

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

September 4 – 5, 2008

Richland, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary.....	1
Welcome, Introductions and Announcements	2
June Meeting Summary	2
Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies' update	3
Status of TPA negotiations	12
TPA agencies' priorities for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009.....	14
Introduction to new contractors	17
HAB Chair cover letter to DOE regarding charter changes	20
Baseline workshop	23
Strategic Planning Workshop – Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC)	25
Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) update	26
Committee Reports.....	29
Public Comment	32
Board Business	32

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 authorized its chair to send a transmittal letter and Sounding Board referring to its acceptance of the Memorandum of Understanding and Operating Ground Rules to the local DOE field offices and to personally convey the challenges of this process to Jim Rispoli, Department of Energy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.

TPA agencies' update

The Board received 2009 priorities and year-end updates from the TPA agencies.

TPA negotiations

The Board received an update on the TPA negotiations. Very little information is publicly available at this time due to the confidential nature of the negotiations.

Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement update

The Board received an update on the structure and schedule for the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement.

Introduction to new contractors

The Board was introduced to and heard from new site contractors Washington River Protection Solutions and the Plateau Remediation Company.

Upcoming workshops

The Board discussed the upcoming baseline and public involvement strategy workshops.

Board Business

The Board will have committee calls and meetings in September and October. The Board will meet in November.

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.

Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

Charlie Weems, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), introduced Karen Bowman, the new alternate for Physicians for Social Responsibility. Bob Parazin, Public-at-Large, announced that Sam Decker is the new alternate for a Public-at-Large seat. Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), introduced Liz Mattson as the new director of outreach for Hanford Challenge and the new Hanford Challenge alternate.

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, requested Board members to provide nominations for Board Chair by the end of the day. The formation of a nominating committee will depend upon how many people are nominated for the position. Susan said currently, only Susan Leckband has been nominated for the position. Susan noted that nominations for vice-chair are not taken until February.

Susan Leckband announced that the Board will be able to function as usual through the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 given careful budget management and spending reductions. The Board will be on continuing resolution going into FY 2009. Susan asked Board members to submit travel authorizations for reimbursement as soon as possible. She noted that Board management and administration is moving from the Department of Energy – Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) to the Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL). She thanked DOE-ORP for managing and supporting the Board.

Emmet Moore, Washington State University (University), thanked Washington Closure Hanford, DOE and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the new greenhouse at Washington State University – Tri-Cities. He said it is an excellent facility.

Board meeting goals include:

- Finalize the letter from Susan Leckband to James Rispoli, DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, transmitting the June Sounding Board summary (Board Action Item).
- Receive updates from Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies: TPA annual updates and status of TPA negotiations.
- Discuss agency priorities for 2008-2009.
- Receive an introduction to the new Plateau Remediation and Tank Operations contractors.
- Receive an update on the draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS).
- Announce November workshops of interest: Baseline Workshop and the Strategic Planning Workshop [Public Information and Communication Committee (PIC)].
- Board business: committee reports, nominations for Board Chair, adopt new procedures for adopting Board meeting summaries.

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

June Meeting Summary

Board members did not submit any substantive changes to the June meeting summary.

Susan Leckband noted that Board meeting summaries are now required to be adopted within 45 days of the meeting.

The June meeting summary was adopted.

Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies' update

Susan Leckband described how each year, the Board hears TPA agency leadership perspectives on the past year and future cleanup plans and goals.

Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP

Delmar was attending today on behalf of Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, who was unable to attend the Board meeting. Delmar provided copies of his presentation on the back table.

Delmar said DOE-ORP has focused on personnel resources within its office and with contractor transition. Delmar said they have worked hard to increase the number of qualified engineers and staff. At the end of last year, DOE-ORP had 99 full-time employees. Now DOE-ORP has or can hire 124 full-time employees. Delmar said they plan to have 127 full-time employees by the end of FY 2008.

Delmar reviewed the status of FY 2008 milestones. He said they missed some milestones tied to tank retrievals and Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) operations. Delmar said the agencies continue to negotiate changes to the TPA, including operation and construction of WTP and single-shell tank work. He said there are several open key issues that need to be resolved before negotiations will conclude. DOE-ORP is committed to seeking stakeholder and tribal input before TPA changes are finalized.

DOE-ORP tank farm achievements include:

- Awarding the Tank Operations Contract to Washington River Protection Solutions in May 2008. The transition is on schedule for completion by September 30.
- Completing the interim barrier at T Farm that is designed to preclude or limit migration of contamination. In July 2008, DOE-ORP received \$7 million earmarked for interim barrier activities.
- Retrieving waste from seven single-shell tanks; two tanks were retrieved to the limits of first technologies. Tanks retrieved to-date: C-103, C-106, C-201, C-202, C203, C-204, S-112. Two tanks retrieved to the limits of first technologies: C-108 and C-109. DOE is working with the Department of Ecology (Ecology) to address hard-heel waste. C-109 retrieval is approximately 88% complete; C-108 retrieval will follow completion of C-109. Delmar said the contractor has installed equipment and will do a readiness review for C-110 retrieval. Delmar said DOE is conscious of contractor transition and is working to make sure it does not affect safe retrieval operations.
- Progressing with cleanup from the S-102 spill incident. Delmar said DOE is working hard to improve and review lessons learned and keep those lessons as contractors' transition.
- Nearing completion of the Environmental Management (EM) – 1 review of a supplemental treatment program. Delmar said they hope to publish the review and share it with the Board soon.
- Continuing looking at early commissioning options for the low-activity waste (LAW) facility. Delmar said a critical decision was approved for evaluating pretreatment technologies to support early commissioning of the facility. Construction is ahead of schedule and DOE may have the opportunity to establish an early LAW feed. Delmar said no decision has been made; Bechtel is preparing a conceptual design report analyzing impacts and approaches.

Delmar said the big challenge for tank farms in the near term is single-shell tank retrievals. He said DOE is successful at retrieving about 80% of tank waste, but the last 10-20% is difficult to retrieve. Delmar said they need better system tools and processes. Delmar also said DOE needs to maintain a workforce with an established health and safety culture throughout contractor transition.

Delmar reviewed WTP achievements:

- WTP construction fully resumed and the overall project as of July 2008 is 44% complete. Overall engineering is 74% complete and overall construction is 38% complete. Delmar said 1,600 employees are working at the WTP jobsite, providing engineering, craft, field safety and other services. Delmar said about 250 subcontractors support construction activities.
- Pretreatment facility: 38% complete as of July 2008; projected to be 42% complete by the end of FY 2008. Design is 66% complete and construction is 25% complete.
- LAW facility: 69% complete as of July 2008; projected to be 71% complete by the end of FY 2008. To date, design is 94% complete and construction is 61% complete. Delmar said the roof is on and workers are currently installing massive amounts of piping.
- High-level waste facility: 41% complete as of July 2008; projected to be 42% complete by the end of FY 2008. To date, design is 84% complete and construction is 20% complete. Delmar said much of the work currently underway is raw construction, such as rebar installation.
- Analytical laboratory: 41% complete as of July 2008; projected to be 43% complete by the end of FY 2008. Delmar said work is underway on internal walls.
- Balance of facilities: 50% complete as of July 2008; projected to be 51% by the end of FY 2008. Delmar said crews are currently working on silos.

Delmar said quality assurance challenges continue with WTP, such as vendor supply and performance. Safety should continually improve and DOE needs to resolve outstanding technical issues and fully staff the workforce. Delmar said DOE has closed 24 of the issues identified by an expert review panel; eight issues remain open. Delmar said the biggest issue is leaching; there is a test platform to test and close such issues early in the next calendar year.

Delmar described how WTP is helping rebuild the nuclear supply chain. WTP is a huge and technically complex facility, and the first of its kind. Delmar said WTP is the bridge from the diminished nuclear supply chain to an experienced nuclear infrastructure. Delmar said they are building a cadre of nuclear and safety-minded individuals: there are more than 3,400 personnel working on WTP.

Delmar said the pretreatment engineering platform (PEP) is a quarter-scale model of the pretreatment facility to test and confirm effectiveness of the pretreatment processes on a large scale. He said the test will close technical issues for the pretreatment facility. The PEP was designed and fabricated in New Mexico, is comprised of 16 skids and 25 vessels, 18 feet tall, and about the size of a basketball court. Delmar said design, construction and shipments were completed by the end of May 2008; integrated water testing is planned for mid-September followed by stimulant shakedown testing at the end of September. Integrated phase 1 testing will begin in late October and run through December. Delmar said the challenge is that data is needed by mid-2009 to support continued WTP pretreatment facility construction.

DOE-ORP Look Ahead includes:

- TPA negotiations
 - Delmar said TPA negotiations are key to the long-term success of the project
- Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC & WM EIS)
- Tank Operation Contract Transition
- WTP
 - Resolve technical issues (goal: early 2009)
 - PEP test
 - Focus on completion of design
 - Focus on completion of construction
- Tank Farms
 - Continue single-shell tank retrieval activities
 - Develop single-shell tank hard-heel removal robotic arm
 - Develop and demonstrate a clean closure
 - Perform 242-A Evaporator campaign
 - Continue characterization for tank farm soils
 - Pretreatment at tank farms
 - Interim barrier project
 - Develop and test simulant for enhanced chemical cleaning

Delmar emphasized a strong foundation of safety, noting the VPP Star Status process, applications and awards at tank farms and WTP. He thought there is and will be positive momentum as DOE moves forward with its work at Hanford.

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL

Dave announced that the Plateau Remediation Contract (PRC) was awarded to the Plateau Remediation Company and DOE issued a notice to proceed. The Mission Support Contract (MSC) was awarded to a Lockheed-Martin-led team called Mission Support Alliance, LLC. Dave said DOE was happy to award those contracts and move forward. The notice to proceed will be issued later.

Dave reviewed a list of DOE-RL accomplishments in 2008:

- K East Basin was drained and grouted, and the superstructure was demolished. Dave showed photographs of K West Basin and described how DOE is working on a treatment system for sludge. K East Basin is downgraded to a radiological facility and is essentially gone. Dave said they should complete excavation and soil removal by summer 2009.
- Offsite plutonium shipments: Dave said there has been good progress, but the biggest challenge is obtaining shipping containers from qualified vendors.
- PRC transition will be complete by October 1. Dave hopes to transition all contracts by the end of December 2008. He said Fluor announced they would offer a self-select option for employees who would like to leave or retire. Dave thought that provided employees with greater options.
- Realigned DOE-RL office to manage new contracts. Dave said that process has gone smoothly and DOE-RL has a complete complement of staff of nearly 275 employees on board.
- Developed a site-wide lock-out/tag-out program that was implemented by all contractors. Dave said it is important because it makes the entire site much safer for workers. He thought it was an especially notable process because it was an employee-led initiative.

Dave said DOE-RL accomplished 10 milestones ahead of schedule and 16 on schedule. He said they missed some with K Basins and submitted a change package. Dave described the importance of milestones and how they drive the cleanup schedule.

Dave said the River Corridor demolition is complete and described the status of Hanford cleanup.

- Dave said they removed glove boxes and are taking down the power houses. He said DOE worked closely with EPA to use equipment to tear down the power houses rather than send workers up on scaffolding. Dave said it was a safer method and EPA and DOE worked well on arriving at the solution.
- Cleanup activities at 618-7: Dave described how crews discovered large stainless steel tanks. Dave said that is an example of unknowns completely changing a project plan in the middle of the job, and the contractor did a good job adjusting to the situation. Dave noted that crews took appropriate actions in response to a pyrophoric event.
- 116-N stack demolition: Dave showed a video of the demolition and noted that crews continue to strip down the interior of buildings and remove things like asbestos.
- Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility (ERDF): Dave acknowledged the compaction problems at ERDF in the past year that led to corrective actions. He said nearly 250 large cans a day are going to ERDF; a huge amount, and DOE wants to do more. He said mercury soils are being treated; it seems simple, but treatment is based on how much mercury is expected to be in the soil. Dave described that a flash of light was seen as dirt was spread in the landfill, evidence that there was excess treatment chemicals in the soil. He said they now have a more specific chemical cocktail to treat mercury before it is buried. Dave said they need new cells at ERDF and noted that the boats and greenhouses the contractor paid for in response to the penalty were delivered and built.
- Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP): cleaned out many glove boxes and shipped plutonium. Dave said they are on track to complete that work at the end of FY 2009; he said DOE is happy with the work and believes they will have SLAB on grade by 2013.
- Groundwater: Dave said there is a focused effort on groundwater at Hanford and DOE implemented an integrated groundwater program. Some 3.6 billion gallons of water have been treated.
- Completed the strontium-90 barrier in N Area.

- Improved the barrier in 100 D Area.
- Decommissioned 100 wells.
- Will triple throughput of pump-and-treat system between K reactors and the Columbia River. Dave said getting power to all the wells is a massive undertaking.
- BC cribs excavation: a helicopter is searching for earth anomalies that could indicate unknown waste sites. Dave said this effort is ongoing and showed a photograph of BC crib excavation.
- Transuranic waste (TRU) waste retrieval: Dave said some of the boxes were loosely buried, but has gone well overall. He said it was effective to work the backshift during the summer to take advantage of cooler temperatures.
- B Reactor: Dave said next fall, people should be able to park offsite or just onsite and get a shuttle to the reactor for a tour. The inside will be restricted. Dave said there were 2,000 bus tours in 2007 and that will continue in 2008.

Dave discussed some of the challenges DOE faced in 2007.

- Mercury in soils at ERDF: utilized outside expertise.
- Conduct of operations; significant improvements.
- “Drops:” Dave said DOE was concerned about drums rolling off trucks and piping rolling off drill rigs; a worker lost some toes. Dave said such scary situations must be prevented, and a program was implemented to prevent such accidents.
- Columbia River risk assessments: Dave said DOE wants to close the River Corridor; there were fits and starts to “get it right,” and DOE is “willing to learn.”
- Planning for the unexpected: Dave described how they continue to find more fuel than expected and more surprises in general. He said crews also find unexploded ordinance on the side of Gable Mountain at the old 600-149 Pistol Range Site.

2015 Vision

Dave described the 2015 Vision, a vision created by DOE-RL to identify how the site should look and focus its efforts on the work, the TPA, and contractor efforts. Dave said it incorporates HAB advice. He said they picked 2015 because that is when the River Corridor Contract (RCC) expires. The 2015 Vision uses some driver dates that may not be met, but Dave said they are being used as something to strive for.

Doug Shoop, DOE-RL, further discussed the 2015 Vision. He said DOE-RL shared the vision with DOE-RL employees, DOE-HQ, EPA and Ecology. There will be meetings in September to discuss it with tribal nations and the State of Oregon. Doug said 2015 is not far off, but even though Hanford is the most contaminated site in the United States and the largest environmental restoration project in the world, DOE believes it can shrink its 586 square miles of contamination footprint to 75 square miles by 2015. He said they need final Records of Decision (RODs) in place in the River Corridor. Doug said they think they will have six RODs under CERCLA that will identify remedial actions. He said the remediation associated with those RODs should be completed by 2015. Doug noted that while DOE has many qualified people, it lacks the expertise to get those final RODs in place; DOE will search and select people with that expertise by the end of September.

Doug described parts of the 2015 Vision:

- 300 Area: remedial actions for groundwater and soil, close out PSP units, demolish 186 SEE SLIDE. Doug said 618-10 and 11 are significant challenges with major radioactive contamination; they do not have a good process for dealing with that material right now. Doug said there is a low probability of getting it done by 2015, but if it is not in the vision, they would not have the right focus.
- IU-2 and IU-6: Doug said it covers a large area with a number of waste sites and some facilities.
- D and H Areas
- K Area: Doug said there is a lot of demolition work at K East Basin and the vision states the reactor will be in safe storage by 2015. Doug said the sludge is the key issue; they have to get the sludge out of the River Corridor by 2015. Doug said he would prefer to treat it and get it out of the corridor by 2015, but there is not a good treatment technology right now.
- Central Plateau and PFP: Doug said they expect to have PFP SLAB-on-grade by 2015, which will be a tremendous accomplishment. Doug said DOE believes it is feasible and necessary. PFP is expensive in ways one may not consider, such as keeping security lights on. Doug said that money can be used for cleanup at other places when PFP is gone.

- Central Plateau: Doug said treatment technologies will be in place to treat carbon tetrachloride and ensure other contaminants are contained.
- 400 Area: Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) will be put into long-term surveillance.
- Infrastructure: Doug said DOE believes that part of the key to success is to “right-size” the infrastructure; as cleanup shrinks, infrastructure should shrink and free up money for cleanup.
- Natural Resource Injury Assessment: Complete by 2015 and have a better understanding of the injuries and how to mitigate.

Dennis Faulk, EPA

Dennis said the key principles and values for Hanford cleanup hold true: Get on with the cleanup and protect the river. Dennis said the course for Hanford cleanup was chartered years ago with the Tank Waste Task Force and now the HAB. He thought getting off the river by 2015 can be a reality; EPA is confident contractors can finish cleanup at soil sites and implement groundwater treatment systems to achieve the cleanup along the river.

Dennis discussed some the 2015 Vision cleanup goals and work completed in 2007:

- B Reactor: EPA did not have a role in the National Landmark designation, but they played a significant role in putting it into safe configuration that led to it being available for the designation.
- Groundwater cleanup: Dennis thought groundwater cleanup has stepped up in the past couple years; cleanup is more aggressive, chromium is knocked back and there are more innovative technologies. Dennis said the apatite barrier at N Area is working well to contain and treat the strontium-90 plume.
- 300 Area: Dennis said great progress has been made in the 300 Area. The landscape has changed dramatically and most of the buildings are gone. Dennis thought 618-7 provided many lessons-learned and crews responded well to the fire and did not lose a day’s work.
- Central Plateau: Dennis said PFP is expensive and needs to go. He said EPA is glad to hear the plutonium is leaving the facility, but there are still plutonium waste sites around the facility that need to be dealt with. Dennis thought BC crib cleanup was a big 200 Area accomplishment. He said EPA and DOE did not agree on the remedy, so they compromised and did a treatability test that proved it could be treated in a safe manner and the waste could be moved to a safer configuration.

Dennis said DOE and EPA are issuing a ROD for 200-ZP-1 by the end of September. It will be the first comprehensive groundwater ROD for the Hanford Site. He said it is a big deal for EPA because every other groundwater remedy has been an interim action. This ROD will address all of the contamination and successfully integrate CERCLA and RCRA. EPA wants to have the groundwater system up and running earlier than 2015; Dennis expected the system to be huge and pump more than 1500 gallons a minute.

Dennis said the Board is the conscience of the TPA agencies. He encouraged new Board members to review the history of the Board. Dennis said new contractors will have good new ideas, but they have to be everyone’s ideas to be successful – DOE, EPA, Ecology and the public are not successful if contractors are not successful. Dennis said he is excited for new visions and expected that a new federal administration will change things, too.

Polly Zehm, Ecology

Polly said, like all years, there are successes and challenges. Ecology is encouraged by the positive upfront work on groundwater cleanup along the River Corridor. Sources of contamination are being found and innovative technologies are being developed and tested. Polly said good progress has been made in moving special nuclear material out of PFP and to the Savannah River Site.

WTP successes:

- Construction is 44% complete. Polly said Ecology was pleased that DOE restarted construction on the pretreatment and high-level waste facilities and advanced the construction of the LAW and analytical laboratory facilities. Polly said moving forward with WTP construction moves the site

one step closer to getting waste out of tanks and reducing the risk of contamination to the Columbia River.

- Polly said Ecology is proud of the innovative permitting approach which allows permit approvals to be processed as design elements are completed, allowing for timely construction. She said they try to avoid the “push/slow” paradigm.

Penalty settlements on S-102 tank spill:

- Ecology and DOE reached agreement on settling two violations caused by the S-102 tank waste spill by CH2M Hill. Ecology’s investigation indicated that flaws in the initial tank pump system design and faulty operational decisions resulted in the spill of dangerous tank waste.
- Polly said Ecology took this seriously and initiated penalties. The first involved engineering design related to the water backflow equipment and the second involved inadequate engineering reviews.
- Ecology agreed to hold \$250,000 of the \$500,000 penalty in suspension pending completion of an agreed-to list of corrective actions and one year and 360 hours of active retrieval operations without similar incidents. Polly said breather filters were replaced in T single-shell tank system and emergency equipment was purchased for the Tri-County Hazardous Materials Response Team, two supplemental environmental projects that will directly benefit the community and environment.

TRU mixed waste certification:

- Polly said Ecology and DOE reached an agreement to resolve two missed waste management milestones involving the failure to certify the required volume of TRU mixed waste for shipment to New Mexico.
- Rather than spending tax dollars on litigation, Polly said Ecology and DOE worked together to reach an agreement that benefited the cleanup. There is a commitment now to bring an expert from US Fish and Wildlife Services to assist with assessing potential natural resource injuries at the site. The M-91 milestone includes the payment of a \$25,000 penalty.

TPA negotiation update:

- Polly said Washington State (the governor, attorney general and Ecology) has been negotiating in good faith for more than a year with DOE. Polly said the negotiations are confidential and she could not speak about specifics, but in April, Ecology took a step forward in concept with DOE and EPA. Over the summer, they have been trying to convert that concept into a written agreement. Polly said it has been challenging.
- Polly said negotiations are not concluded, but they are close to being over. Ecology prefers to reach an agreement rather than litigate, as long as the agreement serves Washington State’s interests. She said they are prepared to litigate if necessary.
- Polly described Ecology’s four objectives:
 - Protective, aggressive and realistic actions to address ongoing risk to human health and the environment.
 - Hold DOE accountable for compliance and commitments in the TPA
 - Reach a credible and fair outcome, with “gives and gets” that can be supported by the public.
 - Minimize the chance of repeating the situation in the future because additional delay means increased risk.
- Polly said there will be a full public involvement process.

Areas of concern:

- Groundwater
 - Polly said Ecology has seen progress and positive work recently, but more work needs to be done to protect groundwater and the Columbia River. Polly thought conventional methods are not enough and Hanford cleanup decision-makers must think outside the box. For example, she said, last month DOE and Ecology began testing a vegetable oil mixture to see how effective it may be in cleaning up chromium contamination. Polly said changing migrating, underground plumes of chromium into a less mobile non-toxic form is important to reducing impacts to the shoreline and plant communities.
- Supplemental low-activity tank waste treatment capacity

- Polly said DOE failed to provide a concrete plan for treatment capacity for all of the low-activity tank waste. She said decisions need to be made and facilities constructed in a timely manner.
- Central Plateau
 - Polly said federal budget limitations will cause cleanup to slow or limit cleanup progress on Central Plateau buildings, soil and groundwater cleanup, and removal of waste for disposal at New Mexico's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).
- Tank retrieval
 - Polly said tank retrievals are a high concern, especially since single-shell tank retrievals were stopped for nearly a year after the significant tank waste spill in July 2007.

Polly thanked the Board for its commitment to working with the TPA agencies on Hanford cleanup. She said it keeps them moving forward. Polly said Dave's example of taking a risk by putting something with a low chance of success into the 2015 Vision shows a risk and commitment to pushing forward even if certain cleanup goals appear somewhat unlikely.

Polly said Ecology is trying to write its documents better and in a "language" people can understand. She said the Board should not have to craft advice requesting clear and readable documents, the agencies should be expected to do that anyway. She asked for feedback both on documents and on website information.

Polly said TPA negotiations regarding proposed decades of delays to Hanford cleanup are taking longer than Washington State hoped or intended. She said Ecology heard the Board and public loud and clear in the workshops about how WTP should have been operational in 2007 and concerns that the 2014 date for LAW facility should be accelerated.

Polly said Ecology's involvement in developing the criteria for the Proposed Plan for 200-PW-1,3 and 6 has been limited because EPA is the site's lead regulatory agency. Ecology believes all cleanup decisions should be based on adequate characterization and they will continue to work with other agencies to ensure waste is retrieved, treated and disposed of in a timely manner.

She thanked the Board for its time and attention to Hanford activities. She said the Board helps Ecology do its job better. Ecology will continue to seek the Board's input on innovative cleanup solutions. Polly said the Board is able to make connections with its constituents that Ecology cannot; Polly said that is very valuable.

Discussion

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), thanked the agencies for coming to the Board meeting. She said it is important for the Board to review the past year and look forward to the next one. Pam said she was happy with progress on groundwater cleanup. She had the opportunity to sit in on a peer review process involving experts from around the country discuss groundwater cleanup at Hanford and found it very valuable. Pam thought B Reactor tours are also very valuable; the more people see the work and progress at Hanford, the better the general public opinion, and the better the effects on the cleanup budget. Pam also appreciated TPA negotiation efforts and looks forward to a successful conclusion. Finally, Pam said contractor transition times are precarious for the Tri-Cities community and asked the agencies to be aware of that this is a difficult time for families. She thought it would be helpful for people to talk to the new contractors and asked if DOE could facilitate such a situation.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said at a Tank Waste Committee (TWC) meeting in August that she felt that nothing had changed since the last time she came to a Board meeting. However, she said, today she was impressed by the progress illustrated by the agency presentations. She said the tension between the agencies is productive and will help create creative solutions. She asked Delmar to name the top three to five outstanding issues at WTP. Delmar said such issues include defining process routes for the ultra filtration process, and dealing with toxicity of the leaching process and the potential need to add sodium is a technical risk. He said other difficult issues include the nuclear quality and procurement of materials, and retaining and maintaining a qualified workforce with the skill to move forward with construction.

Regarding the 2015 Vision, Paige asked what might get in the way of progress and how DOE could proactively prevent slow downs. She asked Delmar to focus on WTP. Delmar said engineering time and analysis has the potential to slow work; estimated hours for an engineering activity are coming in higher than expected. Delmar said procurement is a common “culprit” for slowing things down, and other basic construction-type activities. Delmar said DOE thinks about how to help vendors mitigate their issues to prevent issues that will slow down Hanford cleanup.

Paige asked why safety performance is down. Delmar said WTP safety performance is doing well, but they are seeing increases in some non-reportable type injuries, such as bruises. He said they are keeping an eye on such things to make sure they do not become more significant. Delmar said they have increased the workforce and have to work to maintain safety and safety performances.

Paige asked about safety performance at tank farms. Delmar said DOE always strives to improve the safety record regardless of current performance. His focus is to work with contractors during contract transition to make sure safety the focus on safety is not degraded.

Tom thanked the agencies for their presentations. He asked Delmar if it is a forgone conclusion that the PEP test will confirm the ultra filtration process at the pretreatment facility. Delmar said they would not do the test if it was forgone; he said the key is to do the test in time to be able to modify the design and move forward on schedule. He said they hope it is complimentary of where they are with the design and give time to deal with unknowns, which is why they want the data as soon as possible. Tom asked about a Plan B if the PEP invalidates the path forward. Delmar said it is more how fast waste will move through and to the pretreatment facility, not if it will work. He said there are engineering solutions and options, but they need the test data – not knowing the problem makes it hard to know the solution.

Tom said he was concerned about moving forward with pretreatment facility construction when the PEP test will not be done until summer 2009. He asked what might happen if the test results are not what DOE thought they would be and construction is underway on the pretreatment facility. Delmar said the designs will not be complete until the PEP test is done. He said the schedule includes holds on completing some component designs within the facility until they have confirmation on things like filter configuration, for example. He said the construction currently underway is raw construction (e.g. rebar), and DOE has much greater confidence that work will not be impacted by the PEP test results. He said about mid-2009 is when they need confirmation to tweak processes within the facility. Delmar said they include confirmation in the schedule.

Tom asked Dave about Hanford plans to send TRU waste to be processed in Idaho where it will be compacted and packaged for WIPP. He heard that it would cost an additional \$50 million to do that. He asked if it would be safer and better to do that work at Hanford and avoid sending the waste twice by road. Dave said shipping the waste to Idaho for that work is actually cheaper than doing it at Hanford. He said TRU waste shipping trucks will be available in a couple months, and Idaho has a compactor installed and the license to do it. The material will be certified for transportation to Idaho and they will treat the waste in their process system that currently has excess capacity; it will then be certified for TRU waste disposal. Dave said about 1000 drums will be certified and shipped to Idaho, and he believes it is the most effective use of DOE’s resources. Tom said it seems like it would be good to do that work at Hanford.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, asked what DOE will do with the PEP facility when the test is finished – will it be used as a training facility? Delmar said they are currently discussing that and reviewing their options. Phase I testing will answer engineering questions to continue with design, and Delmar said they are looking at options post-Phase I testing. He said they want to keep and use it.

Keith said the single lock-out/tag-out program is excellent, and expanding worker participation will not only make work safer, it will make it more efficient because of fewer work-stopping injuries. Keith said he heard that the initiative to employ a worker management safety program has lost energy at WTP, and he would like to see DOE reinvigorate that program. Keith thought it would help allay concerns about minor injuries turning into something worse.

Keith thought some of the problems with obtaining high quality nuclear materials and equipment might stem back to the decision years ago to not have a vigorous apprenticeship program at Hanford. He said Hanford has a huge impact on nuclear quality welding and manufacturing, and the loss of the

apprenticeship program created a problem. Keith also cautioned against excessive infrastructure shrinking. Such plans require good planning and worker input.

Greg deBruler, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said the 2015 Vision was good; Hanford cleanup needs goals and visions. He said he is interested in achieving all the goals that were set throughout the years. He said the River Corridor is supposed to be cleaned up to unrestricted use and nothing less. Greg commented that they learned in the late 1990s that the definition was changed to mean surface use, which is a huge issue. Greg said it is fine that the 2015 Vision states that the contaminated footprint will shrink to 75 square miles, but it still does not establish and meet the goal of unrestricted use. Greg asked when there would be a definition of a final end state and “how clean is clean,” for the River Corridor and in general. Greg said he would like to see a plan in the next year that defines how clean is clean.

Greg said the Board and public do not know what issues are being negotiated and asked for a frank discussion about what topics are under discussion in the TPA negotiations. He said the River Corridor should be cleaned up to a level acceptable to all species, not just humans. Greg also said all waste should be retrieved, including TRU waste. Greg questioned how WTP can be built when only 40% of the design is complete; how final RODs can be achieved when the cleanup is not comprehensive; and how tribal input and land use is considered. Greg said he wants EPA to commit to unrestricted use.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), asked what actions DOE is taking to answer questions raised by National Research Council (NRC). Second, he asked for an update on tank SX-104 and its classification as a non-leaker or possible leaker. Delmar said the NRC review process is complete, including the public process. He said DOE is defining action plans for identified issues. He said they will work with DOE-HQ on some of the scope questions. NRC did not ask for a report or corrective actions plans, so DOE is working on the action plans internally. Susan Leckband suggested that TWC take the issue on and report to the full Board.

Delmar said SX-104 was evaluated and determined the cause in liquid level fluctuation was due to lancing action. It was a clear phenomenon related to the level changes in the liquid observation well. Delmar said there is no indication that it is leaking.

Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, commented that it looks like there is marked improvement in DOE management. He said it seems probable that Hanford may end up keeping glass blocks in the 200 Area if shipments are not made to Yucca Mountain, especially considering the upcoming presidential election. He thought DOE should consider a different mechanism using sulfides to bring technetium to the surface of glass. He said it would be a shame to have huge glass blocks with the most mobile, longest-lived radioisotope sitting at the surface of the glass. He encouraged DOE to reexamine the technetium issue in light of what may or may not happen with Yucca Mountain. Secondly, related to aluminum and the amount of sodium that has to be added to the glass, Mike said it seems easy to add things like sodium, but adding that much sodium will lead to a major increase in the number of glass blocks. He encouraged DOE and its contractors to look at classic processes like the Behr process to remove aluminum. He said it would be money well-spent to see if aluminum could be removed rather than adding sodium.

Delmar said DOE is conceptually looking at options for dealing with sodium and continue testing. He said sodium is added during pretreatment processing, and sodium added in the treatment process drives up the final amount of glass product and the duration for which it has to be made. He said DOE is keeping those variables in mind as well as the operations of the whole integrated treatment system.

Bob Parazin asked if DOE is formalizing its strategy regarding early LAW facility startup. He said there has to be a feed system from tank farms for early LAW start up. He asked what it would take to use and isolate the LAW facility.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), asked if DOE is looking at technologies for addressing hard heel tank waste and if it is considering retrieving and using the robotic device that fell off the tracks while it was being used. Delmar said they have some potential chemical approaches to dealing with hard heels, but they have to see how that affects waste treatment. DOE is evaluating their status in terms of technological approach. Regarding the Voltrac device, Delmar said he did not think they will retrieve it from the tank and repair it due to the cost and labor of doing so.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), said DOE Office of Environmental Management (EM) issued a technology roadmap that including an evaluation of iron phosphate glass for high-level waste. He asked if DOE is supporting that effort or is DOE opposed. Delmar said they are working with EM-20 as far as sodium treatment technologies and are working directly with ESL for testing, coordination and implementation.

Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), encouraged DOE to consider Mike Korenko's comments. He said the length and cost of producing glass will be reduced if they are able to remove sodium and aluminum from the treatment process and glass. He said early LAW facility startup will not remove technetium and will increase long-term risk. He said DOE should look at fractional crystallization and Behr processes.

Status of TPA negotiations

DOE-ORP

Erik Olds, DOE-ORP, said Polly's description earlier (see page 8) was very good, and all the agencies share the values she expressed. He said the project and activities that are the focus of the negotiations are shared by the agencies and they are looking for a constructive conclusion.

EPA

Dennis said despite the inability to share the information, he said the agencies are moving forward. He said work is ongoing and they will be able to share information at some point. He said the baseline is part of the negotiations; work is not on hold because of negotiations.

Polly provided Ecology's perspective earlier (see page 8).

Discussion

Dick asked if a new work plan and feasibility study for BC cribs will be issued and what DOE plans to do. Doug said they finished excavating to the intended depth at BC trenches, and looked at treatability options and showed they could safely excavate soils. Doug said they are looking to take a foot of soil from the control area. Dennis said they expect to see a report soon that summarizes the results, which will be factored into a revised feasibility study. He said EPA did not agree before on cost and thought they should have the feasibility study within the next year. Dick asked how deep they dug; Doug said about 15 feet. Dennis said the information will be refined and they will come up with a remedy for BC cribs. He said the information they will gain will help create a more credible cost basis.

Dick asked how remote-handled TRU waste will be shipped. Doug said they are still looking at the options; it would be beneficial to not build a facility to handle remote-handled TRU waste. Susan Leckband thought BC cribs should be discussed within the River and Plateau Committee (RAP).

Dirk asked if F Area is included in the RODs; Dennis said yes.

Rob asked if there will be any effort to look at technologies, such as plasma vitrification and cast stone, which were considered in the past and subsequently discarded to deal with K Basin sludge. Doug said DOE is looking at all options for treating sludge; the report is due at the end of 2008 or early in 2009.

Dirk asked if DOE is considering sending sludge to tanks. Doug said DOE directed the contractor to evaluate all options, but did not know if that option will be considered in the report. Dirk said it is a bad idea to send sludge to tanks. Doug said he did not disagree.

Dirk asked that, given what was learned the 300 Area groundwater decision, how will that decision integrate with source units and the vadose zone? Dennis said it is well integrated for carbon tetrachloride, and they know the location of the carbon tetrachloride plume. He said they know there is some technetium under T and TX tank farms, and they are hopeful the selected technology options will play out successfully and take care of the vadose zone. Dirk asked if plutonium will be addressed; Dennis said they continue to discuss plutonium mobility and have a different opinion about the mobility of plutonium. Dennis suggested

discussing that in more detail at the committee level. Dick thought K Basin sludge should have been analyzed earlier if its presence was known; problems should be dealt with in parallel rather than in series.

Paige asked if it was good that DOE-RL is 10% above its staffing needs; Doug said they evaluated how many staff is needed to oversee the contracts, which was more than DOE-HQ thought they needed. Doug said DOE-HQ provided funding for 10% more staff than they thought DOE-RL needed. Paige asked if that was a vote of confidence from DOE-HQ; Doug said yes, DOE-HQ is providing the latitude to hire more people to get on with cleanup.

Paige asked if the 2012 Vision was ever met. Doug said he did not know; they will establish metrics to measure performance for the 2015 Vision. Paige said she would like to see what was really accomplished in the 2012 Vision and said it would be instructive to look at past vision efforts and performance as DOE looks forward using a new vision.

Dennis said the 2012 Vision was focused primarily on remediating soil sites and they will probably meet all of those commitments outside of K Area. Dennis said they have or will meet about 90% of the 2012 Vision goals.

Paige appreciated how difficult K Basin work has been and said there has been great progress. She said she was concerned that the biggest risk – tanks – is still out there. Paige asked how much time and money was diverted from cleanup to work on B Reactor tours and associated activities. She said she was also curious about the safety of the area for children. Doug said B Reactor has not required a huge resource investment, but required focused attention from DOE management. As far as tour safety, Doug said DOE seriously considers that and said people do not have to be concerned about their clothing, for example; DOE will ensure tours are conducted in a safe manner. Paige asked where the tour budget comes from; Doug said DOE set aside a budget earmark separate from cleanup resources. Doug said that will not take money away from cleanup and DOE will not develop the “Cadillac” of tours.

Greg asked when RODs for the River Corridor will be issued. Dennis said he did not have specific dates off the top of his head, but they would have to be done by the end of 2012 to meet the 2015 Vision goal. He said it takes about three years to build and make a groundwater system fully operational.

Greg said cleaning up to surface use does not adequately protect the riparian zone. He said the ecosystem must be protected. He asked how and when DOE will define aquatic organism and riparian zone protection and how will it incorporate its tribal and trust responsibility. Dennis said there are ongoing risk assessments for the River Corridor that are the backbone for needed remedial actions, particularly for the riparian zone and groundwater. The draft River Corridor Risk Assessment was delivered to EPA last week and they will take samples in the Columbia River (including the islands) later this month. Dennis said those two activities will lead to final feasibility studies for each operable unit and remedy selection. He said the ROD will attempt to achieve protection of ecosystems and the riparian zone.

Jane Hedges, Ecology, said the TPA negotiations are not discussing the definition of “how clean is clean.”

Doug said they need to look holistically at all the risk assessments and come together on how they fit together.

Greg asked if DOE has ever written something that defines the problems in establishing final end states. Doug said he was not aware of any such document. Greg suggested that the regulators look at the River Corridor, review the work done so far and try to define the issues that are impediments for achieving a final end state. He said he wants to better define the impediments so he knows what to address when the ROD process begins. For example, Greg said the tribes disagree when DOE says the cleanup protects human health and the environment.

Greg said there seems to be a tendency to refer to long-term stewardship and institutional controls as activities that will occur far in the future. He said DOE-HQ is not adequately evaluating the cost of long-term stewardship and institutional controls at Hanford. Greg said Washington State and DOE should both evaluate that cost and stop putting the responsibility in the lap of an office that does not exist. Greg also commented that money saved by completing PFP cleanup and closure will not likely come back to Hanford

to use for cleanup. Greg said that is often assumed, but does not happen; he thought DOE should have some guarantee in writing that freed up funds would be used for cleanup if they are making that assumption.

Regarding attempts to find a way to treat remote-handled TRU waste, Keith suggested looking at what has already been explored. He said sometimes the workforce and engineers differ in their opinions on how the cleanup should be approached.

Larry Lockrem, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), suggested that RAP receive an update on K Basin sludge developmental studies (e.g. solidification in drums).

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), recommended Chapter 5 in *America's Nuclear Wastelands: Politics, Accountability and Cleanup* by Max Power that provides an overview of the problems surrounding "how clean is clean." She said cleanup should not be paralyzed over the issue and thought people should remember that some phased cleanups make sense and some do not. She said there are a variety of ways to approach the elusive and almost unattainable goal of reaching consensus on final end states without bringing cleanup to a halt.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), congratulated Pam on her work on B Reactor and making it more accessible and known to the public.

TPA agencies' priorities for Fiscal Year (FY) 2009

The TPA agencies provided major areas for consideration by the HAB in 2008-2009:

- TC&WM EIS: continue frequent communication with the agencies regarding the development and schedule of the TC&WM EIS. Provide advice that will help DOE develop a robust public involvement process for release of the draft EIS.
- Waste site remediation and cleanup: based on the HAB's values flowchart, provide the agencies with ideas for configuring cleanup of Central Plateau waste sites and burial grounds.
- Tank cleanup and closure: based on the HAB's values flowchart, provide the agencies with ideas for configuring tank cleanup and making closure decisions.
- Site-wide RCRA permit: provide input on the site-wide RCRA permit when issued for public comment.
- Cleanup baselines: provide input on the development of cleanup baselines for the remainder of the Hanford cleanup mission. Help identify opportunities for accelerating risk reduction and optimizing resources.
- TPA negotiations: provide advice on agreements that result from negotiations between the agencies regarding TPA milestones.
- Public involvement outreach: reach out to more diverse audiences. The agencies challenge the HAB membership to identify three to five new outreach opportunities for the HAB.
- Provide input for overall Hanford cleanup priorities subject to budget.

Agency perspective

EPA

Dennis said some issues were from the 2007-2008 list, such as waste site remediation and cleanup. He said with the new contractors, they are figuring out how to parse out Central Plateau cleanup work. Dennis said they are getting close to having a good discussion on baselines that all can support.

Ecology

Jane said Ecology hopes to have a first draft of the site-wide RCRA permit out in November. Since it will be a massive document, she said they are struggling with public involvement, how to make it understandable for the public, and how to break down key issues and elements in each of the units. Jane said they want to work with PIC and obtain recommendations.

DOE-ORP

Erik agreed with Jane and said they are facing something similar with the TC&WM EIS. He mentioned the possibility of the two documents coming out at the same time and said DOE wants to work with the Board and PIC on the public involvement effort.

DOE-RL

Doug emphasized the agencies need feedback on Central Plateau cleanup strategies. He said they also want input on RODs for the River Corridor.

Discussion

Susan Leckband noted that the Board does its best work through committees and issue managers. She challenged all Board members to become more involved and take on some of the legwork. She said it is important to not lose ground during the contract transition process.

Dirk said DOE needs staff that can see long-term ramifications and problems, especially in the areas of chemical engineering and technical systems engineering. Dirk also said there should be a digestible form of the site-wide RCRA permit and TC&WM EIS, and DOE and Ecology should provide a long enough public comment period. Dirk also noted that when the agencies last negotiated the TPA, they touched base with the public through a series of meetings, meeting in five cities at the beginning, middle and end of the process. He thought it provided good checkpoints throughout the process, and thought it especially provided Ecology with an opportunity to tell people about some of the tough issues and get their opinion.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, said PIC discussed the site-wide RCRA permit and while an executive summary will be helpful, there should be an even more condensed and focused summary of the executive summary.

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), volunteered to review the site-wide RCRA permit outline and help identify how to boil it down to key issues. Jane said she will send Steve a structure outline of the permit.

Erik said he was concerned about whether or not an outline would provide enough information.

Pam said public participation for final RODs and institutional controls will be very important. She said usually local governments are involved with institutional control decisions, but that will not happen with Hanford because of the magnitude of the project. She said they need to think about how institutional controls will function and how they are funded. Pam said they will not be funded if they are not well defined within the ROD. Dennis thought it was important to continue that discussion; he said EPA is still thinking about institutional controls and would like to discuss it at the November Board meeting.

Paige asked what the site-wide RCRA permit will cover. Jane said it will cover operating, closing or closed facilities that will store or manage hazardous material. It will permit mixed-radiological and hazardous facilities, but not radiological facilities. Jane said it covers T Plant, the closing of some of the facilities in 183-H Solar Basin, the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF), and others.

Paige asked how the TC&WM EIS and the site-wide RCRA permit fit together – what comes first? Are they connected? Is timing an issue? Erik said some of the activities analyzed in the TC&WM EIS are covered in the permit. He said he did not know if they could be easily meshed.

Paige said she was concerned the TC&WM EIS and permit public involvement strategy will be piecemeal and disconnected. She said most of the public will not read them and DOE should have excellent summaries or outlines. How will DOE convey to the public how a particular element fits into the whole cleanup picture?

Jane said they will use the TC&EM EIS to make tank closure decisions. However, she said, the tanks contain waste and are therefore operational and require a permit. She said they do not need the TC&WM EIS for everything in the permit, and they do not need the permit for the EIS. Jane described the EIS as a tool that analyzes options and makes recommendations, helping the agencies make decisions. Jane said the EIS and permit interrelated but accomplish some separate goals.

Paige asked what the agencies want from the public in relation to the EIS and permit. Jane said they want to make sure the public understands and trusts the way DOE is managing the cleanup and how Ecology is regulating it. Paige said that makes sense but asking that through two massive documents is not the best way. Jane said she agreed; the question is how to boil down the issues. She said the Board can help the agencies.

Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said facilities operators are the primary audience for the site-wide RCRA permit. Ecology would also like the public to review it and do more than just “check the box.” He said the issue is how to make the executive summary, maps, tables, and more useful for the public.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), agreed with Paige and said EISs come before permits because they are supposed to identify the potential impacts and risks to alternatives and get public comment on a readable executive summary before the permit is prepared. He said the two original EISs that were later merged into the TC&WM EIS were supposed to come out long before the site-wide RCRA permit. Gerry said the documents are out of order; the EIS is supposed to describe the situation (e.g. tank vapors) and risks, and the permit describes how to prevent risks. Gerry said there should be a serious discussion about timing and the failure of the original EISs.

Regarding TPA negotiations, Gerry said the agencies should not expect increased public involvement if they cannot share information about the negotiations. He said the agencies should be clear with the public about what they want help on and what the problems are. Gerry suggested that if the agencies want diverse public involvement, then they should hold State of the Site meetings in additional locations, such as in Oregon or Spokane. He said they should also share information about TPA negotiations at the State of the Site meetings. He said the HAB is not tasked with public involvement itself, but advises the agencies about their public involvement efforts.

Jane said everyone is frustrated with the lack of transparency with the negotiations because of confidentiality clauses. She said they would like to provide the Board and public with more information but given the legal situation, she did not expect anyone to make a guarantee that detailed information will be shared at State of the Site meetings. Gerry thought the confidentiality rules should change; he said it has been a year and it is time to go to the public. Dennis said they will do what they can.

Greg asked the agencies to think about why anyone would want to come to State of the Site meetings and how they will create a real dialogue? He thought last year’s meetings ignored delays to cleanup. Greg asked how he should prepare to get people to attend the meetings this year and what they will learn and comment on. Greg said State of the Site meetings are in less than 30 days and usually Board members have at least 45 days to prepare their outreach for their constituencies.

Dennis thought the Board understands the issues and pitfalls regarding TPA negotiation dialogue. He said they want to talk about what is going on with the cleanup. Greg said delays to milestones were not discussed last year and people asked why the regulators were not open about cleanup shortfalls. Greg thought the agencies should think about what they will do differently this year.

Keith said agency priorities for the HAB do not include health and safety issues. He thought DOE may have an opportunity with new contractors to ensure safety programs are robust and inclusive. He said in the past, there was frustration that enhanced work planning was not included in Integrated Safety Management Systems (ISMS); he thought DOE may have the chance to encourage new contractors to put enhanced work planning into their basic management structure. Keith said he was encouraged that people with a safety background are now in DOE-ORP and DOE-RL management.

Rob commented that the agencies should review the Board’s clarity and readability advice when they look at creating summaries of the TC&WM EIS and site-wide RCRA permit. He also suggested that DOE provide a way to read and provide comments online.

Pam commented that regardless of a person’s technical knowledge or experience, they can always provide comments on values. She noted a peer review meeting of groundwater technologies and its success in bringing experts in from around the country to talk about similar challenges and potential technologies. She thought it was a successful approach. Pam encouraged the agencies to consider a Best and Brightest review

of the site-wide RCRA permit; she said she will not understand the document, but there are people who will that she trusts.

Introduction to new contractors

CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company

John Lehew, president and CEO of CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company (PRC), thanked the Board for the opportunity to share information about CH2M Hill's new company. John said they are excited to be selected by DOE as the PRC contractor.

John shared information about CH2M Hill: it is an employee-owned company with 25,000 employees worldwide. John recently worked in Scotland on Dounreay Nuclear Facility decommissioning.

The PRC mission is the decommissioning and remediation of the Central Plateau and 100 K Area.

- 100-K Area remediation, sludge treatment, and reactor interim safe storage
- PFP closure
- Groundwater and vadose zone remediation project
- Groundwater, soil, and facility regulatory decision/other documents
- Facility, waste site, and canyon remediation (beginning with U-Canyon)
- Waste retrieval, treatment and disposal, and fuels management (including TRU waste retrieval)
- Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) near-term shutdown activities
- Facility and waste site minimum-safe/surveillance and maintenance

John said their vision for Hanford is to provide a sustainable future for the Hanford area through protection of the Columbia River and remediation of the Central Plateau. John said PRC wants to work with the community and the Board to identify how they want to use the land when cleanup is complete. John described PRC's team values and described how safety and environmental compliance is paramount to success: reducing injury rates and teaming with the workforce enhances productivity on a work effort.

John said PRC's leadership team shares common values and brings expertise from around the country:

- John Lehew – President and Chief Executive Officer
- Victor Pizzuto - Chief Operating Officer
- Patrice McEahern - Safety, Health, Security and Quality
- Moses Jaraysi – Environmental Programs & Regulatory Management
- Steve Dahlgren – PFP, Balance of Site Decommissioning, Infrastructure and FFTF
- David Del Vecchio – 100-K Area Project
- Ty Blackford – Waste and Fuels Management
- Kurt Kehler – Engineering, Procurement and Construction Projects
- Con Murphy – Soil and Groundwater Remediation
- Dan Cartmell – Business Services and Project Controls
- Amy Lientz – Strategic Planning and Outreach
- Dave Ruscitto – Chief Engineer

PRC's approach includes:

- Partnering with DOE and the regulators to:
 - Establish site-decision strategy
 - Create Central Plateau end-state vision
 - Streamline regulatory document process
- Early removal of sludge off the river and remediation of 100-K Area
- Remove special nuclear material from PFP, reduce risk and downgrade security to facilitate early demolition to SLAB on grade
- Optimize groundwater remediation methods
- Early fieldwork for soils/waste site remediation
- Integrated approach to zone closure for canyon facilities, soils and groundwater
- Point of generation waste management (e.g. eliminate "drops" off trucks)

- Accelerate remaining PRC project activities to reduce the Hanford Site footprint
- Work with other site contractors to achieve site-wide river protection goals and objectives

John said their contract was awarded in June 2008 and received the notice to proceed on August 1 that established a 60 day transition. Transition activities John reviewed include:

- Staffing: John noted that key personnel proposed on the contract have been on board since August 1.
- Conducting due diligence (projects and functional areas)
- Finalizing business and administrative systems
- Adopting key programmatic areas
- Establishing first-year execution plan and project management systems, getting in line with TPA milestones
- Establishing interface agreements
- Finalizing subcontracts: John noted that there are two large business subcontracts (Fluor and Areva) and twelve pre-selected small business contracts.

John said these activities need to be complete when they take over the contract on October 1. John said they are ahead of schedule for all transition activities and have submitted deliverables ahead of schedule (approximately 2,000 tasks). They conducted four open house meetings with employees at different times of day to accommodate shift workers; John said approximately 900 people attended to discuss transition activities and ask and answer questions. John said PRC will meet with union leaders, stakeholders and regulators.

John directed Board members to PRC's website and hotline for more information: www.platauremediation.com, (509) 376-7500.

Discussion

Paige asked if PRC has compared its vision to DOE-RL's 2015 Vision. John said yes, they have discussed visions and priorities with DOE-RL managers and staff as well as with Ecology and EPA and will work to best align those visions into their first year approach.

Larry asked when PRC plans to have PFP SLAB-on-grade; John said 2013. Larry asked if staffing is, and will be, limited; John said they will have about ten people supporting PFP work and they will use the existing workforce to clear out the remainder of the glove boxes. He said part of their approach is to get special nuclear material out as soon as possible to downgrade security requirements.

Mike Keizer, Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), thanked John for meeting with Central Washington Building Trades.

Washington River Protection Solutions

Bill Johnson, president and project manager for Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS), said WRPS was selected at the end of May as the Tank Operation Contract (TOC) contractor and received the notice to proceed on June 23. Since then, Bill said, they have mobilized central personnel and have 84 people currently on the ground.

Bill introduced himself and his background: he has 35 years of nuclear projects experience, 17 years in DOE and high-level waste projects (including Idaho Cleanup Project, Savannah River Site, and Idaho Chemical Processing Plant), and 18 years in the commercial nuclear industry (nuclear safety and compliance, project management and field services). He said his job has not changed over the years: it is still safety and safety remains the foundation on which all work is done. Bill said safety enables productivity.

Bill said WRPS is comprised of URS (Washington Division), Energy Solutions and Areva (integrated subcontractor). Together, Bill said, they represent the largest team of nuclear operators in the world.

Bill said overall, the project is about risk and risk reduction to the Columbia River, the workforce, DOE, regulators, tribal nations, and about meeting TPA milestones. Bill said this leads to a three-part approach: 1) working with safety and regulatory compliance, 2) eliminating risk to the river by focusing on tank retrievals and preparing tanks for closure, and 3) performance assurance by meeting key performance indicators into the future.

WRPS transition activities focus on people, plants and processes. Goals include:

- Connection with the workforce, DOE-ORP, regulators, stakeholders and the community
 - Bill said WRPS wants to integrate into the fabric of the community. Fred Brandt (environmental health safety quality manager) will be the Board's primary contact and liaison. Bill said Fred has experience with WTP and the knowledge and experience in environmental health safety and public communications.
 - Bill said he wants WRPS employees to be active participants in the community and in HAB activities.
- Establish WRPS organization and staffing
 - Bill said job offers are essentially complete.
- Baseline physical conditions through due diligence
- Adopt and adapt programs
- Support DOE-ORP in-process reviews
 - Bill said WRPS interacts daily with DOE-ORP.
- Ensure readiness for contract responsibilities

Bill said WRPS is on day 64 of 90 days of transition. Transition is managed as a project, and Bill said WRPS is running 6% ahead of schedule and under budget. They are focusing on communications with the workforce and have held four Town Hall meetings at times that accommodate all shifts and workers in a variety of locations including Sunnyside and Richland. Bill said they have 1,130 personnel on board for the October 1 start date.

Bill said all plant walkthroughs (664 facilities) are complete and they are incorporating them into performance baselines and work plans. Bill said programs focus on adopt, adapt and enhancing safety, integrity, teamwork and results. He said WRPS is committed to ISMS and have made a great deal of progress with the Voluntary Protection Program (VPP), which is an integral part to the enhanced work plan. Bill said a safe nuclear culture is fundamental for workers to feel free to come forward with concerns and ideas without fear of retaliation. Bill said WRPS will participate in the Hanford Concerns Council without any lapse during transition.

WRPS is on target for starting work on October 1: 1,292 activities are complete and 276 are in process. Bill said they are delighted with the welcome they have received from the community, stakeholders and regulators. He said the ultimate goal is risk reduction and elimination of tank waste.

Discussion

Keith said he is interested in how WRPS will involve workers and how that affects the safety culture. He asked Bill how he feels about his own involvement and presence in the workplace. Bill said the primary role of management is to support the workforce, and the only way to do that is to be where they are working. WRPS' approach is to place management with the workforce.

John said all PRC managers have worked their way up from the ranks and will be in the field at each of the projects. He will be out in the field regularly, too.

Pam asked how much PRC and WRPS understand the funding situation and how is DOE helping them anticipate their resources. John said they are working closely with DOE on the funding profile for FY 2009 if and when they are under continuing resolution. Bill said WRPS is working closely with DOE-ORP and interacting on a daily basis on the work plan. He said continuing resolution is being factored in and they are integrating DOE's priorities into their work plan.

Pam asked DOE how they will anticipate and approach layoffs. Doug said DOE-RL and Fluor offered employees an early out for retirement and have no plans for layoffs at this time. Erik said DOE-ORP is not anticipating layoffs.

Wade Rigsbee, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), asked how WRPS and PRC will integrate groundwater and tank farm work. Bill said they are looking at the integration of activities and have points of contact between WRPS and PRC. He said integration is a deliverable and they are on schedule. John said their approach is to integrate River Corridor work with tank farm work.

Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health (Ex-Officio), asked about an organization chart and scope of work for WRPS. Bill said it is on the website and could mail a summary of their approach and scope to Debra. Debra noted she would like to see what work has shifted to the MSC contractor (the recently selected Mission Support Alliance, LLC). Bill said the overall tank farm scope is essentially unchanged; they will manage tank farm waste, retrieve and transfer waste to double-shell tanks, prepare for feed to the LAW and pretreatment facilities at WTP, and integrate work between the contractors.

More information can be found on the WRPS website: www.wrpstoc.com. Erik said EnviroIssues can send out website information to Board members.

Gabriel Bohnee, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), asked how DOE prepared the new contracts to incorporate treaty agreements and did the contractors know about such agreements. Doug said DOE does not anticipate any change between DOE, the contractors and the tribes. Bill said PRC knows the commitments and obligations to tribal nations and they will work with the tribes. John said WRPS recognizes the obligation as well and said several of his staff has experience working with stakeholders in similar situations.

Susan Leckband thanked Bill and John for meeting the Board and said she the Board looks forward to working with them.

HAB Chair cover letter to DOE regarding charter changes

The Board adopted DOE's proposed Operating Ground Rules (OGR) and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in June, and committed to sending the approved Sounding Board with a cover letter to Jim Rispoli. Susan Leckband asked the Board to review the transmittal letter. The Board also reviewed language suggested by Gerry.

Discussion

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), said he has serious objections to the third and fourth paragraphs; he said they are argumentative and do not need to be part of the transmittal. He said he could not support the letter with paragraphs three and four.

Rick Jansons, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), said he shared Harold's concerns and thought paragraphs three and four try to characterize the Sounding Board. He said there are nuances and additional information in the Sounding Board that cannot and should not be captured in the transmittal letter. Maynard agreed.

Pam did not think the third and fourth paragraphs add anything to the transmittal letter. She suggested sending the transmittal letter and Sounding Board to the local DOE managers and Jim Rispoli.

Gerry said he did not think anyone at DOE-HQ will read the Sounding Board and thought it was necessary to send it with some sort of summary in the transmittal letter. He said the Board should communicate to DOE that adopting the MOU and OGR was not a "slam dunk" and that they never communicated why the Board's original charter changes proposal did not meet the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), did not think DOE will read the Sounding Board. He thought if the Board wants to convey its concerns, it should send the transmittal as is (with paragraphs three and four). Debra agreed with Jeff and had some editorial changes, such as avoiding the use of the word "trepidation." Keith agreed with Jeff and Debra and though it is important to summarize the Sounding Board.

Dick suggested summarizing the Sounding Board, but not as part of the transmittal letter.

Art Tackett, Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), said the Board advises DOE to utilize executive summaries, and it should follow its own advice and provide a summary. Paige agreed that there should be a summary of the Sounding Board, and suggested making the transmittal letter more matter-of-fact.

Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local/Regional Public Health), thought the transmittal letter should document the dissent. Charlie disagreed that the vote was a straight 2/3 vote; he said there was a range of feeling from total agreement to total opposition. Dick agreed and said many Board members who voted to approve the MOU and OGR did so reluctantly because there really was not any other option. Jeff agreed and said the only reason he was part of the majority “yes” vote was because Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, and Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Environmental/Citizen), gave their support. Jeff said until they gave their support, he was against adopting the MOU and OGR.

Nancy Murray, Public-at-Large, suggested saying the Board had “serious reservations” about the charter change process.

Susan Leckband said the 2/3 vote reference was made to record how the decision was made. Betty suggested not referencing the vote.

Dennis thought the conversation shows how much angst there was over the MOU and OGR issue. He thought the Board should communicate that in the transmittal letter. He also thought the Board should say that consensus was not reached, which is the usual Board process.

Paige thought the transmittal letter should say that the Board accepted the MOU and OGR with serious reservations, and was reached by a vote rather than the typical Board process of consensus.

Rob asked if the Board could think about this for a few months and revisit it. Susan Leckband said no, the OGR and MOU have been accepted and the transmittal letter is trying to illustrate the struggle. Susan said the Board charged her as chair with sending a transmittal letter to accompany the Sounding Board. Process-wise, as chair, she could have sent the letter without Board review, but she did not think that was appropriate. Harold asked if the MOU and OGR have been signed and sent to DOE-HQ; Susan said yes, the MOU and OGR are in effect and the transmittal letter is a follow-up.

Rick thought the Board agreed to a simple letter because it was so difficult to agree on accepting the MOU and OGR. He said the Board is sending this letter to an outgoing administration, and the next time charter changes arise, there will be different people. He volunteered to help rewrite paragraphs three and four, but did not really want them included in the transmittal letter.

Susan Leckband said it sounds like the Board wants the letter to contain an expression of the range of feelings, the fact that it was not a “slam dunk” and that the MOU and OGR were accepted with serious reservations. She said it will be difficult to express the range of opinions in the transmittal letter (and those opinions are expressed in the Sounding Board to which it will be attached). Maynard noted that no one fully supported the replacement of the Board’s charter with the MOU and OGR.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), asked what the desired effect is of communicating to DOE-HQ the Board’s struggle with the process.

Paige said there has to be a record of the charter change situation; there must be a letter.

Harold said he was amenable to approving a revised version of the transmittal letter. The transmittal letter was revised.

To whom should the Board send the Sounding Board and transmittal letter?

Susan Leckband said there is a proposal to send the transmittal letter and Sounding Board to the local DOE offices and a copy to Jim Rispoli. She noted that the local offices signed the MOU. Susan said the Board’s intent decided on in June was to send the Sounding Board and transmittal letter to Jim Rispoli. Dick

thought it would be most useful to go to the local DOE offices. Doug said the local DOE offices care and will read the transmittal letter and Sounding Board if the Board sends it to the local offices.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large, said he thought the local field offices already participated and understand the Board's position.

Jeff said the Board could hold the transmittal letter and Sounding Board until there is a new DOE assistant secretary for environmental management. He said the purpose of both pieces to convey to DOE-HQ the Board's "angst" over the decision.

Maynard said it was the legal staff at DOE-HQ who had the problems with the Board's old charter. He said the Board should copy the legal staff at DOE-HQ who generated the OGR and MOU proposal. Erik said he did not think the transmittal letter should go to the Office of General Counsel at all, directly or copied.

Nolan suggested that the Board send it to Jim Rispoli because he led the replacement of the charter with the OGR and MOU and send it to the next DOE assistant secretary for environmental management. Julie Jones, City of West Richland (Local Government), agreed and thought the Board could add more information for the next administration to provide more background. She thought the transmittal should express the Board's frustration without itemizing it.

Dick asked who initiated the charter change; Erik said it was DOE-EM, who required all sites in the complex to be FACA compliant. Dennis said to be clear, there were a couple things in the Board's old charter that needed to change; how broad they ended up being is the unclear part.

Maynard thought the transmittal letter and Sounding Board should go to the local field offices and later send it to the new administration. He did not think it should go to Jim Rispoli because he was worried about possible negative implications. Paige and Charlie thought it should be sent to Jim Rispoli in addition to the local field offices. Rick did not think it should go to Jim Rispoli at all because he is on his way out, has no vested interest and it cannot do the Board any good to send it to him. Debra thought it would be important to have it on record now.

Erik said he thought the best way to get the Board's decision-making process on record is to send it to the local field offices. He said incoming assistant secretaries and others will ask Dave and Shirley about the Board.

Norma Jean thought the transmittal letter and Sounding Board should go to DOE-HQ as well as the field offices since it was initiated at the federal level. Betty agreed and thought it should go to Jim Rispoli.

Doug Mercer, University of Washington (University), asked if it is traditional to send a letter to a new administration anyway, as a way of introduction. Would it be appropriate to include the Board's charter change process with such a letter?

Mike Korenko said it should go to DOE-HQ so they can see the integrated response of all the boards affected by FACA. Dick thought if other boards submitted comments to DOE-HQ, then the Board should, too. Susan Leckband noted that none of the other boards operate as the HAB operates (e.g. board of interests). She said their charter changes were not as big of a deal as it is for the HAB, and they did not have the same sort of objections. Susan offered to hand-deliver the transmittal letter and Sounding Board to Jim Rispoli at the next Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting.

Rick asked why the Board should "poke" the assistant secretary of environmental management on his way out of office. He thought it could only hurt the Board and has no possibility of helping the Board. He proposed not sending it to Jim Rispoli at all.

Gerry said there has to be a record at DOE-HQ that the MOU and OGR were not willingly accepted, and Jim Rispoli should know that. He said Rick's concern today that DOE-HQ will mess with the Board if they receive the transmittal letter and Sounding Board completely belies the original argument that the Board should trust DOE with the changes. He said the Board persuaded itself that they should accept the MOU and OGR on the basis of trust. He said the Board should send them to Jim Rispoli and then send a packet of

information, including the transmittal letter and Sounding Board, as a way of providing HAB background information to the new administration.

Maynard said he liked the idea of Susan delivering to the new assistant secretary for environmental management. He still did not want to send it to Jim Rispoli. Rick said he trusts the local field offices but does not trust DOE-HQ. He did not think it makes sense to send the transmittal letter and Sounding Board to Jim Rispoli and then ask for more funding at the same time. He liked the idea of Susan hand-delivering it to the new assistant secretary for environmental management.

Dick thought Susan should talk with Jim Rispoli at the next SSAB meeting and describe the Board's decision-making process. He thought a casual conversation would go a long way. Keith agreed.

The Board agreed to send the transmittal letter and Sounding Board to the local field offices (DOE-ORP and DOE-RL). Susan Leckband will personally speak with Jim Rispoli at the SSAB meeting in two weeks to share and explain the Board's process of accepting the OGR and MOU. The Board will present the history of the Board, including the charter change process, letter of transmittal and Sounding Board, to the new administration.

Baseline workshop

Gerry introduced the discussion on the upcoming baseline workshop. The purpose of the proposed workshop is to be briefed on and discuss the baselines for DOE-ORP and DOE-RL. The workshop will not be a briefing on the FY 2008 and FY 2009 budgets. A separate workshop will be held on March 26 to address development of the FY 2010 budget. The audience for the workshop is the full Board and informed public (note: all Board meetings are open to the public, but the level of information needs to be geared toward those familiar with Hanford programs and budgets).

Gerry said baselines are essential because they are the schedules by which contractors work and funds are requested. He said BCC has spent a lot of time discussing baselines and the necessity of reviewing them before they are approved by DOE. He said currently the baseline does not match the TPA, and it should, and he would like to know about the discrepancies between the two. He said DOE-ORP and DOE-RL committed to sharing the baselines with Board and the Board has issued advice sharing its disappointment when it found DOE-HQ approved baselines without having a chance to comment on them. Gerry said the Board also wants to know regulator and contractor perspectives. The goal of the workshop is to understand what the baselines are and what they are not. Gerry noted the importance of terminology; "risk" in a baseline means the risk of missing the schedule or cost, not the risk of a fire, for example. He said the Board wants to work with DOE and the regulators to understand the approved baselines, offer advice if needed, and understand fully how the baselines differ from the TPA. He said they want to know the assumptions used in the baseline since baselines drive budget requests.

Gerry said the committees have and are working on proposed workshop content. The goal is to have a day-long workshop-of-the-whole that touches on every aspect of the baselines and the particular issues the committees have investigated. He said they have been cooperating and working well with DOE on planning the workshop.

At the beginning of the workshop, DOE will explain the concept of baseline budgets, how they are developed and how they will be used to develop future budget requests.

DOE will discuss how the 2010 budget reflects the baseline and how baselines relate to the five-year target and the five-year plan:

- General perspective
- Scope
 - How is the scope defined (including cleanup methods and end states)?
- Cost estimate
 - How are project costs estimated?
 - What are the project costs?
- Schedule
 - How are completion dates determined?

- What is the difference between being TPA compliant and technology compliant?
- What are the completion dates
- Risk
- How is “risk” defined and considered in baselines? It is important to be on the same page when the term is used.
- What are the parameters for the 50% and 80% confidence levels?
- Putting it all together
- How are the IPL, budget and baseline connected?
- How do baseline schedules and funding relate to: a) “target” budgets and approved out-year forecasts, and b) five-year plans and c) integrated priority lists?
- What are the project funding levels?

Gerry said DOE-RL and DOE-ORP will each provide the following information:

- Overview presentation of baseline information broken down by major project and/or geographic area:
 - What are the assumed remedies (include regulator perspectives as well)?
 - What are the schedule uncertainties and characterization of risk?
 - What are the interconnections between projects and/or areas?
 - How are technology needs incorporated into the baseline?
 - How does the baseline schedule compare to TPA milestones? [presentations by both DOE and the regulators]

Maynard described the issues RAP wants to hear about from DOE-RL and the regulators. He said they are all groundwater-type activity:

- ZP-1 groundwater operable unit
- PW 1/3/6 waste sites
- Deep vadose zone characterization and analysis
- M-91 milestone (remote-handled TRU characterization and packaging facility)

Maynard said they want to understand DOE’s assumptions and how DOE arrived at baseline decisions – how does DOE research and validate its decision. He said it also applies to the risk of completing remediation work.

Ken Gaspar described what TWC and the Board will hear from DOE-ORP:

- Interim pretreatment system and supplemental treatment
- Single-shell tank waste retrieval
- Infrastructure upgrades to maintain tanks and prepare feed to WTP

Ken Gaspar said because WTP estimated startup is 2019, the Board advocated in advice that DOE seek early LAW startup. Ken said if there is the desire to process waste before 2019, the Board has been told that interim pretreatment and supplemental treatment is the critical path forward.

Ken said the systems plan identified that there was the potential over the next 20 years to shutting down WTP because single-shell tank retrievals will not keep pace for providing feed. Ken said single-shell tank retrievals are also critically important because they pose the maximum environmental risk. Ken said TWC also wants to know what the impacts are of needing infrastructure upgrades in order to maintain tanks and prepare feed for WTP given the significant delay in operations. Ken said they want the assumptions and plans.

Regulator perspective

Nolan said Ecology thinks the workshop will be very useful and emphasized that the baselines are DOE’s baselines. He said Ecology is concerned that baselines are rarely vetted with the regulators. He said they would like to see what the baselines look like to meet the TPA schedule and compare that to what the baseline looks like when budget is considered. He said Ecology wants to see the actual cost to perform the actual work needed, and then worry about the budget and make appropriate adjustments.

Craig Cameron, EPA, participated over the phone. He said EPA looks forward to the workshop and is clear about how important a baseline is that everyone can support. He said EPA thinks there can be a baseline that matches up with milestones. Assumptions made by DOE are important, as is risk. Craig said the regulators want to see the discrepancies between DOE's assumptions about remedies and their own. Craig said they want the Board's input.

Doug Shoop said they have not picked an exact date yet, but are looking at November 18 or 19.

Discussion

Pam said the process to have a baseline workshop started in March. She noted other dynamics, including her and Jane Hedges participation with DOE-HQ through an intergovernmental working group including governors, attorneys general, local government officials, and environmental directors from other states. She said it is disappointing that baselines are not tied to the TPA. She said in the past, they have looked at huge charts, and it took months to change the baseline if one assumption changed. She said the baselines show how integrated work on the site is, and she is anxious to understand that integration and terminology. Pam said the rest of the country does not have a sense of the right questions to ask. She said information from Hanford has been shared with other SSABs so other stakeholders can be more informed and involved. She said Hanford is far ahead of other SSABs.

Erik said DOE-HQ has provided direction to all field offices to hold these types of baseline workshops throughout the complex.

Strategic Planning Workshop – Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC)

Steve said PIC is responding to requests from the Board and TPA agencies to meet its obligation to the HAB. He said PIC needs to be more productive, clarify public involvement goals and purpose, identify new approaches to public involvement, and ensure public involvement meets the multiple purposes and needs of stakeholders and agencies. Steve said the only way to do this productively is to have a day-long workshop.

Steve said PIC agreed to the following draft objectives and framework for the November workshop:

Objectives

1. Identify projects/activities that energize PIC and meet agency needs
2. Identify how PIC meets its responsibilities
3. Identify how agency goals are set for public involvement and how PIC fits in that framework
4. Identify how PIC contributes to HAB work plan accomplishment

Framework

1. Part I: Strategic planning
 - a. Discuss how PIC functions and relationship with HAB, public and TPA agencies
 - i. HAB public involvement and agency public involvement
 - ii. Three foundational documents help guide PIC strategic planning: TPA Community Relations Plan; HAB White Paper, Public Involvement Evaluation (version 7, revised June 23, 2002); TPA Communication Strategic Plan
 - b. Work plan development and integration with HAB and other committee work plans
2. Part II: Specific PIC contributions to HAB and TPA agencies public involvement
 - c. Budget meeting approach
 - d. Tank Waste and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement
 - e. "Thursday Night Tutorials" and other tools
 - i. Structure
 - ii. Evaluation
 - iii. Specific topics
 - iv. "Hanford 101"
 - f. RCRA site-wide permit public rollout

Agency perspective

Nolan said the regulators are supportive and encouraged by PIC's work. He said it is critical for the agencies to find ways to work more effectively with the Board, especially with respect to public involvement. Nolan said their goal is to have a more effective public involvement process; he said that burden is on the agencies, not the Board.

Discussion

Susan Leckband said the workshop will be held back-to-back with the baseline workshop for travel and convenience. She encouraged everyone to attend the public involvement workshop. She said each Board member has an obligation to share information with the group they represent, as well as try to involve the greater public.

Erik said the baseline workshop is tentatively planned for November 19 and the groundwater and vadose zone workshop is on November 18. They will work on the schedule for the public involvement workshop.

Steve said the committee will discuss a workshop date during the committee call on September 18. Steve said they might want to have the workshop in conjunction with a Board meeting.

EnviroIssues will provide a link to the Community Relations Plan and other documents.

Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) update

Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, updated the Board on the status of the TC&WM EIS. She said she often hears "the EIS will cover that" and thought it was time to remind people what the EIS will and will not do.

The TC&WM EIS will enable DOE to:

- Close the tank farms
- Evaluate WTP and supplemental treatment technologies
- Implement onsite disposal of mixed waste and low-level radioactive waste from the tank farms, other Hanford operations and offsite locations
- Evaluate disposition of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF)

The TC&WM EIS will support the following needs:

- Supplemental tank waste treatment technologies
- FFTF end state
- Tank farm closure
- Waste leaving Hanford (WIPP/Yucca Mountain)
- Hanford disposal of offsite waste
- Hanford onsite waste disposal

Major areas of alternatives analysis include:

- Waste management
 - Solid waste disposal locations
 - Low-level waste and mixed low-level waste
 - Waste coming and going from Hanford
- Tank waste
 - Extent of tank waste removal
 - Type of supplemental treatment for low-activity waste fraction
 - Method of tank farm closure
- FFTF disposition

Mary Beth said waste management alternatives should be thought of in terms of tank closure alternatives and FFTF alternatives.

Included in alternatives analysis:

- Retrieval
 - Tank waste retrieval

- Treatment
 - Tank waste pretreatment
 - Tank waste treatment
 - Cesium/strontium capsules
 - Effluent Treatment Facility and 242-2 Evaporator replacements
 - FFTF decommissioning activities
 - Waste management expanded treatment/storage capabilities
- Disposal
- Onsite waste disposal at the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) of:
 - Onsite, non-Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (non-CERCLA) wastes
 - Immobilized low-activity waste
 - Bulk vitrification
 - Caste stone
 - Steam reforming
 - Secondary wastes
 - Spent melters
 - FFTF decommissioning wastes
 - Offsite wastes
- Onsite waste disposal at the River Protection Project Disposal Facility (RPPDF) of:
 - Contaminated rubble, soils and debris
- Transportation
 - Onsite
 - Offsite to onsite
 - Offsite to WIPP and Yucca Mountain
- Closure
 - Tank closure
 - No closure
 - Landfill closure (two types of barriers)
 - Partial clean closure
 - Full clean closure
 - Post-closure monitoring and control
 - Waste management
 - IDF landfill closure
 - RPPDF landfill closure
 - FFTF decommissioning
 - Entombment
 - Removal

Not included in alternatives analysis:

- Current waste management activities, e.g. operations of ETF/Liquid Effluent Retention Facility and 242-2 Evaporator
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)/CERCLA remediation activities in 100, 200 and 300 Areas, e.g. canyon remediation/closures
- Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) disposal activities
- Remediation of contaminated groundwater plumes
- TRU waste disposal at WIPP
- High-level radioactive waste disposal at Yucca Mountain
- Pre-1970 TRU waste

Mary Beth said postcards will be mailed soon to see who wants to be on the mailing list and how they want to receive the document. She said the EIS will be about 5,000 pages and people will have the option of receiving it entirely electronically, a summary with a CD, or a complete hard copy. She said the EIS will be issued with a Readers Guide. The draft EIS should be ready in winter of 2009 (December – March timeframe).

Regulator perspective

Nolan said he wanted to emphasize that the regulators are working with DOE. Ecology is a cooperating agency based on the settlement that prompted the TC&WM EIS. Nolan said they are reviewing a draft public involvement plan for the EIS and will work with Mary Beth and the Board. He said the EIS is important to Ecology, and their goal is to arrive at an acceptable and satisfactory EIS because it is necessary for DOE and Hanford. Nolan said they take the Board's comments seriously.

Craig agreed that the agencies need the Board's help for rolling the EIS out to the public.

Discussion

Paige asked how long the public comment period will be and if there will be workshops. Mary Beth said they do not know for sure, but DOE is aware of the Board's advice. She thought the public comment period will be at least 60 days, perhaps longer. She said that decision will be made once they send the draft EIS to DOE-HQ. Paige said given the importance and length of the document, the public comment period should be more like 120 days. Charlie agreed.

Keith asked if the EIS addresses PUREX tunnels. Mary Beth said PUREX and canyons are included in the cumulative impacts.

Paige said the regulators should remember the big picture before considering permitting with the site-wide RCRA permit. She said the EIS should be complete before they look at permits. Paige said it makes sense for the public to provide comments on the EIS first.

Gerry agreed with Paige and reiterated that a RCRA permit should not be done before the EIS. Regarding public involvement, there should be a process including workshops before the public comment period begins. Gerry said there should be hearings around the region, including several in Oregon and one in Spokane, about the EIS to increase the diversity of Hanford's audience. He asked if DOE will send a public comment notice to everyone who attended previous Solid Waste EIS hearings and submitted comments on the Solid Waste EIS.

Mary Beth said hearing locations will be finalized when they get closer to producing a draft. She said they will cover at least the places where they had scoping meetings, but they have not discussed additional locations yet. Regarding the mailing list, DOE will include people who attended meetings or commented on the Tank Closure EIS, FFTF and anyone who went to the second sub-scoping meetings. Mary Beth said they looked at their listserv and asked if those people want to know about the TC&WM EIS and requested their mailing address. She said they are trying to include as many people from old mailing lists as they can. She thought the postcards will help update those lists. Mary Beth said DOE is committed to having a workshop to walk people through the document, show alternatives that will help DOE make decisions. She said there is a specific way to walk through the alternatives to reach a decision.

Gerry asked DOE to confirm that they have the list of people who attended the meetings and provided comments. Mary Beth said they have the list of people but do not always have an updated forwarding address.

Pam asked how DOE is looking at interim pretreatment systems. Mary Beth said they are still in the CD-1 stage and the information is fairly new in the design portion. She said they are still seeing how the design matures. Pam said it seems like even if the design is not mature, it should still be included in the EIS.

Dirk asked if DOE will work with HAB issue managers before the release of the draft EIS. Mary Beth said yes. Dirk asked about PUREX tunnels; Mary Beth said DOE is not planning to make a decision on the PUREX tunnels right now, which is why they are included in the cumulative impact part of the EIS. She said their focus will be on analyzing the inventory, the impact to groundwater and the surrounding area.

Dirk said the modeling work will be complex and involved and will need technical review – will it be available before the release of the draft? Mary Beth said they have had 14 workshops on groundwater models and the final report from the technical working group is on the website. Mary Beth said there was a number of workshops and Board members will see it next in the draft EIS. There will be an appendix on vadoze zone modeling, groundwater modeling and transport code. She said they will summarize it in the workshops; people will hear the issues and what DOE have considered, but probably not in detail. Dirk

asked if the modeling code will be available for those who wish to see it. Mary Beth said there may be a licensing issue.

Dick asked if the Readers Guide will be available on CD. Mary Beth said yes.

Dirk asked about the interim pretreatment system and the development of an expense device rather than a full scale project. Erik said he knew Ben Harp, DOE-ORP, has talked with the committees. Erik said he can find out more about how the interim pretreatment system will be developed.

Betty asked in the Readers Guide, can DOE include a timeframe for when decisions will be made based on the different elements of the EIS and can it identify what permits will be required? Mary Beth said they identify the types of permits that are required, but not to the level of detail like when they go through each aspect in closure. Mary Beth said they have to get through the ROD first; DOE would like to reach decisions in the EIS fairly quickly through RODs after the EIS is finalized.

Nolan said from the EIS, they get a better site-wide model that they use to inform permitting decisions. Nolan said Ecology is not bound by the ROD as far as recommended decisions; he said they use the EIS as screening criteria, but it does not make decisions for Ecology.

Doug Mercer thought they should recognize the clear evidence that the public involvement model for Hanford is broken. He said DOE and the regulators should be more imaginative and fund public involvement.

Doug asked what the relationship is between the EIS and the baseline. Mary Beth said in the EIS, they purposefully structure alternatives so they do not match the baseline because they try to figure out what things drive the program. Mary Beth said WTP, for example, they analyze what happens if replacement facilities are needed and what is the infrastructure mode that drives the cost. She said they shape the alternative to show that impact, and try to not to have it look like the baseline otherwise they just analyze where they already are.

Doug thought it sounds clunky to draft two alternatives motivated by the assumption that one of the baseline assumptions might be wrong.

Art said the Benton-Franklin Council of Governments has a section newsletter that it sends out weekly for reviewing documents. He offered to advertise the draft EIS in the newsletter and can help distribute CDs or hard copies if DOE wants help.

Rob said DOE is putting forth a great effort. He said the EIS should consider new technologies that will be developed; technologies will change and the EIS should consider how changes will be authorized, vetted and approved. He thought that change process should be included in the final EIS.

Emmett said the EIS should precede the site-wide RCRA permit. At a minimum, Emmett said a list of permits is required in the EIS. He said usually DOE has a regulatory requirements section. Emmett agreed that a 120 day public comment period will be needed, especially with the number of public hearings required.

Paige said they should use more money and better methods for public involvement for the EIS. She said it is imperative that the agencies plan the workshops with the Board, and make clear to the public the purpose of the workshops and how the agencies will use their comments. She thought this EIS is a prime example of how the agencies use public comments, since it is being done in response to negative comments about the Solid Waste EIS. Paige offered to help get addresses for people who were involved with the SW EIS.

Susan Leckband asked the Board to consider what they heard about the EIS. She thought it was ripe for HAB advice and the committees should work together.

Committee Reports

RAP

Maynard said RAP met on August 12. RAP has been dealing with the PW 1/3/6 proposed plan. He said DOE's original plan proposed capping the area, a proposal that was not acceptable to the Board or the TPA. The Board issued advice on the issue. Maynard said RAP recently had a PW 1/3/6 workshop where the agencies provided a lot of information and it went well. Maynard said DOE will have a new draft proposed plan in February or March. He thought the issue shows the success of Board advice.

Maynard said RAP is spending time reviewing technology development, and have discussed with Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, the implementation of some of the studies and strategies being considered for groundwater remediation. He said it is an interesting discussion and they can see the results from the money EM-20 is providing. Maynard said Mike is comfortable that DOE will get more funding, specifically to deal with strontium-90 in the 100 N Area and the uranium plume in the 300 Area.

RAP is also talking more about its work plan. Maynard urged Board and committee members to get active and participate as issue managers or helping issue managers. He said they are finding that a small number of committee members do the majority of the work.

RAP will meet on September 10 and have a committee call on September 16. They will get an update on D, H and K reactors, discuss the work plan, learn about the River Corridor risk assessment, review the roadmap and the potential for the Hanford Technology Sharing Forum.

Dirk said the RAP meeting will conflict with the Columbia Generating Station Emergency Exercise. He thanked the agencies for improving their websites, and personally thanked Steve Weigman, Lori Gamache and many more for their work. He said there are many changes coming, and thanks to those who came before.

TWC

Larry Lockrem is the new TWC chair. He thanked Ken Gasper for serving well as committee chair for the past year. At the August 12 meeting, Larry said the committee discussed the SX-104 leak assessment, C-109 tank retrieval, and the single-shell tank integrity program. Larry said DOE brought a CD for managing tank data; they integrate all the geologic and analytical data and pull it up on the CD rather than having to review hundreds of pages of information. Larry thought it could be beneficial to the Board and other committees.

TWC had a committee call on August 21. Upcoming topics include: NRC final report on WTP regulatory process; quarterly update on the EIS schedule; single-shell integrity expert panel; different technologies such as fractional crystallization and spin technologies; funding perspectives. Larry said DOE agreed to provide an update on supplemental technologies.

TWC will have a committee call on September 15 and will meet in October.

HSEP

Keith said HSEP will discuss tank vapors and hear how the new contractor plans to minimize exposures. Keith said he was disappointed to hear that there were exposures earlier this summer. The committee also wants to hear an update on the beryllium program and how it is being administered.

HSEP will have a committee call on September 15 and will meet in October.

BCC

Gerry said BCC will be working on the baseline workshop. After the workshop, the committee will review the new contracts, including their scope and contractor incentives. He thanked committee members for being flexible with the August meeting schedule. Gerry said there will be a lot of flux with the FY 2009 appropriation and the start of the fiscal year; the committee will schedule a briefing once more is known. Gerry suspected there will be a lot of work, and hoped things will happen in a timeframe in which the committee can weigh in on allocations.

BCC will have a committee call on September 16 and will not meet in October.

PIC

Steve said PIC met on September 3, and he thought the discussion today about the strategic planning workshop shows how the committee's obligations and responsibilities have grown dramatically. He said PIC wants Board member input on the Community Relations Plan. Steve offered to synthesize and prepare a comment summary for the workshop. PIC would also like input on the Public Relations Plan and hear from other committee chairs about cross-committee work.

Steve said PIC would like to consider moving its meeting to the evening before the Board meeting. He said PIC is also looking at reinstating the Thursday Night Tutorials and would like input on the topics Board members would like to see discussed.

PIC is also discussing the State of the Site meetings. There was concern about the structure and success of those meetings. State of the Site meetings will consist of an open house from 6:30 to 7:00 p.m. followed by a public meeting from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.

DRAFT State of the Site meeting schedule

Date	City	Location
Thursday, October 2	Kennewick	Red Lion Hotel 1101 N. Columbia Center Blvd.
Tuesday, October 7	Seattle	N. Seattle Community College 9600 College Way N.
Tuesday, October 21	Hood River	Best Western Hood River Inn 1108 E. Marina Way
Wednesday, October 22	Portland	Lloyd Center Doubletree 1000 NE Multnomah Street

Steve said the Board always has a display at the State of the Site meetings but has not been good about staffing it. He would like a commitment prior to the meetings that someone will staff the display. Steve has also asked PIC to supply "observers" at the meetings to note people's concerns, questions, answers and even logistics and quality of the meeting location. He thought PIC should provide the Board with a summary of the meetings. Steve said PIC did not intend it as criticism, but rather an observation. Steve said committee thinks State of the Site meetings should provide 1) information about cleanup challenges, 2) information about the changes and the rationale behind the changes to the TPA, and 3) a report on how the agencies used public comment in 2007.

PIC will have a committee call on September 18.

National liaison

Susan Leckband said Shelley is at a national radiological waste conference. Susan, Shelley and Rick will attend the SSAB meeting in two weeks in Washington DC.

EIC

Susan Leckband said Dave Brockman would like the Board to take more tours of the site. She said they could take specific tours, such as to 618-7, instead of full-day site tours if that works better for the Board. Susan asked the committees to consider tours when they plan meetings and agendas.

Keith said HSEP toured 618-7 before, and it was an enlightening tour. He said it demonstrated the use of technology and special equipment for handling. He said they take great care to avoid hazardous exposures.

Susan said the EIC call should be rescheduled and proposed having it on September 23.

Public Comment

No public comment was given.

Board Business

Chair nominations and selection

Susan Hayman only received one nomination for Susan Leckband to serve as chair of the Board in 2009. She said the HAB Process Manual indicates there can be a nominating committee to vet potential candidates, but there is no specific requirement. Given that there are no other nominations, Susan asked if the Board needs a nominating committee.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), proposed closing nominations and selecting a chair today. Norma Jean agreed. There were no objections and Susan Leckband was affirmed as HAB chair for 2009.

New procedures for adopting Board meeting summaries

Susan Leckband proposed changing the Process Manual to reflect the 45-day certification process of Board meeting summaries as required by the OGR. She thought reviewing and adopting the summary via email will make the summaries more timely.

Gerry thought committee summaries should also be reviewed and adopted via email.

Susan noted that she pushes DOE to post summaries to the website more quickly.

Rob asked how the Board would achieve consensus by email – do all the members have to say they approve it? Susan Hayman said EnviroIssues will send out a draft summary, ask for comments by a particular deadline, incorporate comments and then post it by a certain date. If there is no disagreement, consensus will be assumed. If there is an issue that cannot be resolved by email, Susan said they would provisionally certify it and bring it back to the full Board.

Susan Leckband noted that Board summaries are not verbatim. The adoption process can be reviewed at future Board meetings.

Keith agreed that summaries could be adopted via email. He suggested asking for a read receipt.

Maynard suggesting that EnviroIssues put a deadline for comments in the email subject line.

Susan Hayman asked if it would raise confidence if EnviroIssues clearly states a comment deadline, and asked people to verify that they received the summary. The Board agreed.

Susan Hayman clarified that the 45-day certification applies only to Board summaries, not committee summaries. She said EnviroIssues is happy to take suggestions for committee summaries, though, but will continue to turn committee summaries around in two weeks.

Larry noted that there are electronic ways to track consensus; Susan Leckband said they could look into it. Dirk supported the idea and said emails can sometimes go awry.

2009 Board meeting locations

Board 2009 meeting dates are currently scheduled for:

- February 5-6
- April 9-10
- June 4-5
- September 10-11
- November 5-6

Susan Leckband said Board meeting dates will be finalized at the November Board meeting, but the Board needs to decide on locations. At the June Board meeting, there was a proposal to have them all in the Tri-Cities in 2009 because it is cheaper.

Doug Mercer asked what would be done with the money saved. Susan said it would stay in the Board's budget and be used for things like other meetings, more travel, or workshops. Doug said he did not think it was a big deal, but thought having meetings in other locations is a good way to establish the Board's presence. Doug said he was interested in having a Board meeting at another DOE site. Susan said the SSAB meetings are held at different sites.

Dick did not see an advantage to having meetings in places other than the Tri-Cities – it is more expensive and there is poor public attendance.

Dirk said the point of meeting in other locations is because locations other than just the Tri-Cities are affected by Hanford. He thought his office would object to such a restriction. Liz agreed with Dirk and said Hanford cleanup is a regional issue and it makes a difference giving people access to the Board in Portland and Seattle.

Helen said Thursday Night Tutorials will help public attendance and involvement in other locations. She thought the Board should think about where exactly they have meetings in each region and their accessibility.

Maynard said there will be more Committee of the Whole meetings that will cost money, and a lot of overlap between committees. He also said taking more tours like Dave Brockman suggested will cost more money. He did not think the public participated very often at Board meetings.

Rob and Keith said it is about perception – it is important that the Board is perceived as a regional board.

Jim said it would be more cost effective to have all the meetings in the Tri-Cities; he supported having them in the Tri-Cities if it saves money that the Board can use for other things.

Paige said she did not care about perception and it is important to save the Board's budget. She proposed having meetings in Seattle, Pendleton, Portland, or Hood River only if they are connected to a worthwhile outreach effort such as a Thursday Night Tutorial focused on a particular large and timely issue (e.g. TC&WM EIS). She said most people cannot attend Board meetings because they work during the day.

Norma Jean thought it is important to have regional meetings in Seattle and Portland.

Ken Gasper said the Board faces major budget issues on which Rick is working. He said it is gratifying that EnviroIssues has enough funding right now to complete its support through this fiscal year, something that has not been the case in past years. He said budget issues are the key drivers for proposing all meetings be in the Tri-Cities.

Doug said he would like to see how much money the Board would save by only meeting in the Tri-Cities. He suggested PIC identify what the Board achieves by meeting in different regions.

Harold said regardless of where the Board meets, it needs to get better public turnout.

Susan Leckband said she liked the energy for the Thursday Night Tutorials and making public involvement valuable at Board meetings. She said it sounds like the Board would like to meet regionally; it will see and approve the 2009 meeting schedule at the November Board meeting.

Board meeting packets

Paige asked how cost-effective it has been to electronically distribute HAB packets rather than mail them. Susan Hayman said the Board has used electronic packets for the past couple meetings, and she has heard they could improve in format. She said EnviroIssues will survey the Board to see what could work best.

She said it is costly to print and mail packets, but wants to make sure the electronic method is as good as possible.

November Board meeting topics

Potential November Board meeting topics include:

- New contracts and more detailed briefings; introduction to the MSC contractor
- Site tour schedule and areas of interest
- Update on the safety program
- TPA negotiations
- Institutional controls
- Single-shell tank integrity
- PIC advice on public comment opportunities for the TC&WM EIS and site-wide RCRA permit
- Science and technology, potential RAP advice on Hanford Technology Forum
- Primer on plutonium toxicity

Committee call schedule

- September 15: HSEP (1:30 p.m.), TWC (3:00 p.m.)
- September 16: RAP (9:00 a.m.), BCC (10:30 a.m.)
- September 18: PIC call (11:30 a.m.)
- September 23: EIC (2:00 p.m.)

Committee meeting schedule

- September 10: RAP (all day)

Nolan noted an Ecology focus sheet on the back table that describes enforcement at Hanford.

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Gabriel Bohnee, Member	Bob Parks, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate
Tom Carpenter, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Member	Liz Mattson, Alternate
Rob Davis, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	David Molnaa, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Emmett Moore, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Laura Mueller, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate
Becky Holland, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Rick Jansons, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Dick Smith, Alternate
Julie Jones, Member		Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member	Karen Bowman, Alternate	Art Tackett, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	Charlie Weems, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Dirk Dunning, Alternate	Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Ken Gasper, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate	
Doug Mercer, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-Officio
Bob Parazin, Member	Wayne Lei, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL	Sharon Braswell, Ecology	Bill Johnson, WRPS
Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	John Lehew, PRC
Doug Shoop, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	
	Polly Zehm, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP		Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Delmar Noyes, DOE-ORP	Craig Cameron, EPA	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP		
Stephen Weil, DOE		Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Beverly Penny, CTUIR		
Ann Parazin		
Vasha Cornellier, Heart of America Northwest		