

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

April 3 – 4, 2008

Portland, OR

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary..... 1
Welcome, Introductions and Announcements 2
February Meeting Summaries 2
Draft Letter on the 200 Area ZP1 Operable Unit 2
Draft Advice on Site Coordination Technology Group 4
Draft Advice on Configuration Control over System Baseline Assumptions..... 6
Tri-Party Agreement Negotiations Update 8
Draft Advice FY 2009 Budget Request..... 8
Draft Advice FY 2010 Budget Development13
Site Specific Advisory Board Update.....15
Agency Updates16
Committee Reports.....18
Public Comment20
Board Business21

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 three pieces of advice during the April meeting. The first voiced support for reconvening the Site Coordination Technology Group at Hanford and other Department of Energy (DOE) sites, the second prioritized funding for any increase to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 budget request, and the third commented on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 budget development.

The Board also adopted a letter in support of the work happening in the 200 Area ZP1 Operable Unit.

TPA Negotiations Update

The Board received an update on the ongoing Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) negotiations and will continue to track the negotiation process.

National Liaison Update

Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, reported on recent Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) activities including the upcoming Chair’s meeting that will be held in Richland, Washington at the end of April.

Board Business

The Board will have committee calls in April to plan for committee meetings in May. The Board will meet in June.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

April 3-4, 2008 Portland, OR

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force) 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 asked HAB members to sign cards located in the back of the room for friends and family of the HAB that have moved on, been sick, or passed away.

Susan congratulated Shirley Olinger, Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), on her nomination for 2008 Woman of Achievement.

Susan announced the April 15th workshop on PW 1/3/6 disposal sites around the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) regarding cleanup alternatives.

Susan introduced new HAB members Julie Jones, City of West Richland, and Doug Mercer, University of Washington, and welcomed them to the table.

Susan reviewed the meeting goals:

- Consider a draft letter from the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) regarding the remedy selection to treat groundwater contaminants near the Plutonium Finishing Plant;
- Consider draft advice from RAP on the reconvening of site technology coordination groups to review remediation technologies;
- Consider draft advice from the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) on the configuration control over system baseline assumptions used in decision making studies;
- Hear an update on the negotiations process from the Tri-Party agencies;
- Consider draft advice from the Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC) on the FY09 Budget Request; and
- Consider draft advice from BCC on the FY10 Budget Development.

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

February Meeting Summaries

Board members did not submit any non-substantive changes on the February meeting summary.

The February meeting summary was adopted.

Draft Letter on the 200 Area ZP1 Operable Unit

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), introduced the draft letter on the 200 Area ZP1 Operable Unit. She said the RAP committee received a presentation from Dennis Faulk, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regarding the decision to use the cleanup remedy of pump and treat in the ZP1 Area Operable Unit. Pam said this operable unit has been studied for years; it is a large plume and poses a long term threat to the site and to the Columbia River. The Feasibility Study (FS) calls for a final cleanup remedy of pump and treat to be released this spring. Pam thought this was a significant determination for DOE and will effectively address the carbon tetrachloride plume and other threats in the area. The remedy selection and path forward is positive and the Board should take the opportunity to support the effort.

However, DOE was planning to begin this work in 2009 but the budget does not provide funding for the equipment needed. Pam pointed out that there is an error in first paragraph of the draft letter that was distributed to HAB members; the paragraph should reference the carbon tetrachloride plume, not technetium 99.

Discussion

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), said he would prefer not to indicate the Board is happy with long term controls and asked to remove the last sentence of the second paragraph. Pam explained the commitment to pump and treat gave the committee confidence there would be long term action. Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), said the letter attempts to concentrate on the fact that DOE has made a commitment, and suggested that the language be revised to keep the focus on the recognition that an action is being made on cleanup.

Wade Riggsbee, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), agreed the emphasis should be on groundwater cleanup and technology. Wade said there is a problem with adding capacity to the pump in this area because the aquifer cannot be expanded until there is more characterization and testing. Nick Ceto, EPA, said the National Remedy Review Board has looked at the FS and believe that this is a major step forward in DOE's commitment to cleanup. Nick said the pump and treat will be a long term effort and did not think the reference to restoration efforts and long term monitoring does not take away from the Board's message.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large, said he did not see a problem with dropping the sentence about institutional controls (IC). Bob said RAP has an issue manager group working on the topic of ICs and did not think that group would be ready to make the statement included in the advice.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, suggested revising the language in the first sentence to clarify whether the Board has been concerned for many years or that the contamination has been there for many years.

Wade said the focus of the letter should be on the effort to expand characterization as well. DOE is trying to combine two projects at ZP1 to address carbon tetrachloride but also iodine and others contaminants. Susan suggested adding language regarding expanded characterization to address this.

Keith suggested removing the word we and replacing it with Board for consistency. Ken Niles felt that the terms HAB and Board should not be used interchangeably.

Armand Minthorn, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) (Ex-Officio), asked how the determination will be made in the remedial action to prevent versus mitigate. Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP, said prevention would occur where the contamination is in the soil and the objective would be to keep it from getting into the groundwater. Where contamination is already in the groundwater DOE will mitigate using a pump and treat. Armand argued that preventing the contamination from getting into the groundwater is not mitigation. Dennis Faulk recommended taking the reference to mitigation out of the letter because it has not been agreed to yet. Armand said he would like to see mitigate left in the letter. Armand said prevention and mitigation are two different actions and DOE has committed to doing both actions. Pam clarified that the language came directly from a presentation DOE made to the HAB. Steve said DOE is committed to both and offered to have a specific conversation regarding the difference between prevention and mitigation with DOE groundwater staff to make sure everyone understands the interpretation of the terms.

Pam thought that carbon tetrachloride should be referenced along with technetium 99 in the third paragraph. Dennis agreed that those are the two main contaminants of concern but the pump at treat remediation will address others too.

Susan asked if the letter should be addressed to Dave Brockman, DOE – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and the typical cc list. Ken Niles asked that the letter be cc'd to Mr. Rispoli at DOE – headquarters (HQ) as well.

Draft Advice on Site Coordination Technology Group

Shelley introduced the draft advice on the Site Coordination Technology Group (SCTG). She said when the SCTG was active they met monthly to focus on remediation technologies. Shelley said the funding for the group was cancelled in the 1990's. The Board issued advice (HAB Advice #156) in 2004 but DOE did not make a commitment to reinstate the group. In December 2006, the SSAB Chair made a recommendation that DOE include public participation in technology development similar to the site wide technology group. In January 2007, Mr. Rispoli responded to the SSAB letter and agreed the recommendation was sound and that an effort should be made to achieve the objective. Shelley said there has been no movement so far. The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) agreed with HAB Advice #156 but said if the group is reinstated it should be more cost effective and should only meet quarterly. Ecology also recommended the group focus on promising technologies. Shelley said the Science and Technology Roadmap was released last February which makes it more important than ever to get this group going again to provide input on the roadmap.

Agency Perspective

Doug Shoop, DOE-RL, asked if it would be helpful for DOE-RL to provide a presentation to the HAB on the Science and Technology Roadmap prior to the Board issuing the advice. Shelley thought the Board was informed of the roadmap and thought the presentation was not necessary prior to advice but would be useful at a later date. Doug said the roadmap is a living document that will change over time but because of the funding period the advice would be time critical.

Steve Wiegman said he discussed this topic with Mark Gilbertson's staff and said they have an interest in having further discussions with the HAB.

Jane Hedges, Ecology, said Ecology was supportive of the HAB's last communication regarding the SCTG and continues to express support for this effort. Jane thought the SCTG brought a uniform voice of priority that was effective at bringing technologies and money to Hanford.

Nick Ceto added many HAB members have already provided input on the roadmap. Nick said DOE will use the roadmap to move work forward and felt an effort needs to be made to make sure the mechanism is in place to provide formal input. Nick said it is important to include a message that funding should be included as well.

Discussion

Dick said Vince Panesko, HAB Board member, reported that the previous national technology program did not accomplish much with the money and resources that were used. Dick thought the idea was good but wanted to make sure the process is done better in the future. Dick said it would be nice to see individuals other than the contractors and DOE participate in technology selection. Shelley said she has spoken with Vince about the advice and he agreed that with Ecology's input the HAB could help turn this into something better than it was before.

Rick Jansons, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), commented that the advice itself is a good example of how advice should be done: it is high level and provides a good level of background information. Rick said he thinks it is important for the group to have diverse participation and to include people from off-site. He said he thought it was important for the people who make decisions on-site to travel and see what is done elsewhere; Rick said he travels more for the HAB than he did when he worked on site. Rick thought there are some basic things that are not being shared from site to site.

Susan said one message the Board took forward from the last technology group was the importance of being able to implement technologies in the field. Susan said that message should continue to be shared.

Pam said she understands the concerns regarding cost effectiveness but felt the communication the group achieved across programs was important. Pam thought the group was effective at identifying challenges in the field, prioritizing needs, and communicating with the people who provide funding. There is an effort to communicate tank closure, soil characterization, and remediation across the country but sometimes the only mechanism stakeholders have to participate in cross-fertilization of information is in this group. The

technology roadmap is an important document/process to be involved in because it provides stakeholders the chance to learn about funding for technology deployment and other tools. Shelley agreed that it would be nice to be at the front of the roadmap and participate in the process.

Ken Niles suggested providing examples in the advice of where the SCTG was effective. Ken said without getting into great detail, referencing the effectiveness of specific technologies would make the advice stronger. Nancy Murray, Public-at-Large, supported using examples as well.

Ken Gasper said some HAB members provided input on the draft roadmap and was happy to see those comments incorporated. Ken said he would report on aspects of roadmap as part of the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) report from the 2008 Waste Management meeting.

Tom Carpenter, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), said he discussed the issue of technology with a professor from American University. The professor had a meeting with contractors at Hanford and said the contractors felt they had no incentive to use foreign technologies and if they did, they would make less money. Tom thought there may be a contractual problem that prevents contractors to work on new technologies. Pam said Fluor Hanford (FH) said they had to achieve success on a new technology within two years because they had to use their own money and needed to pay back the money. Keith suggested that the advice provide ways DOE can incentivize contractors for using new technology.

Larry Lockrem, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), suggested replicating the technical workshop held at Savannah River last year. The workshop focused on on-site technology coordination and included individuals from the site, agencies, universities, etc. Larry said the success depends on the forum and the Savannah River workshop is a good example to use.

Bob said his concern regarding the SCTG is about implementation because he would not want this group to shift money from the cleanup budget. The group needs to be a communication device where each site could develop a technology program and share lessons learned across sites. Each site may need to use their own dollars to focus on what they need.

Susan Kreid, WA League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), thought the advice should be clarified to specify if the SCTG is for multiple sites or just at Hanford.

Maynard suggested referencing the Columbia River resources in the advice instead of just the Columbia River.

Ken Niles suggested including stakeholder assistance along with Congressional leverage in the reference to the renewed momentum for groundwater cleanup. Wade asked that tribal nations be included too.

Wade asked how the SCTG should actively engage with the Office of Science and Technology. Wade thought the interface for this communication does not currently exist and HAB may need to help develop this relationship.

Dick asked for clarification of the advice to say whether the quarterly meetings are limited to each site or if they are across site meetings.

Ken Niles asked that the example of grout materials be removed from the advice.

Shelley said she would like to see the fifth advice bullet regarding DOE contracts dropped because it is a separate issue and may be a topic that warrants a separate letter. Dick agreed that the contractual issues should be deleted from the advice. Maynard disagreed; he thought the advice on contracts was an implementation method for the process. Maynard said there were problems with the previous group because contractors were not actively involved and the fifth advice bullet directly addresses that issue. The advice to hold semi annual meetings is also an implementation piece and follows the same logic as this one. Shelley said the contracts issue may be better worded to ask contractors to be incentivized to participate in the group.

Ken Niles proposed new language for the fifth advice bullet. Pam said technologies developed by the private sector were hard to incorporate into the SCTGs and suggested including a reference to private

sector technologies as well. Ken Gasper supported Pam's addition. He said the most profitable new technology to Hanford has been the hose in hose application in tank farms which came out of the private sector.

Dick suggested changing the numerical advice points to regular bullets to clarify that they are not in order of priority.

Larry asked that universities be included as well as the private sector.

Susan said the advice would be sent to Mr. Rispoli and the usual list of cc's. Shelley suggested cc'ing the SSABs too.

The Board adopted the advice.

Draft Advice on Configuration Control over System Baseline Assumptions

Dick Smith introduced the draft advice on configuration control over system baseline assumptions. Dick said the draft advice on configuration control in system baseline assumptions is the result of TWC committee discussions. DOE-ORP recently prepared a Business Case Study that looked at alternative treatments for low level wastes. Some examples raised in the study were unsatisfactory to TWC members. For example, DOE-ORP failed to evaluate particular scenarios and used different parameters than ones used in their other reports. Dick said in his opinion the report was written to support bulk vitrification with different parameters used but not documented from DOE's baseline. Dick said it took a lot of research to determine why the parameters had been changed and felt the parameters used should have been identified up front. The TWC determined this warranted advice. . Dick said DOE needs to be more transparent in parameters usage in a report and should not be able to change those unless they go through a process to determine why it is necessary. The advice attempts to recommend that DOE document their procedure so any lay person can understand why and how the documents were written. Dick said this advice is a matter of technical integrity.

Agency Perspective

Steve said he agrees with the TWC's desire to make reports more transparent. However, Steve said he expected to have the opportunity to discuss this issue with TWC before the advice went to the Board and explain why the different parameters were used. Steve also asked for clarification on the level of assumptions that should be shared from the system plan because some of the assumptions are extremely technical. Steve said he would like the opportunity to discuss this issue further with TWC issue managers before the advice goes forward.

Nick said EPA thought the fact that the baseline is beginning to be shared with the regulators is good, but said it is critical that the planning tools are transparent enough to understand. Nick agreed that if DOE has a plan, the public should know what the plan is. During the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) negotiations, the agencies talked about scope, schedule and cleanup decisions and discussed what each agency was thinking. A few projects were looked at in detail, but without knowing the cost details it was hard to comment. Once EPA saw those details they were able to comment and move forward in negotiations. Nick thought controlling the assumptions used is a good case to make.

Jane said Ecology has the advantages of having their technical staff sit down and ask the questions about why a document changed. She said her concern is the implementability of this advice.

Discussion

Ken Niles said he supported the advice and would like to see it go forward, but suggested the advice be rewritten to be clearer so the public is able to understand the Board's intentions. Ken said Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), has rewritten another version of the advice that attempts to make it more readable for those who are not engineers and technically involved.

Susan reviewed Dirk's version of the advice, she said the two pieces of advice are very different and asked if the advice is time sensitive. Dick said he thinks it is important for the advice be instituted as soon as possible so future reports can benefit, but indicated it was not particularly time sensitive. Ken Gasper thought Dick's draft is more concise and Dirk's is more public friendly. Ken said members of the TWC have reviewed both pieces of advice and feel that either of them will meet the communications needs from HAB to DOE that the committee is seeking. Dick said the advice is for DOE so it should be written so DOE understands it; Dick was not sure the general public particularly cared about this topic.

Keith said he supports Dirk's draft in lieu of HAB's recent advice on readability of documents.

Susan asked how TWC members felt about Steve's request to send the advice back to TWC. Ken Gasper said he thought this was a request that the committee could honor. Dick asked how many documents ORP is preparing now which would not adhere to this advice. Dick thought that if there are not many documents coming out then the advice is not time sensitive and could go back to committee, but if there are documents that will be released soon then the advice needs to go forward. Steve said a team from DOE headquarters (HQ) is working with ORP on the next part of the business case study that will come out soon but it is so far along that this advice would not affect that work. Dick asked what the status was of the System Plan Rev 3. Steve said the System Plan Rev 3 is available and could be shared with the committee now. Dick asked if the assumptions for that document are easily accessible. Dick said he spent a lot of time digging through old documents to pull out the System Plan Rev 2 assumptions to compare against the business case study. Steve said he would check with Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP, but thought they would be able to share the assumptions.

Susan said the policy issue in the advice is transparency. If the advice goes back to committee, the committee should determine what level of detail should go forward to the Board in June. Rick thought the advice should go back to committee. Rick said he read the documents Dick is referencing and said there is a lot of detail in those studies that would make it difficult to implement in a database. Rick said he supports the transparency issue but would like to see the suggestions regarding implementation removed from the advice. Rick said he did not think the advice is time sensitive. Dick clarified that the advice just asks that a document list the assumptions that were made and why they changed. This is not a major cost item and would not require a new database system, but DOE needs to make it readily available to everyone.

Bob provided an example of a table that was used to present the options for single shell tank (SST) retrieval and said the assumptions could be displayed in a table like this one at the beginning of each document. A simple table can help people understand what assumptions were used. This would simplify the cases that use different rates and underlying assumptions. Bob agreed that this topic should go back to committee to look at different ways to display the information.

Keith said he had a unique position at Hanford and got to see how decisions were made even though he worked in the trenches. Keith said having this kind of record is good but HAB needs to be careful about how they ask DOE to do it.

Susan Kreid thought there was more at stake than transparency. Over time, the numbers of pages in a document has been substituted for clarity and the documents have become more and more obtuse. If the public is going to understand a document they need to know up front what assumptions were used in creating it. Susan referenced the NASA incident that occurred when one team was using metric measurement and the other was using standard. Susan said that was a critical mistake in transparency.

Tom agreed with Susan Kried's comment and said configuration control is a basic element for nuclear safety and thought this was not being done at tank farms. Tom said it could be a matter of DOE requiring contractors to do this more effectively at tank farms. Tom said he strongly supports the advice and would like to see the information on assumptions be made public.

Susan Leckband confirmed Board consensus that the advice should go back to committee and be restructured. DOE will review the advice with the committee to support this advice. Susan asked Tom to follow up with the TWC with his specific comments.

Tri-Party Agreement Negotiations Update

Jane provided an update on the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) negotiations. She said she and Nick, along with representatives from their agencies, met yesterday for negotiations in Seattle. Jane said during the last HAB meeting she explained that they were waiting for the Governor to meet with the Secretary of Energy. She said the Washington State Legislature session delayed that meeting, but the parties have met and a status update was distributed to the Board regarding that meeting. Jane said the negotiation meeting was constructive and positive and the representatives will go to their principals to talk about next steps.

Discussion

Ken Gasper asked if it would be appropriate to put another update on the June Board meeting agenda. Jane said she was not sure if they will have anything concrete to share by June. She offered to provide the same type of update she did today again in June, but did not think she could promise anything more.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America NW (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked Jane to restate the timeline. Jane said she does not have a specific timeline for negotiations, they are hoping to have information at the end of May but that has yet to be agreed upon by all the agencies. Gerry said it is nearing two years since DOE proposed delays to the milestones which is unacceptable. Gerry commented that the HAB issued advice six months ago that asked the regulators not to negotiate further until DOE does a lifecycle cost and schedule report to show how fast DOE could do the work without a constrained budget. Gerry asked if DOE has agreed to do the report. Jane said she cannot share what the State is going to do. The Governor made a commitment to talk with the Secretary of Energy, which she did, and the regulators are still waiting for further guidance from the State.

Gerry asked for feedback from the other agencies. Nick said the TPA is their tool for follow through. Steve said the report the HAB has asked for is part of negotiations and it is DOE's intent to proceed on negotiations. Gerry said the negotiations make it impossible to get more funding from Congress. Gerry felt that it will undermine stakeholder's ability to fight for additional cleanup money if there is not a public acknowledgement that the negotiations are not happening on the delays. Nick said while he understands Gerry's perspective he does not see that the issue is tied to negotiations the way Gerry described. DOE has been clear they have insufficient resources to meet compliance.

Keith said he took to heart the statement that the discussions have been positive. Keith said he thinks the State and EPA are aware of the public's concerns and perhaps some of those concerns were reflected in that positive connotation. Keith said as a member of the public he would like to encourage the regulators to stand fast to some of those principals as they continue through negotiations.

Dick asked if the life cycle cost and schedule report is part of the negotiations. Dick said he does not understand how the agencies can evaluate trade offs of the milestones without that information. Steve said the context of that report was initiated in the negotiations and is still part of the negotiations. Steve clarified that the report was presented in the initial negotiations, negotiations are not complete, and the report will not be done until the negotiations are complete.

Draft Advice FY 2009 Budget Request

Pam provided an overview of the Budgets and Contracts Committee's (BCC) recent work on budgets and baselines. Pam said BCC was hoping to hold a workshop on baselines and incorporate it into the budget workshop but because of the timeframe for the fiscal year (FY) 2009 budget request it was not possible to link the two topics. The budget workshop was held on March 26, and BCC is still planning to hold a baseline workshop at a date to be determined. Pam said the certified baselines are important because they will be the basis for the budget in future years. BCC is concerned about the lack of regulator involvement in the baseline. Pam said she did some research to explore the connection between the TPA and the baselines and found little connection between the two currently.

Pam said the recent budget workshop started with a brief overview of the baselines by DOE. The baseline process is begun by using the approved remedy or in the case that an approved remedy has not been developed, DOE uses an assumed remedy. Once DOE determines a remedy and path forward they can

estimate a schedule for when the work will be completed. The baseline also evaluates the costs associated with the approved remedy and has inflationary costs built into it to account for any schedule delays. Pam said the baselines will provide the HAB a better sense what type of work will be done around the site and what timeframe it will be done in.

Pam said the baseline workshop will address how the FY 2010 budget proposal relates to the baseline. The two field offices will review the topics of 200 SW 1 and 2 operable units and early low activity waste start up to further illustrate the assumed remedy and schedule uncertainties, interconnectedness of baselines, and how cost is applied. Pam said she participates in a national committee representing energy alliance and thought other sites have limited comprehension on how to get involved in budget and baselines discussions. Pam said she would like to work on an outline to share with the other sites so they have a model to use if they choose to engage in budget discussions.

Gerry introduced the FY 2009 budget advice. Gerry presented the concept of a budget bonsai baseline tree he created to represent some important baseline concepts brought out in the budget workshop. Gerry highlighted projects identified on the tree and described how projects around the complex are interconnected such as the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP), Central Plateau, and groundwater. Gerry said as the HAB looks at the budget advice, Board members should consider the FY 2009 budget allocations for each project, but also keep in mind the long term funding issues. Gerry said the bonsai tree is the baseline, and if it were to represent the TPA requirements, it should be larger to represent the several million dollar budget allocation that would be needed to meet the TPA. Gerry showed that the bonsai tree is being strangled by the Presidential budget and the five year plan that reduces the baseline. Gerry explained that the roots of the tree are the assumptions that feed the baseline which have not been reviewed by the HAB. Gerry felt the assumptions are presented in a way that makes them un-challengeable even though some are not consistent with the TPA.

Gerry summarized the fundamental points in the budget advice. Gerry said the first issue the advice addresses is the commitment DOE made to reallocate clean up funds to Hanford after the closure of smaller sites. Hanford has yet to see those additional funds which would amount to \$650 million more in cleanup funding. Gerry said the budget advice proposes a method for allocating any additional funding that could be added to the cleanup budget this year. In some cases the advice disagrees with DOE priorities for additional funding.

Gerry said the advice outlines a proposal for how to retrieve waste faster than one tank per year. The advice also discusses the impacts of inadequate funding from 2009 and the need for additional double shell tanks (DSTs). Gerry also noted transuranic (TRU) retrieval is inadequately funded and there is no funding for mixed waste treatment in 2009. The River Corridor cleanup work planned and funding allocated will not be sufficient to meet the goal of restoring the River Corridor by 2012 for public use. The advice also identifies projects that should not receive cleanup funding such as mixed oxide fuel that Gerry said should be funded from another program. Pages six and seven in the advice highlight DOE-RL and DOE-ORP priorities and specific plus up and plus down amounts identified by RAP and TWC. Gerry said the end notes were deemed to be valuable by committee members to back up the priorities.

Agency Perspective

Steve asked how the HAB is proposing to fund early LAW. He said the \$690 million for WTP is money needed to start the facility up by 2019. Steve said this amount reflects the HAB's advocacy for the project specific plus up and plus down amounts of a lot of work from people on the Board advocating for the project. The advice suggests diverting money from WTP to early LAW which will undermine the WTP in its entirety; it cannot operate without pretreatment.

Doug said the section on PBS 100 indicates DOE did not request the money needed for the project. Doug said DOE-RL did request the money but it was not funded. Gerry clarified that DOE-RL made the request to headquarters (HQ), but HQ did not make the request to Congress.

Nick said the EPA has been clear the lack of resources will constrain the cleanup and said he thought it is appropriate for the Board to provide comments on that. EPA is trying to avoid prioritizing work except for in the short term. Nick said EPA would like to wait to see what the end result will look like before they make any suggestions for prioritizing work around the site. Nick also commented that in the opening

paragraph of the advice there is a reference to the importance of being compliant with the TPA. Nick felt the focus should be on environmental protection and human health because that is what means something to the public, not the regulations.

Jane said Ecology has a draft letter on the FY 2010 budget that mentions that the 2009 budget was inadequate. Ecology's comments on the FY 2009 budget have been similar to the HAB's; the Governor has come out as well about the 2009 and 2010 budget concerns. The state is worried about what the budget shortfall means and is working actively with Mike Wilson and Congress to address the shortfall. Jane said Ecology did not include dollar amounts in the draft letter because they have not sat down with EPA to determine what all the priorities involve and feared that if they put a number next to an item someone would pick that item and only fund it because of the dollar amount. However, Jane said she liked the dollar amounts in the Board's advice because it gives DOE an understanding of what the Board is talking about.

Discussion

Pam said there was an effort made by Hanford Communities and Tri-City Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) to make sure the advice was consistent on the DOE-RL side. Pam felt some advice RAP suggested was not included in the final version. Pam said the committee's original language said the budget was drastically cut for the M91 facility for characterizing and packaging of remote handled TRU and the funding for post 70s TRU to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) is cut in half which would not meet the milestones. Pam said the workforce has done an excellent job at retrieving deteriorating waste enabling them to meet those milestones. The concern now is in the 100 Area decommission and deconstruct (D&D) work due to the specialized workforce. The budget shortfall could cut those employees. In the 300 Area, there was a net increase of funding for groundwater but the money came from another area so the increase is not as much as it looks like. Pam said the Central Plateau wording is consistent with what the committee suggested but is missing the point that the result of the cuts would stop work on the burial grounds and other sites. The impact of the cuts will have a cascading effect on overall cleanup.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), said Gerry did a good job of pulling this advice together in a short time. Harold said he agreed with the main points in the advice but felt the advice is too long and was not sure the Board would have the time to address every point made in the advice. The FY 2009 budget reallocation will not happen for another four to five months. Thus Harold suggested the advice go back to the committees for further review and then go forward at the June Board meeting. Harold thought that a shorter piece of advice would be more effective.

Betty Tabbutt, WA League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), disagreed with Harold because she felt the detail was important to clearly convey the concepts to the public. The more specific the advice is, the better it will be. Betty suggested adding a summary at the beginning of the advice to help the general public understand the important points. Betty thought it was important to take action on the advice because there is not a lot of time to deal with the 2009 budget.

Gerry said the advice reflects input from three committees who framed their issues to make a case to Congress. Gerry said Congress will be in recess in June and at that point there will be no point in issuing the advice. Gerry felt HAB needs to weigh in now on where an increase in funding should be allocated, otherwise it will go to bulk vitrification. Gerry clarified that the advice is not on the allocation, but is focused on the Congressional budget request which is several million short.

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), recommended moving the advice forward based on the amount of work done by the committees and the clarity of the budget advice.

Susan asked if any Board members objected to moving forward with the advice. No one voiced an objection.

Dick made a suggestion to restructure the advice. He said there is good information in the advice but it is too long. Dick thought everything except for the last three pages should be put into a white paper instead of in the advice, those that care will read the white paper. The rationale for why the money is needed could be put in the white paper.

Keith said he agreed with moving forward on the advice but cautioned the Board from contradicting earlier advice supporting the completion of the vitrification plant. Keith also thought it was important to consider how this advice might affect the new contracting approach because one contract provides support as an infrastructure contract. Keith said Board members know how perilous the infrastructure is, the contract is supposed to prevent the programs from taking money away from infrastructure to get cleanup done. Keith said the advice should not be so program specific that it might take away from a mission support need.

Ken Niles said he agreed with the comment Steve Wiegman made about diverting funds from WTP and would not support including that in the advice. Ken clarified that he originally added the section that Doug Shoop referenced on the Natural Resources Damage Assessment (NRDA). The language originally said that DOE-RL requested the money but did not receive it. Ken thought the advice should say the HAB is requesting \$200 million in additional funding. Lastly, Ken recommended using another term should for “bow wave” because it is not public friendly. Doug Mercer said regulators use the term bow wave in their 2010 budget document, but said he does not like the term either. Doug suggested stating succinctly the importance of why the shortfalls are creating an impact instead of using a vague term like bow wave. Nancy said she did not think the advice was long given all the important detail. Nancy thought the purpose of the advice should be stated in the beginning and suggested that the introduction could be shortened. She also commented that the sections of text in bold should be removed because it suggests that the author is raising their voice and is not appropriate.

Ken Gasper clarified the section TWC developed. Ken said pages seven and eight of the advice should mirror page six in content and also should include the dollar numbers at the end of each paragraph. The committee intended for the section regarding DOE-ORP activities to be removed specifically to address the issue of diverting funds from the WTP project mentioned by Steve. This section was intended to be less prescriptive on the details of what should be funded and only include the dollar levels that are needed program-wide. The total DOE-ORP funding amount should be \$90 million and should not be allocated for each topic. Ken recommended these changes be made before the draft is approved by the Board. Gerry said he misunderstood the intent of the committee and will work to incorporate Ken’s changes.

Pam said the HAB has had a lot of experience with budget development and has been frustrated with HQ in the past for not putting forward the full request or adequate documentation. Pam thought this was not the case this time as there were a lot of people who tried hard to support this program. Pam agreed with Nick’s comment on the importance of the TPA. She said as much as the HAB believes in the TPA, Congress does not. The argument about regulatory compliance and risk is more compelling to the people the advice is directed to. Lastly, Pam asked that the reference on page two, following the chart that shows funding, be removed. She felt that it indicates the Board is asking the state to take legal action and said she does not support that.

Susan Kreid commented that the advice is passionate but not coherent. She said finding and identifying the advice is challenging, each section is not consistent, and the priorities are not clear. Susan said Ken’s clarification on the ORP side helped her understand those sections. Susan said this advice does not follow HAB’s regular format which makes it difficult to follow. Susan said the advice asks for more money, but as a whole it does not clearly make a case for why the money is needed. Susan recommended separating the advice into three sections: background, advice and then discussion.

Bob agreed with Steve’s comment about the WTP and did not think the Board should direct DOE to move dollars away from one facility to support another. Bob said Ken’s recommendation to delete remove the section on the amount of money needed for early LAW. Gerry suggested accommodating that request by dropping and shifting the totals.

Maynard supported Pam’s comment about focusing on the environment instead of the TPA. He also thought that both paragraphs that Pam referenced on the second page should be removed. Maynard said he would have difficulty supporting the advice section in the fourth paragraph and would like the paragraph to stop after the first sentence.

Bob McFarland, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), also thought the bold statements on page one should be removed. Bob said the paragraph currently reads as if it is scolding and he did not think it is appropriate to scold someone you are directing advice to and seeking additional funding. Bob suggesting rewording this section and said he would help with the language.

Gerry Dagle, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local/Regional Public Health), supported including the purpose of ensuring public health for future generations around the Columbia River in the first paragraph.

Ken Niles said he thought the advice on DSTs was meant to ask for a study to evaluate if additional DSTs are needed. Ken said if this is the intent of the advice, the section should be reworded. Ken said if the advice is asking for four new tanks then he was not sure he could support that request. Susan Leckband also thought the intent was to ask for a study and asked Ken to submit new language. Ken Gasper said the TWC asked to delete that paragraph; the committee's intent was that DOE-ORP advice covered the plus up of \$87 million and was sufficient to cover that paragraph.

Dick thought it would be appropriate to evaluate the alternatives to DSTs as well. Dick said Al Boldt made a suggestion to look at turning some of the DSTs into salt cakes like DOE did in SST because it may provide the space needed to empty the rest of the tanks. This process may complicate retrieval, but should be part of the alternatives to getting the space needed.

Susan summarized the proposed changes to the advice so far. The Board agreed to reorganize the draft advice to match previous HAB advice and rewrite the introductory paragraph to state the importance of protecting the environment and public safety.

Dick thought the fifth paragraph is redundant to the third paragraph and suggested taking out the last sentence of the first paragraph and putting it at the end of the third paragraph to make it stronger. Gerry said Board members suggested including the environmental and public health issues up front as the first subject to state the purpose of the advice. Therefore, Gerry thought the order of the paragraphs should stay the same.

Maynard thought the emphasis on the environment and public health was not strong enough in the first paragraph. Maynard said the paragraph should highlight the water resources issues and not the TPA as was suggested previously. Gerry thought that at some point the advice should include the fact that the TPA is not being met. Shelley did not want the reference to the TPA removed from first paragraph. Nancy asked that the TPA be put in a separate sentence.

Charlie Weems, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), suggested saying that some tanks will be 100 years old to make it more clear on the second page, second paragraph. Betty asked whether it would be worth including a reference to the life of the tanks. Susan said the farms were built at different times so including the life span of all the tanks could be difficult. Betty said all of the tanks had a projected life and that point should stand out more in the advice.

Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, thought the wording "prescription for disaster" was inflationary and might discredit the point. Mike suggested rewriting the point to say "a prescription for major contamination release." Ken Niles said he would like to get rid of the word prescription too. Gerry argued that there have already been releases and suggested saying "will likely lead to further major contamination releases." Mike thought Gerry suggestion was an improvement.

Larry suggested clarifying who "we" is throughout the advice. . Susan also suggested being consistent with the words must and shall. Gerry though using shall instead of must de-emphasizes the point. Ken Niles agreed that must is better.

Ken Niles said it is unknown how much more plutonium (Pu) is present and suggested saying an estimated eighteen times to clarify the point on page three.

Ken Gasper said the issue of the serious violation of hazardous waste laws on page three is repetitive and is lost on the reader. Gerry agreed the paragraph with dropping the middle sentence.

Betty also said this paragraph on page three addresses the cumulative impact of mixed waste. Other references to violations were removed so Betty thought it should be left here and should emphasize the effect of backlogs in violation of TPA requirements are a growing concern.

Ken Niles said 618-10&11 are three to four miles from the Columbia River and thought they should not be referred to as near the river. He suggested emphasizing the threat from the two underground sites that contain highly radioactive waste. Gerry thought some reference to the threat to the river is important. Ken said of the 100 and 300 Areas are clearly not near the river. Susan proposed new language that satisfied both Ken and Gerry.

Larry suggested changing “our” to “the Board” throughout the advice.

Susan said the section on the HAB budget makes it seem like the budget is less than \$200,000. Gerry clarified the funding amount in the text.

Harold suggested listing the order in the number of the project breakdown summary (PBS) if the DOE-ORP and DOE-RL lists are not prioritized. Gerry said the list is not prioritized and agreed the list could be clarified by PBS. Ken Gasper did not think the DOE-ORP list was prioritized but said DOE-ORP has not used PBSs the same way RL has so if the list is rearranged by PBS it will not relate to DOE-ORP items. Betty suggested including a statement that the items are not listed by priority but that all are needed to make up the shortfall.

Susan asked whether the end notes should stay in. Board members agreed the end notes were important and should be submitted with the advice.

Susan asked who the advice should be addressed to. Gerry said it should go to HQ as well as the Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Governor, and Director of Ecology. Maynard suggested addressing the advice to EM but cc'ing the Secretaries so it does not offend the intended recipient. Ken Niles asked to cc the Director of Office of Management and Budget. Board members agreed the usual cc's should be included.

The Board approved the advice.

Draft Advice FY 2010 Budget Development

Harold introduced the FY 2010 budget advice. He said the introduction is similar to the FY 2009 introduction covering the budget shortfall and transfer of funds from smaller DOE sites. The bottom of the first page asks DOE to work with Ecology and EPA to prioritize the clean up program elements to ensure timely completion. The second page discusses further this lack of priority and the life cycle cost and schedule report. The budget baseline covers TPA; however, it does not cover a lot of the cleanup work not under the TPA. Therefore, this work is not in the baseline. The remainder of the advice addresses the budget issues and outlines HAB priorities including the need for a SST assessment, early start up of the LAW facility and dissatisfaction with the extension of WTP startup to 2019.

Harold said the 2010 budget request is currently being drafted and therefore the Board did not have access to budget numbers while writing this advice. Susan clarified that while this is time sensitive, there will be the potential for additional advice at subsequent meetings.

Regulator Perspective

Steve Wiegman said he brought copies of the Integrated Priority List (IPL) from the March budget workshop and said it is important that DOE get the Board's input on the priorities because DOE will use this to submit their budget request. Susan asked if the Board's advice should include comments on the IPL or if comments should be submitted independently. Steve said it would be helpful if the advice addressed the list. Doug said there are two priority lists, one for DOE-ORP and one for DOE-RL and agreed they should be incorporated into the advice.

Dennis said he did not think EPA would agree with the tactic of the IPL. He said all the work is important and DOE should request the full funding needed, only if that money is not allocated should the agencies prioritize the money. Dennis said the agencies global priorities have not changed; full funding is needed to support the cleanup of the site.

Jane said Ecology's letter which was distributed to the HAB provides the Department's status on this topic.

Discussion

Gerry thanked Harold for his work on drafting this advice. Gerry proposed adding “our initial comments” in the first paragraph to make it clear the Board could come back again with additional advice. Gerry said the second paragraph also needs clarification and should say “identify only the cost and schedules identified in the TPA.” Gerry also said the last sentence in the paragraph should be replaced with “the statement that the baselines are based on assumptions about remedies that are in conflict with board advice, public expectations, and the standards likely to be required by regulators.” Dick Smith asked that it be revised to say that some of the baselines, because not all of them are in conflict.

Ken Niles said the last page talks about forty-three miles of unlined disposal trenches. Ken asked if this figure is accurate and if it is measuring linear miles. Dennis said his understanding is it is linear miles for the trenches.

Steve Wiegman questioned the source for the estimate on page two regarding the third melter investment. Steve said DOE-ORP has not done the engineer work to determine what the third melter would require yet. Steve said Peter Furlong has made comments that the third melter is a challenge to the facility, but has not estimated a cost for the facility. Gerry said the numbers in the advice are ones the Board has heard from DOE for several years; \$75 million was part of the initial design and came from TWC briefings over the last few years. Dick clarified that the committee realizes DOE has not done the engineering work to verify those numbers, but the committee has been told a range of numbers for what it would take to do it. Steve suggested that the numbers might not be needed to make the point especially if the Board does not have confidence in them.

Keith commented that the construction was not designed to accommodate the third melter but was proposed to be added later which he thought would be very difficult. Maynard said the purpose of this statement is to ask DOE-ORP to consider TWC comments when developing the budget and that should be said up front.

Maynard said the reference to pre 1970s TRU waste on last page should be revised. Maynard said Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, recently mentioned that there is no such thing as pre 1970s TRU. Instead Maynard suggested using “TRU elements disposed of prior to 1970”.

Bob asked whether the advice should be written as a letter and then followed later with advice. Susan explained that if it is advice then the agencies have to respond and if it is a letter they do not need to respond. Susan said that the Board is looking for a response from the agencies in this case so the advice should remain advice.

Larry recommended using the terms characterization or monitoring instead of study in the groundwater vadose zone section since the word study has no meaning. Harold said the intent is to say problems are still being identified, and once they have been identified solutions can be developed. Dick suggested pulling out bullets to highlight the advice or summarizing it in a paragraph to make it more clear what the advice is. Maynard suggested including a statement clarifying that the whole document is advice instead of creating bullets or a summary.

Doug Mercer commented that the values should be consistent between the FY 2009 advice and the FY 2010 advice. The FY 2009 advice should lay the foundation for the FY 2010 advice to keep it from being reactive to each budget and to continue to look ahead. Doug said the level of detail in the two pieces of budget advice is very different which makes it harder to reconcile at a strategic level for DOE implementation. Doug said there are items in the FY 2009 advice that is not addressed in the FY 2010 advice at all. Susan said the same people are working on both pieces of advice and should keep this in mind as they work through the final details.

Nancy asked to change the language “specific program comments” to “specific advice.” Board members agreed with this change.

Susan said it has been suggested that the introduction paragraph be rewritten to clearly state the purpose and to add a comment about following the advice in the document. Nancy felt that the milestones for completion are inadequate and the advice should include an action for what to do about that. Maynard said

this advice is the Board's initial comments and is still in the development stage. When the Board sees the numbers later, more specific advice may be necessary. Dick agreed with Maynard, but thought the statement regarding advice should be put up front. Susan asked if others agreed with this approach, no one showed opposition.

Dick expressed concern that the deadline for remediation on the Central Plateau by 2024 does not seem possible since that work cannot be done until the tanks are emptied. Gerry suggested the advice should say completion of the vadose zone and Central Plateau, and leave out tanks farms since the TPA does not address them

Ken Niles thought some redundancy should be removed on the first page. Doug Mercer agreed with Ken and provided some rewording and reordering.

Shelley suggested including Columbia River resources in the first paragraph.

Nancy recommended being consistent using Board instead of HAB throughout the advice.

Nancy asked where the goal of four to five tank retrievals per year came from. Ken Gasper replied it was a combination of the TPA milestone and the reports the TWC received about how the Department can manage available DST space before early LAW startup. DOE-ORP has identified they can accommodate space between now and 2013 in DSTs and would accommodate that many tanks being retrieved.

Ken Niles thought paragraph three under Central Plateau should be removed because the Pu will be sent offsite in 2009.

Rick asked for an explanation of the statement in the last paragraph that sludge treatment was designed previously. Ken Gasper said the issue is with the dollar value set aside for design. Rick commented that DOE typically discusses this at the committee level and did not feel it was needed in the advice. Bob suggested dropping the paragraph and asking DOE to follow up at a RAP meeting.

Susan asked who the advice should be addressed to. Board members agreed the advice should be addressed to Mr. Rispoli and should include the same cc list as the FY 2009 budget advice.

The Board approved the FY 2010 Advice.

Site Specific Advisory Board Update

Shelley Cimon provided an update on SSAB activities. Shelley said during a recent SSAB call she learned that the life cycle waste forecast is being updated and is currently going through a validation review at HQ. Shelly said Christine Gelles, DOE – Environmental Management (EM), discussed TRU inventories at each site in relation to the forecast and said the document will go to EPA once the data is approved. DOE is looking to maximize the use of the mixed waste processing at Idaho by shipping waste from smaller sites there. Shelley said there is some discussion about using thermal treatment to treat waste especially by in the private sector by Energy Solutions. Italy has expressed interest, but it is not yet determined if the waste could come to the U.S. for treatment.

Shelley said the Rev. 0 Science and Technology Roadmap has been released and recommended all Board members become familiar with it. Shelley summarized the reports from the other site chairs: Idaho has budget concerns from D&D and the delay in waste disposal for sodium waste in Idaho, New Mexico is concerned about budget, Oak Ridge is asking for independent validation of cleanup, and Paducah is asking for a long-term strategy for recycling of materials. Shelley said Savannah River has six new members.

Discussion

Pam said the Hanford communities received a presentation from U.S. Ecology about commercial disposal at Hanford. Ecology indicated that no waste could come from Hanford. Ken Niles said they are proposing it could go to Tennessee for thermal treatment and then it would be reclassified as Tennessee generated waste

which would make it eligible to go to Energy Solutions facilities. Ken said there is a petition to the Nuclear Regulatory Committee (NRC) regarding this issue.

Susan announced that the SSAB Chair's meeting will be held in the Tri-Cities in April. The group will go on a full day site tour and invited HAB members to attend the reception at the CHREST Museum.

Agency Updates

DOE-ORP

Steve said the S-102 tank spill leak cleanup work is well underway. Most of the contaminated soil and equipment have been removed. Steve said DOE-ORP has many of the corrective actions completed as well. In cleaning up the soil, DOE-ORP discovered they could recover virtually all the contamination by digging six inches down. Steve showed a short video of a treatment technology to move waste to the pump out area that DOE-ORP will implement soon in the tank farms Steve said they wanted to make sure the technology would handle the variety of materials in the tank including wire systems from old devices.

Steve said DOE-ORP is also working on an interim barrier for T-Farm over the leak that occurred in the 1970s. He encouraged HAB members to see the interim barrier if they are on site. Steve said the Department is hopeful this barrier will show that it will collect rainwater and snow; and divert water to an area where it can percolate safely.

Steve said the WTP is continuing to make visible progress. The pilot scale facility is currently being assembled for evaluating technical issues with the pretreatment plant. Steve shared a video of crews installing the glass silos at WTP.

Steve announced that DOE-ORP has a new organization structure that will be effective starting this week. The Department has reassembled to include a central engineering and nuclear safety function which ensures consistency across the department. Copies of the new organizational structure are available on the back table.

Steve also announced that one of Bechtel National's contractors achieved Voluntary Protection Program Star status making it the first time awarded to a subcontractor. . Also a supplemental treatment study is now underway commissioned by Mr. Rispoli. The expectation is that the conclusion of this study will help make a decision on supplemental LAW. Steve said he appreciates the support from the HAB on advocating for this study.

Discussion

Keith expressed his pleasure at seeing this achievement by a subcontractor as many believed subcontractors could not achieve VPP status.

Dick asked if the supplemental LAW study will be reviewed. Steve said he was not sure but would find out and follow up with Dick about this.

Pam said the organization chart Steve distributed says John Eschenberg's position is vacant. Pam asked why his position is still temporary. Steve said John is not an SES (senior executive service), he is a STA (senior technical advisor), and Shirley's plan is to upgrade that position to an SES. Steve explained yellow boxes are tied to the managers.

DOE-RL

Doug provided an update on recent DOE-RL activities. Doug said DOE-RL is making progress on awarding the new contracts this fiscal year. Doug said the Department intends to develop detailed transition documents including new contract transition activities and training for federal staff on the new contracts. Doug said they are continuing to make progress in consolidating waste and increasing shipments off the Hanford site.

Doug said K Basins have had a significant reduction in risk since moving the waste and completely dewatering the basin. Doug said DOE-RL is happy that the contractor and workforce were able to do this without any spread of contamination and there was over a million gallons of waste retrieved. Doug said they have already begun work to build the basin back up so the equipment can be brought in to take down the structure. Doug said they will be downgrading the facility to a cap two nuclear facility which lowers the safety requirements and plan to have the superstructure down by fiscal year end.

Doug said the groundwater treatment continues on site with nineteen new wells to control the hexavalent chromium plume in the 100 K Area. Landscaping work in the 300 Area has continued and 140 buildings have been demolished to date. Doug talked about the hazardous materials that are in some of the buildings and the challenges in taking them down. Doug said there is a lot of good work happening in the 618 burial grounds and the contractor is looking at adding another crew to accelerate that work. The burial ground work is anticipated to be completed by the end of this year. The 618-11 waste site is in proximity of Energy Northwest's facility and affects the NRC license.

Doug said there was a recent issue at the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) where soils contaminated with mercury created a chemical reaction that resulted in a flash. The contractor backed off and is investigating it. It looks like there was an incomplete chemical reaction. Doug said they will do more sampling of the soil to see how much mercury is present which may allow them to accelerate work. Fuel continues to be shipped to Idaho and the last shipment will be done this month. Lastly, Doug said they are increasing the site tours this year due to the high demand.

Discussion

Keith commended DOE and contractors on how they are approaching the work in the waste sites. It is a remarkable change from the original concept of how cleanup would be done at Hanford. Keith thought the work is a vast improvement and the remote technology is great. Keith applauded how careful the contractors are about exposing workers to hazards and the extent DOE has gone to protect workers.

Susan said some years ago the Board was involved in suggesting DOE fix the problems at K East and now it is done. Susan congratulated DOE on work well done.

Dick said he thought the process for sludge treatment would have been developed and the design completed long ago. Doug said he agreed and also would like to see the sludge removed from K West similar to the approach taken at K East. Doug said DOE has taken a conservative approach to project management and has talked with the Board about the technology assessment. Doug said DOE-RL thought the contractor knew what they were doing, but the technology readiness assessment questioned the technology that was proposed and forced them to go back and reassess.

Susan thanked the Department for the pictures and thoughtful presentations.

Ecology

Jane said Ecology recently finished entering into a contract with Dana Engineering to do a quality assessment/quality control (QA/QC) review of the WTP looking at the inspection program for that facility. Ecology has a construction inspection program and has two construction engineers on site at all times. This process will help look at the DOE program and make sure it meets all necessary requirements for state laws for operating facilities.

Jane said the Yakima Basin feasibility study (FS) and EIS and the Blackrock EIS are nearing the final comment period. She suggested that Board members submit their comments soon. Jane said the documents are a joint effort between Ecology and the Bureau of Reclamation.

In June the federal regulators will hold a meeting in Richland including a site tour. Also, Jane mentioned there will be a low level waste compact conference in early May. Jane said she provided information on the back table including an editorial piece done by the Governor and Senator Murray and a fact sheet on the 2010 budget.

EPA

Dennis said EPA recently hosted the National Remedy Review Board. Dennis commented that it was worthwhile for them to come to the site since they are reviewing many of EPA's projects. Dennis also mentioned the importance of EPA HQ people coming to the site including an upcoming visit by John Reeder on April 24.

Dennis said EPA is working on preparing for the TRU workshop on PW 1/3/6 operable units planned for April 15th. The workshop will spend time to understand how the alternatives are put together. Dennis encouraged everyone to attend this workshop. Dennis also said that Laura Buelow, EPA, is working on putting together a sampling program for EPA and will continue to talk with RAP. EPA is also tapping into national experts on environmental cleanup efforts and has a national risk assessor to help with risk assessments along the Columbia River.

Dennis said EPA is pleased the 618-10 & 11 work is going well. He said this work has been a long time coming, but is excited to see the characterization work being done in BC cribs and trenches. Dennis also said that people from WIPP will be coming to Hanford on April 16 and 17 and would like to talk to HAB members.

Committee Reports

HSEP

Keith said the Health Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) has been working on a piece of advice regarding uniform site wide safety standards for implementation into the mission services contract. Keith said the advice is pretty well drafted but the committee decided to wait until the June Board meeting to present the draft advice so it will be timelier when the contract comes out. Keith said there are currently not any other topics on the committee's agenda.

RAP

Maynard said the most challenging topic RAP is dealing with is the April 15 workshop on PW 1/3/6 operable units that deals with the Pu contamination and whether to cap or not. Maynard encouraged everyone to attend the workshop.

Other items the committee is tracking include the deep vadose zone treatability test, groundwater, EPA sampling program, and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP). Maynard said the CLUP is evaluating whether enough significant changes have been made since the last EIS to warrant a new EIS. There have been some changes on site including the designation of the 300 Area and the national monument, but the supplemental analysis (SA) for the CLUP has determined that not much has changed. The informal comment period for the SA to the CLUP closes on April 23, for those wishing to submit comments. The next RAP meeting will include a summary from Bryan Foley on this topic.

Maynard thought the June Board meeting agenda will probably include recap of the PW 1/3/6 operable units workshop and the EPA/Ecology white paper recently issued.

TWC

Ken Gasper reviewed TWC recent activities. Ken said the NRC will be following up with the TWC next month on their regulatory review of the WTP. TWC is also following the pretreatment pilot plant work that is a cold pilot plant for WTP and will be assembled at Hanford.

TWC is also tracking bulk vitrification and recently DOE said they will not be continuing large scale work on bulk vitrification in 2009 but anticipate going ahead with cold testing this year. TWC feels that cold testing is appropriate but does not favor allocating supplemental funding to bulk vitrification if additional funding becomes available because there are higher priorities.

Ken said TWC has made progress on the response to HAB Advice #192 regarding the systems plan. DOE-ORP expects to come out with a completed systems plan at end of April and the TWC applauds the

progress and the model being used for the analysis. Ken said the committee is encouraging DOE to include the risk management aspects of the different alternatives in the decision analysis. He said DOE is also doing sensitivity studies for the alternatives and the committee is encouraging them to go back to their overall logic diagram and continue to follow that up.

Pam provided an overview of the recent 2008 Waste Management (WM) conference. Pam said she focused on the following issues: WIPP and the ability to send remote TRU to WIPP and the mixed waste processing facility at Idaho. Pam said a key issue discussed throughout the conference was the 21st Century workforce including labor shortages and loss of jobs from retirement. Pam said Savannah River has shipped 2,500 drums of TRU waste to WIPP so far and expects to ship 5,000 more by 2009. Hanford has a significant amount of waste to ship (70,000 drums) and has shipped 13,000 drums of contact handled TRU to date.

Nick Ceto commented that the estimated volumes for TRU that Pam listed are sensitive because no one knows if they are accurate.

Pam said Congressman Hastings was a keynote speaker and he expressed his frustration with EM leaders who come to Congress and not being honest about the needs and priorities for Congressional funding. EM-HQ provided revised guidance to the field offices in response to Congressman Hastings presentation. Pam said his forthrightness was appreciated.

Pam explained the major sessions focused on K Basins, tank farm, vadose zone work, and groundwater cleanup at Hanford (including many issues surrounding vadose zone contamination). Pam said she attended a presentation on the crucible melter, and learned that Idaho and Savannah have money to do testing on this but the possibility of using this technology has not been studied at Hanford.

Pam next provided some details regarding the Idaho shipments to WIPP that were sent back. She said three-fourths of a cup of Windex was accidentally shipped to WIPP. The accident cost \$9 million dollars and Idaho was fined \$110,000. Pam said a new container is in process of being approved for remote handled TRU; it will hold a drum of remote TRU and can sit vertically on the floor of WIPP. The capacity of WIPP was discussed for taking TRU from sites around country. The situation is encouraging in terms of WIPPs overall capacity. Only four percent of the total capacity is supposed to be remote TRU. Pam offered to share her notes from the conference with people that are interested. She passed around the conference overview that has session details and includes a list of the papers that were presented; the papers will be accessible on Internet soon.

Ken Niles commented on the issue with the waste returned from WIPP to Idaho. Ken said he did not think the state of New Mexico dealt with the issue in a heavy handed way, but that Idaho had previous issues meeting the requirements for shipping to WIPP. Ken said making sure everyone follows the guidelines for shipments to WIPP is an important issue and should be taken seriously.

Ken Gasper also attended the WM conference and heard a presentation Mr. Rispoli provided emphasizing the priorities for EM overall cleanup. The priorities he outlined included 1) safety 2) reducing risk while maximizing regulatory compliance 3) treating radioactive waste 4) consolidating of nuclear materials 5) disposal of TRU waste 6) cleanup of soil and groundwater and decommissioning of facilities. Ken said the administration recognizes the 2009 budget will not allow them to meet some milestones in the TPA requirements. Ken said he attended a talk about spent fuel reprocessing to reduce waste and learned that France has 80% of their energy coming from nuclear power and reprocessing of spent fuel is happening in France and Japan successfully. Ken said he attended another presentation by EM managers where the co-chair concluded by saying Congress and the administration in the future are likely to give less priority to funding cleanup as they give more funding to global warming and carbon reduction in the atmosphere. Ken said it is important that the Board realize there is competition for financial resources.

Ken said Mark Gilbertson's directors also provided a presentation on EM priorities which included 1) waste processing 2) groundwater and soil remediation and 3) deactivation and decommissioning of spent nuclear fuel. Ken said DOE is seeking \$100 million for the FY 2009 budget and is expecting a five or six fold increase in funding to support these priorities. Ken reviewed the waste processing strategic initiatives and said the presentations included a discussion on methodology of technology readiness assessments. Ken shared the lessons learned from applying this process nationwide. He said Savannah River reported on their operating experiences including exploring waste to increase the glass forming and looking at alternative

melters. Lastly, Ken said he talked informally with Ryan Dodd, Vice President of Tank Farms for CH2M Hill Hanford Group (CHG). Ryan shared some lessons learned in tank retrieval technology using a combination of sluicing and other techniques to allow them to lower retrieval costs.

BCC

Harold said BCC held a budget workshop last week with DOE and regulators to discuss the cleanup schedule and FY 2009 and FY 2010 budgets. He said specifics from that workshop are in the FY 2009 and FY 2010 budget advice. Harold thought the bottom line is there is not enough money in the budget to meet cleanup and regulatory requirements. Work across the site is getting stretched out and the cost increase is making the site slip behind. Ecology provided a presentation on the schedule and funding that showed the money is not there to do the work as fast as the Board would like. Harold said the FY 2009 budget is now before Congress and focuses more on priorities than the allocated budget. DOE is currently working on the FY 2010 budget to submit to HQ for review. Harold thought there is not much hope in getting more money so the focus should be on the priorities for where the money should go. Depending on the advice, BCC may have additional work to warrant a meeting this month.

PIC

Steve Hudson said PIC wants to work with other committees more closely for issues that involve public involvement. Steve said they held a meeting yesterday and spent some time talking about PW 1/3/6 operable units, the site wide permit, and the TC&WM EIS. PIC also discussed the advice from BCC concerning the FY 2009 budget from a public involvement perspective and the types of workshops that are proposed region wide. Steve said the discussion yielded ideas about why concerns are voiced so late in process after decisions have already been made. Steve said the PIC will begin thinking about 2012 budget or later to more effectively influence the process. Steve said PIC also talked about the Site-wide Dangerous Waste Permit and the delay in the schedule which lead to a discussion about the importance of the HAB talking about consequences of delays. There will be State of the Site meetings in September and October this year and PIC would like to make suggestions about sites and locations for the meetings. PIC will have a call in May to plan for their June meeting.

Discussion

Ken Gasper asked what the status is for the baseline workshop. Doug said DOE would be happy to work with the committees to set up those meetings. Susan suggested that PIC work with BCC and DOE to set up dates for the workshop.

Public Comment

Pam said she has been contacted by several City of Richland residents that wanted to speak at the meeting today and asked her to share their concerns. Pam read a letter from them about the letter sent by DOE-RL to twelve community organizations regarding their intent to return Rattlesnake Mountain to a natural state. The residents requested to review the documents that informed this decision and voiced their concerns about not being involved in the decision making process. They also commented that the decision is inconsistent with the preferred alternative in the ROD, the Presidential Proclamation 7319, and with the 1977 designation of the area as part of DOE's Hanford National Environmental Research Park. Lastly, the residents expressed unease about the decision's impact on educational programs in the area.

Regulator Perspective

Doug said it is true DOE-RL issued a letter and would not have done so without a lot of discussion and consultation. DOE has heard concerns about Gable Mountain and Rattlesnake Mountain because these are sensitive areas and DOE is charged with protecting them. Cleanup money is being used to maintain access to the mountains. Cleanup funds would be needed for snow removal and to build a road to the mountain. Doug said DOE's intent was to minimize the amount of cleanup funds used there. At some point in time DOE will have to cleanup a site on the mountain but will not do that for some time. Doug said they have talked with the community to minimize impacts. Doug emphasized that DOE is trying to find a good solution for everyone.

Discussion

Keith said he understands the sensitivity in regards to this issue and wondered if any consideration has been given to engaging the tribes to do the work that is needed up there so the site could be turned over to them. Doug said he did not know if that was thought of and clarified that these are not DOE facilities but private facilities.

Rick said he too is sensitive to the treaties, but felt this agreement was done in a vacuum and was a surprise to the residents. Rick suggested not allowing people to go up to the mountain in the winter if the roads are bad. Rick encouraged DOE to go back and involve the public.

Armand said the tribes have raised concerns about Rattlesnake Mountain in the past and applauded DOE's start to protect the mountain. The significance of the mountain is important in that the Nez Perce, Umatilla, and Yakama share histories with the mountain that go further than 9,000 years. The tribes work with the federal agencies under the scope of the National Preservation Act and the Native American Protection Act which have made the tribes successful in protecting these resources. The tribes have stated in the past that Rattlesnake Mountain is a traditional cultural property, and because of that designation there are criteria that need to be met. Armand said the tribes adhere to the same laws the states and federal agencies do and they can be useful but sometimes they are misinterpreted. There needs to be a better understanding of the laws.

Gabriel Bohnee, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), said the three tribes are closely related with this site. The histories tell the significance of the mountain and the tribe's understanding has been brought out since DOE has been on the site. This has been a hard process and it has taken decades for the Department to understand the position of the tribes and the regulations that the treaties imply. Gabriel said it has been hard to watch their sites get trampled on. Rattlesnake Mountain is a sacred site, it is not the only sacred site across the nation, and there are court cases across the country involving sacred sites. Gabriel expressed his appreciation of the local agencies in recognizing the site and using the cleanup dollars in the most efficient way. Gabriel said he has heard Board members say that more money is needed throughout the budget discussions, but that road is needed too. The tribe looks forward to working with the Department in supporting this decision.

Board Business

June Board meeting topics may include:

- State of Columbia River – EPA presentation
- 2009 Board priorities & tentative 2009 meeting schedule
- HSEP advice on Hanford Site wide uniform safety standards
- HAB Charter update
- TPA Negotiations update
- System Plan Rev. 3 update
- TWC advice on configuration control
- Science & Technology roadmap presentation (follow up to Board advice #204)
- TWC review of System Plan 3

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

Committee calls and meeting dates:

- TWC call: Monday, April 14 (3:00 p.m.)
- RAP call: Wednesday, April 16 (9:00 a.m.)
- EIC call: Thursday, April 17 (2:00 p.m.)

Susan said EIC recently met and determined that the leadership retreat will be held on May 19 and 20 in Yakima. Susan discussed the purpose of the leadership retreat and work that will be done during the retreat.

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Gabriel Bohnee, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Dave Rowland, Alternate
Tom Carpenter, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Dick Smith, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Becky Holland, Member	Kristie Baptiste-Eke, Alternate	Charlie Weems, Alternate
Rick Jansons, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Julie Jones, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	Nolan Curtis, Ex-Officio
Mike Keizer, Member	Dirk Dunning, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-Officio
Susan Kreid, Member	Ken Gasper, Alternate	
Pam Larsen, Member	Floyd Hodges, Alternate	
Susan Leckband, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate	
Doug Mercer, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate	
Armand Minthorn, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate	
Ken Niles, Member	Robert McFarlane, Alternate	
Maynard Plahuta, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	John Britton, CH2M Hill
Doug Shoop, DOE-RL	Dru Butler, Ecology	Karen Livas, CH2M Hill
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Steve Wiegman, DOE-ORP	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
	Nick Ceto, EPA	Emily Neff, EnviroIssues
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford
	Mike Priddy, DOH	

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Beverly Penny, CTUIR	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	
Patrick Capper, Hanford Information Network		
Doug Riggs, Hanford Information Network		