

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

February 1-2, 2007

Richland, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary 1
Welcome and Introductions 3
Approval of November Meeting Summary 3
Chair Transition 3
Draft Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for New Hanford Contracts 4
Board Self-Evaluation..... 6
Proposed Changes to the Board Charter 6
Issue Manager Update on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental
Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) 10
Agency Updates 11
Committee Reports 14
National Liaison Report..... 15
Public Comment..... 15
Board Business..... 15
Attendees..... 17

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 Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or the Board) adopted one piece of advice at this meeting regarding requests for proposal to be issued by the Department of Energy (DOE). The Board also agreed to a set of proposed changes to the Charter and Operating Ground Rules of the Hanford Advisory Board.

Chair Transition

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interests) finished his third term as Chair and welcomed Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force) as the new Board Chair. Nominations were opened for the Vice-Chair position.

Board Self-Evaluation

The Board reviewed its work in 2006 and completed a self-evaluation.

Board Business

The Board discussed topics for the April Board meeting and confirmed committee conference calls and meeting schedules.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

February 1 - 2, 2007

Richland, WA

Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interests), 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. Four seats were not represented: City of West Richland (Local Government), University of Washington (University), Public at Large, and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Ex-Officio).

Welcome and Introductions

Nominations for Vice-Chair were opened and selection will take place at the April Board meeting. Board rules are that Board members cannot hold more than one leadership position. For example, a committee chair cannot also hold the Board Vice-Chair position.

The Board meeting was audio recorded.

Approval of November Meeting Summary

Changes were submitted for the November Board Meeting Summary. The Board approved the summary.

Chair Transition

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), incoming Chair, thanked Todd for his dedication as Board Chair, and expressed how glad she is he is remaining a Board member. The Board gave Todd a standing ovation. Susan thanked the Board for the privilege of serving as the new Chair.

Mike Weis, Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), thanked Todd for serving as the Board Chair, and praised him for his ability to appreciate and retain enthusiasm for everyone's perspective, and his ability to keep his passion for Hanford in check for the sake of the Board. DOE-RL and the DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) appreciated his skill and leadership in developing advice. Mike said DOE looks forward to continue working collaboratively with the Board and with Susan.

Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP, thanked Todd for a job well done. He said he enjoyed working with Todd and thanked Todd for his enthusiasm and his desire to work with the community and produce quality advice. He welcomed Susan and said he looks forward to continue a good working relationship with the Board.

Nolan Curtis, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), read a letter from the Washington State Governor, Christine Gregoire, who thanked Todd for his leadership and commended him for his ongoing commitment to excellence. Nolan thanked Todd for his hard work and dedication.

Nick Ceto, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said he personally struggled with how to bridge the gap between liberal western Washington, a region opposed to nuclear energy, and conservative eastern Washington, a region passionate about nuclear energy. Nick considered Todd a "pragmatic hippie" and appreciated his ability to endear himself to people of all perspectives and opinions. He admired Todd's ability to set aside his own personal agenda to empower the group.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), acknowledged the Board is losing a great chair, but is confident Susan will do an excellent job. Ken joked how Susan bakes when she is stressed, and he looks forward to many treats as a result. Ken explained how everyone admired Todd's ability to remain level-headed despite unexpected issues and turmoil – a skill Ken joked resulted from Todd's ability to relieve stress by throttling a plastic chicken before every meeting.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Environmental/Citizen), thanked Todd for his ability to show regard and respect for each person on the Board.

Board members were invited to a party honoring Todd Thursday night after the meeting.

Draft Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for New Hanford Contracts

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, introduced the RFP advice, explaining the Budget and Contracts Committee's thoughts during its development. Keith highlighted a few points in the advice, including making safety a top priority in the RFPs and the need to identify DOE's intent for the Volpentest HAMMER Training and Education Center (HAMMER). Keith noted that HAMMER is pivotal for safety onsite, especially as contractors come and go, and could help standardize safety across the site.

Keith explained the advice recommended the RFPs should:

- Better define "market based" and DOE's plans to use it as a standard to measure contractual items such as pensions and benefits.
- Better explain DOE's intent regarding construction of new facilities and their management.
- Be clear that budget estimates must be consistent with what is necessary to meet the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA).
- Ensure that DOE's end-state responsibility is not delegated to contractors.
- Be clear that risk assessments are intended to help determine cleanup decisions, not to support or justify a cleanup decision.
- Better clarify interfaces and work integration among cleanup programs and contracts.

Board Discussion

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), requested the advice say that RFPs will make it clear DOE will incentivize meeting TPA milestones. Pam said DOE should not provide incentives to contractors for lobbying to change regulation and end-state requirements.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), thought incentives for successful contractors are essentially incentives for better technology; he wanted to see the RFPs include encouragement for contractors to invest their own money in technology development. He thought monetary incentives make a contractor more willing to invest in better melters, for example, because they would receive a return on their investment.

Mike Keizer, Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), thought incentives may inhibit a sound safety culture. He thought safety should be required rather than based on incentives or penalties. Gerry was also concerned about worker health and safety in the RFPs and thought bidders should submit a worker health and safety plan for evaluation prior to awarding a contract.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), noted that the committee decided to advise based on general principles. Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), agreed that an overly prescriptive RFP could limit the amount of new ideas and creativity put forward in bids. He thought specific directives would be more helpful during contract formulation than in the RFPs and the committee will look at further advice down the road.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), asked if the RFP advice would be valuable to DOE and if there was enough time to incorporate it before final RFPs are issued. Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, said DOE is receiving comments from many sources and it was not too late to use the Board's advice.

Rob asked why the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) was not specifically addressed in the advice. Keith said the RFPs adequately addressed ISMS and further advice was unnecessary.

Rob asked if the referenced past advice was supported by DOE. Keith said not in every case and often DOE simply did not respond. Maynard said past pension advice had been at least partially used by DOE, and the committee wanted to reference past advice to make sure DOE knew it had been advised before.

Rob asked why there will be no Environmental Management (EM) infrastructure support funding for HAMMER after five years. Does DOE think HAMMER is unimportant? Maynard thought DOE was trying to get HAMMER to achieve self-sufficiency in five years, but the committee thought funding should be available as long as it is needed.

Gerry had a number of comments. He wanted the Board to be aware of the compromises in detail in the advice. He said opinions among committee members varied from mild concerns to thinking the RFP was poor and failed to detail the scope. Gerry thought it was problematic for the RFPs to strive to minimize the amount of vitrified waste containers, which drives the work of sending "hypothetical canisters to a hypothetical repository in Yucca Mountain." Gerry said a contract has the potential to identify tank waste as transuranic waste (TRU), but the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) may indicate otherwise. Gerry also thought a contractor should not determine need, design, and construction of a facility.

David Molnaa, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), thought the RFPs should require contractors to use HAMMER to provide quality health and safety training. David questioned why DOE spent millions of dollars building and maintaining HAMMER but does not require contractors to use it. David said Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) does not use HAMMER. He said programs have been developed consistent with work schedules, and all employees on site should be required to use HAMMER as the first priority training facility.

David noted his appreciation of the two-tier medical and pension systems advice (Advice #194) issued by the Board at its last meeting. He said HAMTC is pursuing the cessation of directives eliminating pensions. David also was highly concerned about workers compensation. He said the RFPs eliminated workers compensation for non-bargaining employees for the first six months of disability, and DOE is trying to do the same to bargaining employees. David said people work in extremely hazardous conditions and need to be treated accordingly. Susan suggested David work with the Budgets and Contracts Committee to create a future piece of advice.

Becky Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council, wanted stronger advice requiring contractors to use HAMMER instead of simply being "expected" to use HAMMER. She said HAMMER is a proven, world-class training facility with international recognition.

Rob thought contractors should not be required to use HAMMER because there are many safety training methods, and travel to HAMMER can lead to lost work time and cost contractors a significant amount of money. Keith said HAMMER is not able to facilitate all types of training – there is a lot of site-specific training. He also thought it would be much more expensive for a contractor to attempt to emulate HAMMER training.

Tim Jarvis, Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), said in his experience, contractor-based training is eventually interrupted by operations and is the first elimination during budget cuts.

Ken Niles did not think advice suggesting DOE "require" contractors to use HAMMER is overly prescriptive; it just means contractors will have to use HAMMER at least once.

Mike reiterated that varied safety training is problematic and using HAMMER ensures site-wide standardized training.

The Board agreed that use of HAMMER should be required where appropriate.

Tim suggested that payments under the new contracts should be withheld until compliance can be independently reviewed and verified. He wanted to point out that DOE does not have the resources to appropriately review all compliance issues. Susan thought that was a very new idea outside the scope of this advice and could be addressed in further advice during contract development. Keith said there are rules about when independent evaluations are required, and federal acquisition regulations are clear about those types of requirements. Tim said would work with the Budgets and Contracts Committee.

Paige asked how contractors demonstrate that they embrace a strong safety culture. Maynard said it often is demonstrated during the interview process – presentation, sincerity, statistics, and data all help demonstrate if a strong safety culture is ingrained in the company. Susan added that companies can obtain Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) status, which is a very rigorous certification requiring extensive safety program documentation and statistics. Mike thought workers are the best gauge of a safety culture.

Laura Mueller, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, commented that employees have to learn the same safety “language” when they come together, like when WCH was created with many former Fluor and Bechtel Hanford, Inc. employees. She thought it was a good example of why the entire Hanford workforce needs the same standardized, comprehensive health and safety training.

Nick Ceto, EPA, said EPA had suggested DOE consider requiring an independent, third party to ensure work is happening as it should. Charles Spencer, WCH President, agreed with a third party review, and said WCH utilizes such reviews in their self assessments, in addition to parent company assessments.

Tim said all health and safety programs should be transparent and reviewed by independent parties. He also said the health and safety culture can change overnight with a serious commitment by management.

Rob asked if the advice could be sent to contractors. Susan thought that was a good suggestion, but the Board only advises agencies. She thought contractors would receive the advice through other channels.

The advice was adopted.

Board Self-Evaluation

Susan explained that the annual Board Self-Evaluation is a tool to engage new members, show the agencies how the Board thinks it is doing, and show members where they can become involved in the coming year. She encouraged Board members to personalize the questions and really think about how they could improve. The 2006 draft Annual Report was distributed to Board members

Board members were asked to review information and discuss the Board’s work at three stations: Station One focused on committee information; Station Two provided Board meeting and advice information; and Station Three provided information on EnviroIssues administrative support and agency support. Agency staff were also invited to participate.

Proposed Changes to the Board Charter

Todd presented a brief history of the Board’s charter.

Todd thought the Board carried a lot of “baggage” from the charter development process, and noted that many people currently on the Board did not have a sense of how the charter was developed over the years. Prior to 1992, the agencies and stakeholders were not effectively cooperating, so the Future Site Uses

Working Group was established. This group worked to develop a picture of what Hanford should look like when cleanup is finished. Subsequently, the Tank Waste Task Force was established and produced the Tank Waste Task Force Report in 1993. During that time, a national dialogue on advisory boards was underway at the Keystone Center in Colorado. A 1993 convening report provided recommendations on what the Hanford Advisory Board should look like, and the Board was created with its own charter. The Board was not intended to duplicate the existing Washington Nuclear Waste Advisory Council; the State subsequently sunsetted the Council.

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB) charter was developed in late 1993 and the first HAB meeting convened in 1994. In a letter, John Wagoner, DOE-RL Manager at the time, called the HAB his “new informal board of directors” and said he expected “high quality advice on strategy and policy.” Wagoner said the Board “had his word that he or the acting deputy director will be present when the Board advises and during deliberations...DOE will report back in writing...and DOE cannot and will not control the Board...DOE will not limit the scope of [the Board’s] work.”

The issue was that the Board already had its own charter, but also needed to be chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), a regulation prompted by the proliferation of federal advisory committees during the Clinton administration. The Board’s two-and-a-half page EM SSAB charter functions as the major legal agreement between the Board and DOE. The EM SSAB charter is renewed every two years and had remained essentially unchanged; there was no active pressure to ensure the HAB was compliant with everything in FACA.

In 2006, the EM SSAB charter was revised and issued with a memo stating it was the responsibility of DOE-RL and DOE-ORP to ensure the Board is compliant with FACA. The old EM SSAB charter said a typical term is two years and members usually serve three terms; the revised charter said a member may serve no more than three consecutive terms. The changes in the revised EM SSAB charter ran directly counter to the HAB charter. The charter revisions made the Board “belong” more to DOE and less to Ecology and EPA, which runs counter to the spirit of cooperation and equality with Ecology and EPA.

Todd said the EM SSAB charter was revised and renewed without consultation with any of the SSABs. In June 2006, Todd, Shelley Cimon, Public at Large, and Susan met with Jim Rispoli, DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, and described why the changes were unacceptable to the HAB. Mr. Rispoli responded that as long as the Board is FACA-compliant, DOE would find a way for the Board to operate as it always had. Todd said, in other words, DOE does not want the Board to quit advising Ecology and EPA, or enforce term limits. DOE just wants the HAB charter to be FACA-compliant. Todd agreed with that, and the Executive Issues committee analyzed FACA requirements.

Why does the Board have to be FACA compliant?

The Board advises a federal agency, and is therefore regulated under FACA.

What does FACA require?

It gives the Designated Deputy Federal Officer (DDFO) the authority to pick the issues the Board will work on. The DDFO can approve or disapprove of the Board’s agendas and has the power to adjourn Board meetings. Todd said FACA does not indicate if the Board can advise Ecology or EPA, and it does not address term limits. Todd said the DDFOs have never pushed to use those authorities on the Board.

A Committee of the Whole (COW) met in January to look at the proposed changes and tasked a smaller subcommittee to refine the changes for presentation to the Board. Todd said the COW looked at the charter changes with the assumption that the national EM SSAB charter will be amended to provide term limit and other necessary exemptions for the HAB. The draft prepared by the subcommittee does not represent any commitment from the Board leadership or the agencies, but is a first revision attempt. Todd suggested that the HAB charter strongly and clearly state that the Board advises Ecology and EPA and does not enforce term limits.

Todd said the COW discussed if the Board’s operation will change because of the charter changes. Todd said DOE has never tried to inappropriately influence the Board using the EM SSAB charter and he did not

think the Board should fear that these charter changes will change the Board and DOE's relationship. Todd said the agencies have been extremely cooperative.

Agency Perspective

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL, thanked Todd for the thorough history presentation. He said DOE has no intention to use the changes to affect Board operations, but the Board needs to show DOE-HQ that it is FACA-compliant.

Nick Ceto commented that even though the Board is technically DOE's board, EPA considers the Board its Board as well, and will continue to operate that way no matter what the charter says – they would strongly oppose any change to that relationship. He did not think the charter changes will affect the relationship and thought there has been good cooperation so far.

Nolan Curtis said Ecology is very supportive of the Board and understands its role and necessity to cleanup. He did not think the proposed changes fundamentally alter how the Board operates. He reiterated that the Board needs to be advisory to all three agencies.

Board Discussion

Susan noted that the draft charter changes made so far were focused on making the charter FACA-compliant. Additional modifications can be made later to better reflect current HAB operations.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), did not understand the relationship between the TPA and FACA, and asked if the TPA had anything to do with the Board's national EM SSAB charter. Jim was surprised that a charter, even national, did not mention the Board's relationship with all three agencies. Todd said the HAB's local charter includes all the TPA agencies as entities the Board advises.

Helen Wheatley, Heart of America Northwest, asked what things in the Board's charter are not FACA-compliant, and if the COW had looked at other charters for comparison. Todd said Jim Rispoli did not indicate specific items in the Board charter that were not compliant, but did provide some changes which were distributed to the Executive Issues Committee. The COW did its own compliance analysis and found that Sections 9 and 10 of FACA were the most relevant. He said the committee did look at other charters for comparison. Todd also noted the FACA charter actually requires very little and DOE would consider the HAB charter more of an operations document.

Gary Petersen, TRIDEC, asked if DOE wants to eliminate the HAB. Shirley Olinger said the Board is valuable and DOE does not plan to dismantle it. Dave Brockman also said there was no intention of that at all.

Pam asked what happened between the COW and the Board meeting. Todd said the conflict of interest language was changed to mirror what the Board really does, and to not separate classes of seats on the Board. He also said some of the "shalls" were changed to "shoulds," and language was changed to ensure agencies committed to responding to advice.

Pam said the John Wagoner letter Todd read from was compelling and she suggested forwarding it to Jim Rispoli.

Ken Niles said the COW was suspicious at first, but concluded that the charter changes were not an attempt to undermine the Board. Ken suggested Board members keep an open mind during the discussions.

The Board agreed that the HAB charter should clearly state that DOE agrees it is in the interest of the Federal government for the Board to provide advice to all the Tri-Party agencies, not just DOE.

Helen asked why the scope of issues section was expanded. Todd said DOE wanted the Board to be clear that DOE decides what issues the Board undertakes, which resulted in the loss of cooperative TPA language. Todd thought the charter should be clear that consultation and cooperation is integral to deciding what issues the Board undertakes, but that DOE is still the ultimate decider. He said it was a fine line requiring many revisions.

Susan added that the Board provides advice in a few ways: the agencies request advice; emerging issues lead to advice; and Board members or the public bring an issue forward. Susan said the agencies' draft work plan is a way of asking the Board for particular advice.

Pam thought the work plan helped keep the Board on task throughout the year.

Paige thought it was important to have the sense of cooperation codified; not all sites have that.

Helen objected to adding language that DOE, along with EPA and Ecology, consult with the constituency or interest group represented by the seat when a vacancy occurs on the Board. Todd said he appreciated Helen's concern, but clarified DOE is not part of the interview process – the consultation involvement was a compromise. However, Todd noted it was not necessary for FACA compliance.

Gerry said DOE does not get to decide who is on the Board; they can only accept or reject nominations put forth by Ecology and EPA. Gerry thought it was unacceptable to have DOE involved in the nominating process. He also thought the Board should not change the charter until DOE has modified the national charter.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, said his concern was alleviated by Ecology and EPA soliciting nominations, not DOE. For example, EPA and Ecology would consult with Heart of America Northwest, who would then select a person to represent their seat on the Board. Pam said DOE currently approves the nomination presented by EPA and Ecology, and thought it would be constructive for DOE to be involved in discussions with the regulators.

Paige asked how EPA and Ecology would respond if DOE rejected a nomination. Nick said he could not imagine that happening, but he would discuss the rejection and reasoning with DOE and his response would depend on the reason. Nolan agreed. Todd said DOE has never rejected or pushed back on a nomination.

Dave thought the Board could make a strong argument not to include DOE with EPA and Ecology in consultation with the constituency or interest group when a vacancy occurs on the Board. The Board removed the addition of DOE from the statement in the charter.

Rob Davis commented that facilitation is vital to the Board, and continuity of service is valuable. He asked if the Board has input in selecting facilitation contractors. Susan said it is typically a collaborative effort, but the facilitator is contracted through DOE. Shelley said a sub-committee worked on the scope of work for the facilitation RFP; it was an open process and she was satisfied with it. Helen suggested adding language to formalize the cooperative relationship in acquiring and maintaining facilitation.

Gerry emphasized that it is important to understand the Board's history. The HAB was created to be a broader advisory board to equally advise all three agencies. Gerry said the HAB was chartered and then had to be compliant with FACA. He thought it was inaccurate for the HAB charter to imply that the Board was chartered by DOE and DOE determined that the Board should advise the three agencies.

Gerry said the Public Participation Plan cannot be removed from the charter without asking if it is acceptable to the public; the Board should not remove something just because they have not been doing it. Todd said the Public Participation Plan did not need to be removed from the charter because it does not relate to FACA compliance. Nick thought it appeared that the TPA agencies would dictate to the Board how it does public participation, and the Board should consider removing that language. The Board decided to leave the Public Participation Plan in the charter and address changes to that section later.

Pam asked if other EM SSABs agree with DOE's national charter changes. Shelley said it probably will not be an issue with the other SSABs because they are so different. She did not think DOE will object to the changes the Board requested. Susan noted that the changes are not just requested by the Board; they were changes identified with consensus between DOE, the regulators and Board leadership. DOE recognizes that for the Board to continue operating as it has, the national charter needs to be changed.

Shirley noted that DOE will not get consensus from other SSABs, but will simply exempt the HAB from pertinent points of the national charter.

Susan again noted that all the proposed changes to the Board charter are contingent on and based on the understanding that DOE will modify the national SSAB charter to accommodate the Board charter.

Shirley said they need a product or sense of agreement to take to DOE-HQ; presenting from a unified position will be stronger and more effective.

Gerry agreed that the Board could provide a proposal to DOE easily enough, but noted that FACA does not actually require any of these changes because it says a state committee advising other agencies can also advise federal agencies like DOE. He said the Board was not initially viewed as needing to be FACA compliant and now DOE says it is.

Todd agreed, and said there is a difference between "demonstrably compliant" and just compliant, but the Board is trying to be cooperative.

The Board agreed the charter should be clear that the Board was chartered by all three agencies and was subsequently chartered by DOE under FACA. There was debate over whether the Board can direct DOE to do something; charter language saying DOE "shall" do something was removed.

The Board agreed on a charter proposal for the local DOE representatives to present to DOE-HQ. Final agreement on changes is contingent on changes to the SSAB national charter.

Issue Manager Update on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS)

Jerri Main, Public at large, provided an update on the TC&WM EIS. A Board working group including Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy; Ken Gasper, Benton County; and Larry Lockrem, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees, took a closer look at the EIS. She said Dirk had concerns about modeling and is working on a presentation on Hanford geologic behavior, soil chemistry, and the model development process. Jerri said Mary Beth Burandt, DOE-ORP, has been helpful and available for collaboration.

Ken Gasper said the working group has been mainly involved with groundwater modeling and has raised some questions about interconnection and integration with vadose zone studies – they hope groundwater will be viewed and analyzed from a big-picture perspective. The group is pleased to be invited to hear about the modeling work, and will be able to provide meaningful comments as they gain greater understanding.

Mary Beth said the public information outreach plan is available on the website showing public involvement activities between now and when the draft TC&WM EIS is published. She identified some upcoming public involvement activities. She said DOE is working with the HAB issues managers to identify potential topics for workshops that are currently undefined. She said they are also working with Board members through the development of the groundwater model.

Susan thanked Mary Beth for the opportunity for early involvement, and encouraged Board members to attend workshops. Susan said the TC&WM EIS will be huge and difficult to understand; she suggested the Board consider obtaining technical expertise and assistance.

Tim Jarvis said he submitted comments on the Notice of Intent last May and had not received a formal reply. Mary Beth said comments on the Notice of Intent and responses are identified in Chapter One of the EIS and will be available when the draft EIS is released.

Agency Updates

DOE-ORP

Shirley Olinger provided a DOE-ORP update. She said there was a lot of progress onsite even with budget and timeline issues. She encouraged the Board to take a tour to see the progress. Shirley said the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) is 37% complete and has been re-baselined at \$12.26 billion. The heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) ductwork and fire protection piping design at the Low-Activity Waste (LAW) Facility are complete and LAW is being enclosed with a permanent roof and siding. Most of the major equipment has been installed and fireproofing is near completion. The Analytical Laboratory structural steel is being erected. Shirley said 13 of 20 facilities in the WTP complex are under active construction; three are complete.

Shirley said the Pretreatment Facility has many technical issues and most of the 28 issues identified by the External Flowsheet Review Team (EFRT) apply to the Pretreatment Facility. All EFRT Issue Resolution plans have been approved by DOE. Shirley said they hope to resume active construction during this fiscal year. Seismic ground motion criteria modifications and recommended changes were completed and impacts appear minor. The High-Level Waste (HLW) Facility is still waiting on some technical issues to be resolved and hopefully construction will continue by the end of the year.

Shirley said they are actively pursuing retrieval of tank C-108 and hoping to finish S-112. They are going after as much waste as possible (99%) in S-112. She said continued plans for the Demonstration Bulk Vitrification System (bulk vit) were approved by DOE-HQ, and the External Review Report was issued in September 2006. Activities in 2007 include the 130-liter dryer test, full-scale dryer test, and the integrated dryer/38D melt.

Shirley said the tank farms safety record has improved and labor management and CH2MHill Hanford Group worked hard to resolve vapor issues. Overall, performance and safety has been fairly good.

Shirley said they hope to have a budget decision in mid-February, and are anticipating \$274 million for tank farms and \$690 million for WTP.

Board Discussion

Jim Trombold asked if the seismic study was conclusive; Shirley said it gives them confidence that the revised ground motion study will not need to be redone. Jim asked when construction will recommence; Shirley said they hope to start on the Pretreatment Facility and the HLW Facility at the end of the year.

Rob Davis asked if a more detailed seismic presentation was planned for the Board; Shirley said yes.

Ken Gasper asked for more detail on bulk vit. Shirley said DOE is pulling together information to answer parts of TPA milestone M-62-08 as Ecology requested, which they will be able to share with the Board. Shirley said DOE is still committed to bulk vit, and is ready to go as soon as funding is available.

Tim asked if DOE-ORP has arranged for an independent review of the seismic ground motion study. Shirley said it was reviewed by the Department of Defense and the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the report is posted on the DOE website.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), asked if there were modifications made after the independent reviews of the seismic ground motion study. Shirley said there were some modifications to the piping prior to installation, but not to the structure itself.

DOE-RL

Dave Brockman presented a DOE-RL update. DOE-RL is putting an emphasis on the integration of groundwater monitoring and vadose zone work. He noted a workshop on groundwater monitoring priorities in March, and DOE will also brief the River and Plateau Committee on groundwater activities. Dave said apatite injections are being utilized in the 100 N Area to hold strontium-90 in place to prevent migration to the river during the decay process.

Dave said while there is good progress with the removal of additional debris and final vacuuming in K East Basin, the transfer from K East to K West Basin has been difficult. K West vacuuming has progressed and the sludge treatment design is going well. Dave said Ecology and Doe are working on transuranic (TRU) waste retrieval and M-91 milestones; more than 300 shipments have been made to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Two gloveboxes were also removed and they expect to start plutonium shipments this year.

Dave said there have been issues with River Corridor work and safety. DOE has allocated more resources and is in constant dialogue with WCH. Dave noted WCH recently appointed a new president, Chuck Spencer.

Dave said the budget is under Continuing Resolution, probably for the remainder of the fiscal year. He did not think it will impact the DOE-RL 2007 budget. DOE will meet with the regulators and Board committees after the president's budget is rolled out on February 5th.

Dave noted that there has been industry input on the draft RFPs and any modifications to the final RFPs will be posted on the DOE E-Center Procurement website. Dave also mentioned upcoming public involvement opportunities on groundwater and vadose zone feasibility studies on February 7th and 8th, and workshops on the 100 and 300 Area in March. Dave said DOE-HQ and the National Park Service are studying how to keep the B Reactor Museum operational and analyze what other complexes on the site would make good museums. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is hosting public meetings on future recreational use of the Hanford Reach. There is a Global Nuclear Energy Partnership (GNEP) public meeting on March 13 at the Pasco Red Lion. Dave reminded the Board GNEP is being handled by the DOE Office of Nuclear Energy (NE), not EM.

Board Discussion

Ken Niles asked if Dave is confident that plutonium shipments will begin this year. Dave said that is what he was told.

Tim said there are a continuous and alarming number of complaints about WCH industrial hygiene, worker health and safety, and worker retaliation. He asked if investigations are underway. Dave acknowledged the concern and said DOE has increased oversight and initiated investigations. Joe Franco, DOE-RL, said there is no timeline for a report or product, but DOE is currently working with DOE project managers to provide oversight, and has onsite facility representatives. Joe said the regulators are working on reviews and he thought there would be a progress report available in the next couple of months.

Tim commented that there is no definite timeline to correct the problem. Dave said they are working on it and cannot guarantee the problem will be solved in a month or two. He said there are contractual methods available for correction. Chuck said they are looking very seriously at employee concerns, and have improved the Employee Concerns Program.

Pam asked if there were a mechanism in place for employees to share concerns without fear of retaliation; Dave said there was.

Rob asked if the agencies were becoming more proactive to ensure onsite safety. Shirley offered a briefing on employee concerns programs and others during a Health and Safety Committee meeting.

Chuck said WCH hosts a presentation for all employees to discuss open communication and full disclosure. He said an open work environment is essential to maintain safety.

Dave said DOE stays aware of all emerging safety issues through multiple systems of reporting.

Paige asked if there was a connection between worker health and safety problems and the under-utilization of HAMMER. Dave thought HAMMER is a good tool but not the key to a strong safety culture. He said many organizations work safely and do not have a HAMMER facility. Companies must establish a safe environment without employee retaliation.

Shirley said the leading indicator of a good safety culture is VPP status, the rigorous program requiring an externally reviewed safety program.

Ken Gasper asked if there was progress from last year's apatite injections. Dave said they are pleased with the results from the first two wells, and are moving forward with additional injections.

Rob asked if additional problems could arise from the byproducts and attenuation of strontium-90. Dave did not know but said he would look into it.

Ecology

Nolan Curtis provided an Ecology update. He noted that there is a comment period in spring 2007 on the required permit change to put the Integrated Disposal Facility (IDF) in standby mode. Ecology is reviewing the 100B export water analysis and will replace five old diesel engines with new ones. He said Ecology is reviewing bulk vit, but is running up against a deadline. They are asking DOE to analyze other melter configurations to ensure an alternative is available.

Nolan said the Model Technical Review Group (MTRG) will hold briefings on February 5th and 8th on model calibration at the Ecology building, and will follow up in March. He said the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) sub-grade structures engineering cost analysis will be available for public comment in March. The groundwater management plan, which will also come out in March, will include consolidation of groundwater and vadose zone modeling. Also, Ecology is asking for comments on apatite barriers.

EPA

Nick Ceto provided an EPA update. He said EPA has not signed the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) Record of Decision (ROD) amendment. There are problems at ERDF that make EPA uncomfortable, and EPA and DOE decided to halt all normal operations until concerns are resolved. Nick said some compaction data may be fraudulent – some leachate was allowed to collect in the liner deeper than allowable, and a lighter bulldozer than specified was used for compaction, which made it impossible to reach the specified compaction levels. Filling and compacting operations now must be under DOE or EPA supervision until new procedures are established. Nick said cleanup relies on ERDF, so the issues need to be quickly resolved. The ERDF closure is slowing some burial ground retrievals.

Nick said samples have been taken and a well installed to assess contamination in the 300 Area, and tritium levels found in the soil exceed the ROD cleanup levels. They need to decide how to reach the environmental objectives overall for that area.

Nick noted some wells in the Central Plateau have shown an increasing trend of technetium-99. EPA is discussing with Ecology and DOE how to pump and treat to recover that technetium-99 before it spreads further. He said EPA and Ecology feel strongly about restoring the Central Plateau groundwater to drinking water standards, and DOE-ORP is working to get the pump and treat system quickly installed.

Nick said the Board's advice on the proposed plan for BC cribs helped EPA convince DOE that more work was necessary prior to capping. More digging and investigations are needed to analyze how much contamination is in the trench and if it has spread. Nick noted a burial ground proposal is being prepared by DOE and they will discuss it with DOE and WCH, and will check in with the Board as appropriate.

Nick also noted that Elin Miller, EPA's new regional administrator, has met with Jim Rispoli and is already becoming engaged with the Hanford site. Nick hoped that she would visit the site soon, ideally in coordination with a Board meeting.

Board Discussion

Pam announced that the 2006 State of the Site meetings were filmed and a half hour television program is being developed. It is in final editing and agencies should contact her if they want to be involved.

Shelley suggested reviewing the ERDF compaction data problems and 300 Area tritium levels at a River and Plateau committee meeting.

Committee Reports

Tank Waste Committee (TWC)

Rob said TWC is continuing its discussion on bulk vit and will be receiving more information soon. They will present more double-shell tank structural integrity analyses at the committee meeting. Rob thought DOE, regulators, and stakeholders have been relatively open about tank structure integrity. He thought everyone is united to guarantee the tanks' structural integrity. TWC will have a RCRA and vadose zone discussion, and discuss the Idaho grout ROD. The committee looks forward to an update on the TC&WM EIS and WIPP operations.

River and Plateau Committee (RAP)

Pam said topics for the next RAP meeting include orphan waste site processes, 100 Area cleanup status, groundwater integration activities, groundwater values advice, 300 Area scope and strategy changes, ERDF issues, and tritium contamination.

Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP)

Keith said HSEP is developing workers compensation advice.

Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC)

Gerry said BCC will discuss contracting advice after the release of the final RFPs.

Gerry also discussed the public involvement approach for the budget meetings. Helen drafted a proposal suggesting a detailed budget workshop with the agencies and the public and regional public meetings to discuss the budget in terms of priorities. Gerry said the agencies agreed to the detailed budget workshop but suggested they go to individual organizations and constituencies to discuss the budget and priorities, rather than regional public meetings.

Karen affirmed that the agencies committed to a full-day detailed budget workshop, and will try to hold that in conjunction with a Board meeting. The agencies also committed to discussing the budget throughout the region, but are considering a different forum or venue for those meetings. Gerry said DOE only committed to going to small forums if an organization invites them, which is not the same as having open, public regional meetings.

Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC)

Ken Niles said PIC will also continue to work on the regional public budget meetings issue with DOE. He added that it appears there will be more detailed budget information this year, which will be helpful for the local workshop. Ken said the committee broadly discussed the effectiveness of public involvement, and why people who receive notice do not attend a meeting. The committee will continue the discussion and identify tools to obtain feedback. Ken said the committee also discussed making the website and calendar of events more user-friendly.

Jim thought the Board should consider outreach tools other than public meetings.

National Liaison Report

Shelley requested that a national liaison agenda item be added to future Board agendas. She said Mark Gilbertson, DOE EM-20, recently released two draft documents, a Technology Road Map and a Program Plan for the Engineering and Technology Program. These documents lay out strategies and goals for EM-20's three main areas of responsibility: decontamination and decommissioning coupled with facilities management; soil and groundwater; and waste management. The plan will be submitted to DOE-HQ for final approval in March. Shelley said SSABs need to have comments in by February 12; there is not time for Board consensus, but Shelley offered to compile comments from the Board as comments from the region. She encouraged Board members to take advantage of the opportunity. Shelley noted Mark will attend the March SSAB Chairs meeting to discuss the documents.

Shelley said there is a national disposition strategy for low-level and mixed low-level waste coming out soon. She thought EM-12 was developing a similar document for TRU waste, which will hopefully be released by the end of the year. Shelley also thought the Board should consider a programmatic strategy plan for pre-1970 TRU.

Public Comment

No public comment was offered.

Board Business

Susan Leckband thanked the contributors to Thursday's celebration and recognition of Todd's contributions as Chair. Sponsors included Fluor, CH2MHill, Washington Closure Group, Bechtel National, EnviroIssues, and Hedges Winery. Ken Niles thanked Susan, Shelley Cimon and Tammie Holm of EnviroIssues for organizing the party.

A conference call regarding the 2008 presidential budget request is scheduled for February 5 at 1:30.

Committee meeting and call dates were confirmed:

- February 12: HSEP call
- February 13: RAP meeting
- February 14: TWC meeting
- February 15: PIC call
- February 15: EIC call

April Board meeting topics may include:

- 2008 and 2009 budget advice
- Workers compensation advice (HSEP)
- Guest: Mary Lou Soscia, EPA Columbia River Toxics Reduction Strategy coordinator
- TWC updates in TC & WM EIS, tank integrity
- Risk assessment or groundwater product (RAP)

- Remote-handled and pre-1970 TRU, and budget impact on remote-handled TRU capabilities

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Gabe Bohnee, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Laura Mueller, Alternate
Rob Davis, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Vince Panesko, Alternate
Becky Holland, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Gary Petersen, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member		Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Barry Beyeler, Alternate	Dick Smith, Alternate
Susan Kreid, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	John Stanfill, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Kenneth Gasper, Alternate	Art Tackett, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate	Helen Wheatley, Alternate
Todd Martin, Member	Tim Jarvis, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Ken Niles, Member	Wayne Lei, Alternate	
Bob Parazin, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate	Earl Fordham, Ex-Officio
Bob Parks, Member	Gwen Luper, Alternate	Debra McBaugh, Ex-Officio
Maynard Plahuta, Member	Jerri Main, Alternate	
Gerald Pollet, Member	Robert McFarlane, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Karen Hall, CH2M Hill
Dave Brockman, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Joy Shoemake, CH2M Hill
Mike Weis, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Eric Olds, DOE-ORP	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Roy Schepens, DOE-ORP	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Lynn Lefkoff, EnviroIssues
	Jeff Lyon, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Nick Ceto, EPA	John Price, Ecology	Janice Parthree, PNNL/DOE Public Reading Room
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Ron Skinnerland, Ecology	Terri Traub, PNNL/DOE Public Reading Room
		Sharon Braswell, DOE- ORP/Innovations
		Barbara Wise, Fluor Hanford
		Lynette Bennett, WCH
		Chuck Spencer, WCH

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Beverly Penney, CTUIR	Ed (illegible)
Susan Brechbill		