased characterization drilling along the Columbia River

These increases were offset by decreases or deferrals in:

- Ongoing activities for deactivation, decontamination, decommissioning, and demolition of facilities/structures in the 100 and 300 Areas, and waste site and burial ground remediation in the 100 Areas
- Slow downs of TRU retrieval
- Deferred design completion for the remote-handled TRU waste process capability
- Deferral of mixed low-level waste treatment and disposition

Doug described some of the planned accomplishments in FY 2009:

- Complete shipment of plutonium off-site
- Complete interim remedial actions for 100-F Area
- Complete interim remedial actions for High Environmental Priority waste sites in the 300 Area
- Continue construction of new disposal cells at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF)
- Continue D4 activities in the 300 Areas, including the 324 and 327 facilities, and upgrade utilities to support the 300 Area facilities to be retained for Office of Science use
- Complete demolition of K-East Basin
- Retrieve 1,100 cubic meters of suspect transuranic waste from the low-level burial grounds and continue minimal certification of TRU
- Upgrade remediation approach for hexavalent chromium for 100-KR-4, 100-HR-3H, and 100-HR-3D groundwater remediation systems
- Initiate design for the final remedial action for the 100-D Area
- Complete transition of Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) to long-term surveillance and maintenance

Doug said that eleven DOE-RL milestones are at risk, four due to technical issues and seven due to budget issues. The budget is not the one hoped for by DOE-RL, but Doug said they are working hard on progress to move forward.

### *Discussion*

Todd asked if the AP tank farm level rise meant that DOE is changing the criteria for what is safe. Shirley said yes, that was changed, the basis of which was shared with the TWC.

Pam asked about the M-91 facility; Doug said they received directional decisions to help move forward. CD-1 evaluates alternatives. Doug offered a more detailed discussion with RAP.

Keith appreciated DOE sharing the budget information with the Board. He asked about the milestones at risk due to technical issues; Doug said there are technical uncertainties for initiating sludge treatment, but did not know the exact technical issues that were inhibiting the complete removal of K Basins and their content or initiating soil remediation at K-West Basin, but he could find out.

Nancy said it is hard from year to year to assess where progress is or is not made to due a variety of issues including budget, technical issues, or weather. Does DOE annually revisit the list of planned accomplishments to see if it was successful or where expectations were set too high? She asked if the Board could see such a summary next year. Nancy thought it was hard to evaluate DOE's planned

accomplishments if there are no results from the previous year. Shirley said DOE manages its processes through its baselines – they can precisely show the plan, what was funded and what had to change based on funding. Depending on funding, Shirley said DOE may have to change its strategy altogether. DOE maintains a baseline with validated assumptions that can show funding gaps.

Gerry said the budget request was inadequate. He said DOE-RL needed \$935 million but requested \$865 million. He would like the committees to review what was not funded compared to what DOE expected to be funded. He wanted to know what else is not funded at the target. He would also like the committee to discuss funding for FY 2008 because most of the FY 2008 and FY 2009 milestones have inadequate funding.

Greg Jones, DOE-ORP, clarified that the target for FY 2009 was \$934 million and the request was \$938 million. It included significant over-target requests and includes funding for security and non-defense work.

Susan encouraged Board members to attend the budget workshop being held the following week.

Dick thought it seemed like many things were done in series when they should have been done in parallel, like figuring out a treatment solution for sludge. Doug said they have looked at alternatives for some time and want to ensure a rigorous sludge treatment solution.

Maynard asked if there were any infrastructure issues that may be impacted by a lack of funding. Doug said DOE continues to upgrade facilities to ensure they operate safely; the Mission Support Contract (MSC) will focus on infrastructure.

Nolan said Ecology is also concerned about infrastructure, especially the reduction in tank farm infrastructure.

### **Site Specific Advisory Board Update**

The Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSABs) are meeting at Hanford on April 22 – 24, 2008. Susan and the other Board chairs are developing the agenda. Susan reminded the Board that cleanup issues are discussed at a national level through the SSABs, and letters are brought forth to the Board from the SSABs for approval.

Susan extended an open invitation to the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) open house on Tuesday, April 22.

### **Agency Updates**

#### *DOE-ORP*

Shirley updated the Board on DOE-ORPs current activities. Construction is underway at WTP; high-level waste facility construction began in mid-September and construction on the pre-treatment facility began in December. There are about 750 craftsmen and about 865 engineers, which is the peak for that group. Low-activity waste facility design is 95% complete and construction is 52% complete. Shirley said they are making good progress even with weather complications.

The third skid for the pre-treatment facility and engineering platform is being delivered this week; the engineering platform is critical to resolving the open external flow sheet review. Platform construction will begin in April followed by testing in the summer. The platform will be assembled on the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) site. Shirley said they hope to complete Phase 1 testing by the beginning of 2009, which will solve open technical issues like leaching, mixing and particle size. Shirley said they know the plant will work but the question is how well will it work.

Shirley said cold weather has made it challenging to install the T-Farm interim surface barrier. She considered it a big lesson-learned to only install such a barrier in non-winter months. The cost estimate was \$1.5 million; DOE-ORP now expects it to cost \$5 million.

Shirley said the fold track technology and cold testing at the facility is encouraging. She said it appears that it will help retrieve the last percentages of waste left in tanks. Tank C-109 inspections begin in April and readiness reviews begin in March. DOE-ORP expects to complete C-109 and begin C-108 at the end of September. Corrective actions for tank S-102 are about 70% complete.

Shirley commented that the DBVS design approval is a critical decision and thanked Ben for the detailed presentation. Shirley introduced Hugh Taylor, the new deputy manager for DOE-ORP and noted that Zack Smith will be leaving in mid-March to work at Savannah River. Shirley said their goal is 147 total staff and have funding for 130. She said DOE-ORP is actively hiring new staff and Shirley has requested additional senior level positions she believes are needed.

### *Discussion*

Ken Gasper said he was encouraged by DOE-ORP's progress on several issues, such as supplemental treatment technology. He looks forward to tank retrieval activities resuming and learning more at the committee level in March or April. Ken is interested in how DOE plans to pursue supplemental treatment while on a constrained budget. Shirley said DOE will engage the Board and committees on supplemental treatment logic and strategy.

### *DOE-RL*

Doug updated the Board on DOE-RL activities. DOE-RL continues to focus on increasing its productivity and safety. Progress continues on remediating facilities and waste sites in the 300 Area. To date, 109 buildings out of 510 facilities have been deactivated, decommissioned, decontaminated, and demolished; 70 waste sites have been remediated. More waste is being placed in ERDF, bringing the total soil tonnage to 1.2 million. Doug said Cells 5 and 6 in ERDF are about half full. In December, the contract was awarded to begin expanding ERDF and building more cells. Construction will begin in March and work should be complete in early 2009.

Doug said they continue to make good progress in consolidating nuclear materials off-site and continue to remediate glove boxes at PFP. Approximately 7,236 cubic meters have been retrieved, or about 34,800 drum-equivalents out of Hanford's estimated 70,000 drum-equivalents. Doug said they have challenged Fluor to find innovative ways to increase productivity and are sharing lessons-learned with Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) so both can benefit.

Waste continues to be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) – ten more shipments have been made since November. Doug said weather has been causing some problems, but shipments continue. They are also sending sodium bonded fuel to Idaho. Doug confirmed the December 20 TPA milestone is to treat 6,500 cubic meters of mixed low-level waste.

Doug said decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) is beginning at K-East Basin. K-East grouting is complete; about a foot of grout was placed to help control radioactive materials and dewatering has commenced. The Effluent Treatment Facility will treat the water. Following dewatering, glycerin and another fixative will be sprayed to control contamination. The basin will be filled with a sand-like material before the superstructure is torn down. Doug said they have consolidated all sludge in the K-West Basin and are shipping the last bits of fuel scraps to the Central Plateau.

Doug said they continue to install more wells and are looking at using more treatment technologies on groundwater projects. In early January, some Board members toured the 618-7 burial ground. Doug thanked the contractor for planning the tour and noted that waste has to be very methodically and carefully treated because of its close proximity to the Tri-Cities. The surge area at 618-7 burial ground was excavated and workers found several drums. Doug said it will be challenging to meet the December 2008 TPA milestone for finishing the burial ground depending on the condition of the drums. Doug showed a video clip of how drums are punched to see what materials are inside. The drum is placed in over-pack before it is punched and a hopper of sand is kept nearby in case of spontaneous combustion.

Doug said DOE-RL's re-organization was approved on February 3. Each of the prime contracts will have a senior manager.

- Assistant Manager for the River Corridor: Joe Franco
- Assistant Manager for Central Plateau: Matt McCormick

- Assistant Manager for Mission Support: Doug Shoop (acting)
- Assistant Manager for Safety and Environment: Robert Hastings (acting)
- Assistant Manager for Administration: Gregory Jones

Doug said Leif Erikson will become the assistant manager for the Mission Support Contract and they will hire a new Safety and Environment assistant manager.

#### *Discussion*

Keith commended the contractor for using remote-handling technologies and listening to the workers to use best practices. He said he has never seen a retrieval more centered on safety. He hoped those practices and culture can be expanded around the site.

Maynard was impressed with the variety of technologies used and encouraged the rest of the Board to watch the videos. Bob Suyama thought the tour was a great opportunity for the committee to see how everything fits together and to better understand the issues and work.

Pam was surprised that work continued during the day's high winds; Doug said there are controls but he doubted retrievals were happening. He said the periphery of the site is monitored, but Pam has a valid point.

Keith asked if the DOE-RL managers understood Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) and its need to be integrated throughout the site. Doug said DOE is required to have ISMS and contractors are required to use it. Reviews of the system's effectiveness are also now required on an annual basis.

Rob asked how many people are employed at DOE-RL; Doug said they currently have 250 but anticipate having about 275 staff members.

#### *Ecology*

Nolan provided an update for Ecology. He said Governor Gregoire made a strong statement about her concerns on the FY 2009 presidential budget. Ecology is concerned about tank retrievals; one per year does not meet the proposed technical negotiations packages. Ecology is concerned that this budget puts its citizens and the Columbia River at risk. Nolan said Ecology has expectations about what the FY 2010 budget outreach planning looks like, and they appreciate DOE's responsiveness.

Ecology issued a \$500,000 penalty to DOE for the S-102 tank spill. Ecology is meeting with DOE and the contractor to discuss the penalty and look at supplemental environmental projects. Nolan noted that Ecology cannot advocate for particular projects, so he advised the Board to talk to DOE or its contractors if they are interested.

Ecology is returning to the use of Action Memorandums in the 200 Area. They are less formal than RODs, but will eventually be followed by RODs. Nolan said cleanup in the area is scheduled to start in FY 2008 and will be completed in FY 2011.

Nolan said DOE installed 22 wells under the M-24 milestones totaling 38 wells in 2007. The milestone is complete and Ecology is reviewing the draft 2007 Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report.

Nolan provided an update on the Yakima Basin Storage Study Draft Planning Report and EIS, better known as Black Rock. He said it is not a TPA issue, but the Bureau of Reclamation announced that the planning report and EIS are complete and are available for public review. The comment period is January 29 through March 31, 2008. Public meetings are scheduled on February 27 at the Yakima Convention Center and on February 28 at the Three Rivers Convention Center in Kennewick. Nolan noted there is a letter from the Bureau of Reclamation announcing the public comment period on the back table for Board members to review.

Ecology has comments from the 2007 State of the Site meetings which EnviroIssues will distribute. Ecology compiled comments generated from an evaluation provided at the meetings. Comments were not

categorized. Nolan said PIC is working on utilizing all ways to reach people and said Ecology would soon have its annual survey of public involvement.

#### *EPA*

Nick provided an update for EPA. He said TPA negotiations are temporarily suspended but they have not stopped work on the TPA; EPA continues to push the framework and continues to work at Hanford according to the existing TPA. He recognized there are difficult compliance issues down the road and milestones in jeopardy. Nick discussed the site's budget and funding demands. He said there are conflicting demands for resources, and while baselines are helpful, the site has to look at efficiencies and use the money it has. EPA has asked some Board members to help them along with other key players to look at more cost effective ways of working.

Nick said EPA's 200 Area white paper is an important piece that has generated considerable dialogue. Some people thought it was geared too much toward capping and others thought capping would be too difficult. Nick thought there were tough decisions to be made.

Nick discussed EPA's National Remedy Review Board that evaluates cleanup decisions involving EPA across the country. He said there is a higher threshold for DOE sites than private sites. Nick sits on the board for Region 10, which will be at Hanford in March. Nick noted that the board contains senior EPA members who tend to be on the board for some time; he hopes to familiarize them with Hanford and help them understand the vastness of the work.

Nick noted that the 200-ZP-1 operable unit ROD is coming up. Regarding the ERDF penalty, Nick said construction on the greenhouse is underway and two boats will be delivered in the spring and summer. He thought that was a great outcome of a penalty instead of just cash, and he appreciated DOE and contractor cooperation.

Nick discussed milestones, cleanup schedules and delay consequences. EPA wants the River Corridor cleaned up and usable in the future. Right now there are holes in progress, including K Basin delays, soil remediation and burial ground work. Nick said they want DOE to show a schedule for how all that work will happen, and last week signed a settlement agreement to extend K Basin and burial ground milestones until 2009. EPA assessed a \$75,000 penalty to DOE to ensure they receive a schedule, scope, budget and milestones. DOE already submitted the scope description, and will submit the schedule and budget in March and the milestone proposals in May.

EPA is pleased to see progress with 618-7 burial ground work, but is concerned about the Central Plateau cleanup work schedule. Nick said the work does not look to be on schedule as they had hoped. He thought TPA negotiations will really show that schedule issues need to be resolved.

Nick stressed that the more efficient, successful and creative cleanup at the site is now, the more likely Congress will trust the work and provide funding.

### **Committee Reports**

#### *HSEP*

Keith said HSEP discussed safety programs identified in the recent request for proposals (RFPs). DOE discussed its intent for the MSC and how that contract will be responsible for formulating uniform safety programs. He said the committee also heard testimonies from workers and DOE on the respiratory program. The committee drafted advice that HSEP members will discuss at lunch today; it hopes to have advice ready for the April Board meeting.

#### *RAP*

Maynard said the committee will discuss a variety of issues at its next meeting:

- PW-1, 3, and 6, groundwater aspects, and plutonium; Maynard said this is the first time DOE is looking at how to handle such issues
- 200-ZP-1 operable unit
- EPA's 200 Area white paper
- Deep vadose zone treatability testing

- Columbia River component of RCBRA (basis of Hanford waste that goes into the river); there is a workshop on February 11

Maynard encouraged more people to attend RAP meetings and assist some of the busier issue managers. He said the committee will be doing more cross-over work with BCC and other committees. Maynard thought collaborative efforts are very helpful and encouraged more joint and cross-cutting meetings.

#### *TWC*

Ken Gasper said TWC has been busy. Advice #192 asked for a system plan update from DOE-ORP to reflect the impacts of WTP delays, and the committee has received progress reports through June 2007. After that, there has not been much information available. DOE briefed the committee last week on the system plan revisions it received from the contractor. It meets the intent of Advice #192 and Ken looks forward to the report being available at the end of March. The committee would like a system plan presentation at the April Board meeting. Ken noted that it is not a study of alternatives, but a plan covering all baseline activities. Ken also noted that the committee looks forward to the lifecycle report because it will consider all reasonable alternatives.

Ken said the committee has been regularly briefed on DBVS and was happy to see a test report. It also received a briefing on promising pre-treatment activities, which are needed for any early supplemental treatment whether that is an early startup of the LAW facility or bulk vitrification or any other option. Ken thought fractional crystallization technology showed promise at a laboratory scale, and they have heard plans of going forward with a pilot plant with test results available this spring. He suggested possibly having a report from the agencies at the April Board meeting. Ken said the committee would like to know how technologies compare; DOE is looking forward to some funding for such a system analysis to see how technology can integrate or not with alternatives that are on the table.

TWC discussed the business case evaluation report prepared by DOE-ORP in response to DOE-HQ's request to see if DBVS investigations should continue. Ken said it has been rewarding to see the level of involvement and competency that Ecology brought to the evaluation. He thought it is important to see how technical issues like this fit into budget planning and prioritization.

Ken said there will be several issue manager meetings leading into the March committee meeting in preparation for the April Board meeting.

#### *BCC*

Harold said BCC is reviewing the pensions and benefits program being considered for contracts currently under review by DOE. The committee also provided comments on the RFPs for the three site contracts. Harold said they had limited information during the procurement process. He also noted that the RFPs are a general description of the work to be performed, not specific work order. Specific scope and schedules will be figured out once contractors are selected.

Harold commented that there is always more work than there is money. He thought DOE did a remarkable job last year of putting budget materials together and reporting on public input. Harold said public comments focused on continuing with cleanup.

Harold thought the letter to Jim Rispoli will help put the Board interest in the "big picture" of cleanup on record. The current baselines are more short-term and there is work that has to be done that has not been yet negotiated. Harold hoped that by finishing and awarding the new contracts, BCC and the rest of Hanford can focus on budget issues.

Susan noted that budget workshops are coming up and there is a meeting today at noon to discuss them with PIC. She thought BCC members may be interested in joining them.

Karen noted that DOE would like guidance regarding budget efforts in February.

Ken Gasper thanked BCC for coordinating with TWC and RAP on the last piece of budget advice regarding TPA negotiations. He commended the collaborative effort.

#### *PIC*

Steve said PIC had a very energetic and productive meeting. It discussed a few crucial items, including the draft TPA FY 2007/2008 Communications and Public Involvement Strategic Plan. He thought the matrix was very valuable and helped animate and focus the committee on the work needed this spring. Issue managers were assigned and PIC will work to have more focused meetings. Karen said several items were very timely and PIC responded.

The committee reviewed a draft proposal to have a public involvement workshop to discuss how the Board, organizations and agencies each view public involvement and their goals for public involvement. The proposal emphasized clearing away past habits and assumptions and starting with a fresh discussion. Steve said it will require a sponsor outside of the Board and Ken Niles thought the State of Oregon may be able to sponsor it. Steve said the time-sensitive issues identified by DOE pushed this workshop back, but Steve did not want it to languish. He thought it could change the way PIC meets its public involvement responsibilities to the Board and the public.

Susan charged the committees to review the letter from the agencies outlining major issues the Board should review and address them in their committee work plans.

### *Discussion*

Rob commented that the Board needs to support DOE efforts to move forward with an early LAW facility startup and encouraged TWC to draft advice in support of an early LAW facility startup. Susan thought such advice had been issued in the past; Pam said early LAW facility startup has been discussed in TWC for some time. Steve said DOE is wrestling with different treatment technologies that might achieve such an early start, but he did not know if advice would be helpful at this time or just continue the dialogue. Steve said there has to be some form of pre-treatment regardless of the chosen supplemental technology; focused energy on early pre-treatment is going to be important.

Dick said the Board has pushed for an early LAW facility startup for several years and DOE-ORP seems to think it is a good idea. He said the committee and issue manager discussions have been very useful.

Mike Korenko supported emphasizing both pre-treatment and an early LAW facility startup. After hearing about the DBVS sulfur issue, he said he was also concerned about WTP making viable glass – are there lessons-learned from DBVS testing that can be applied to WTP? He thought an early LAW facility startup would help identify and solve problems early before WTP is operational.

Susan encouraged those discussions within the RAP and TWC committees.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment was offered.

### **Board Business**

April Board meeting topics may include:

- State of the Columbia River update (EPA)
- TPA negotiations update
- Board budget update
- HSEP advice on standardized safety programs
- TWC advice on the business case evaluation report
- BCC advice on lifecycle cost and schedule reports

Other potential April Board meeting topics will be identified in the upcoming committee meetings.

Committee calls and meeting dates:

- BCC meeting: Monday, February 11 (1:00 p.m.)
- RAP meeting: Tuesday, February 12 (9:00 a.m.)

- BCC meeting: Tuesday, February 12 (1:30 p.m.)
- PIC conference call: Thursday, February 21

## Attendees

### HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Rob Davis, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Emmett Moore, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Gene Schreckhise, Member	Laura Mueller, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Gary Petersen, Alternate
Becky Holland, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Rick Jansons, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Dan Rowland, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member	Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Alternate	Dick Smith, Alternate
Susan Kreid, Member	Al Boldt, Alternate	John Stanfill, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Barry Beyeler, Alternate	Charlie Weems, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Ken Gasper, Alternate	
Todd Martin, Member	Floyd Hodges, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-Officio
Ken Niles, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-Officio
Bob Parks, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate	
Maynard Plahuta, Member	Jerri Main, Alternate	

### AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Doug Shoop, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
	D. Butler, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Jason Mulvihill-Kuntz, EnviroIssues
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Suzanne Dahl, Ecology	Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
Ben Harp, DOE-ORP	Jane Hedges, Ecology	
Gregory Jones, DOE-ORP	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
Carrie Meyer, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	
Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP	Ginger Wireman, Ecology	Peter Bengtson, WCH
Steve Weigman, DOE-ORP		
	Nick Ceto, EPA	
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	
	Mike Priddy, DOH	

### MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Joe Cruz, B&W	Julie Jones, City of West Richland	N. Kinxter-Meyer, GAO
Beverly Penny, CTUIR	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Joseph Giitter, US NRC
Ted Repasky, CTUIR	Margaret Dagle	