

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**

*August 9, 2012
Richland, WA*

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Opening..... 1
Committee Business..... 4
Attachments 5
Attendees 5

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Opening*

Dale Engstrom, River and Plateau Committee (RAP) Vice-Chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee approved the July meeting summary.

Update on the 100 K Proposed Plan, Rev. 0

Dana Bryson, United States Department of Energy (DOE)-Richland Operations Office (RL), provided an update on the 100 K Proposed Plan, Rev. 0. He said the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has also been working on the Proposed Plan. Dana said DOE has agreed to propose cleanup levels based on a rural resident scenario, including irrigation. This decision has no impact on DOE’s anticipated future land use scenarios for the Hanford Site. DOE is in discussion with the regulators on the Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs). The PRG and irrigation discussions have impacted the schedule for Rev. 0 of the Proposed Plan. Public review will be delayed until the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) and Proposed Plan are revised. Dana said DOE still plans to complete Draft A of the RI/FS and Proposed Plans for the 100 Area (River Corridor) by the milestone date.

Committee Questions and Response

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q: Can DOE update RAP on the irrigation discussion?

R: [DOE] DOE now includes irrigation as part of the scenarios whereas irrigation was not originally considered as a basis for water. The EPA was pressing for an irrigation scenario. These are still evolving issues and the second phase will involve resolving the ecological PRGs.

Q: Are the orchard lands included?

R: [DOE] Orchard lands are considered separately.

C: Even with irrigation as a factor, there are still plumes that are not going to be treated. Tritium is an example.

R: [DOE] There will still be a tritium plume in the K Area. DOE has not addressed that and would like to. The agency is currently determining how to incorporate treatment for tritium and working out the logistics. The Proposed Plan is still evolving and is in preliminary discussions. DOE would like to move further along in the process before asking the Hanford Advisory Board (Board or HAB) for any advice. DOE is still planning to release the Draft A documents by a December deadline, which will be a challenge.

Q: Is the milestone for 100 K to have the Proposed Plan complete or to have it out for public comment?

R: [DOE] The milestone is for submittal of the Record of Decision (ROD).

Q: What are the documents expected this year for the River Corridor?

R: [DOE] The ROD for the 300 Area and 100 K will be released. DOE will be working on Rev. 1 for both of these areas. The remaining Draft A for the Proposed Plans for the River Corridor are planned to be completed by the end of the calendar year.

C: All these documents will be released around the same time, which will be a large workload for the Board.

R: [DOE] The 100 K and 300 Area documents will be released first and the other documents will follow before December 2012.

Q: If all the documents are submitted at the end of December, would there be a staggered public involvement process? The Board could issue advice requesting something to that affect.

R: [DOE] DOE has not made any decisions about the public involvement process yet. It is likely the documents will not all be issued at the same time.

Q: At one point there was a concept to combine all the RI/FSs into one package to avoid continually producing documents. Is that still being considered?

R: [DOE] DOE never intended to combine all the documents into one package. DOE held information workshops at multiple locations in June for the three areas of the River Corridor: 100 K, 300 Area and the remaining 100 Area, and this may have created some confusion that DOE was combining the documents. That is not the case.

DOE Response to Board Advice #257 - 300 Area RI/FS and Proposed Plan

Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL, provided copies of DOE's response to Board Advice #257 – 300 Area RI/FS and Proposed Plan (Attachment 2).

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C: It looks like DOE will be following a phased approach, which is what the Board recommended in the advice; that DOE should proceed with caution.

R: [Discussion] The Board suggested that DOE follow an interim ROD approach and DOE said "no." DOE will do a phased approach to the ROD, which they also indicated during previous RAP meetings. There will be a characterization and then a treatability test with the phosphate solution. Once the treatment is proven effective in a smaller area, DOE will expand the treatment to a bigger area. The Board was saying that approach is more suitable for an interim ROD and if the treatability test is proven effective the treatment can be written into a final ROD. DOE is not going to follow the Board's recommendation, and EPA is in agreement with them. There is a lot of confidence within DOE and EPA that DOE's proposed treatment will work, although not everyone believes it will be as effective as they hope. The Board believes if the treatability test does not work with phosphate, DOE should not simply resort to monitored natural attenuation (MNA). MNA has not worked in the past. There may be an opportunity to remove more of the technetium through a remove, treat, disposal (RTD) approach. However, DOE is not in favor of RTD in that area.

C: The Issue Managers (IMs) should read the response and then come back to RAP with recommendations for possible further Board action. The Board may have gone as far as they can with the advice. The Board can talk about the response at the September HAB meeting and request updates after the treatability test is complete.

C: The Board asked for the Risk Assessment documents to be finalized before the RODs are released. The RODs are being written based on documents that have not been approved. DOE did not agree. The Board does not have a chance to review those documents. It is important for the Board to get involved in the early treatability test documents.

C: There is also a comment on this response from EPA that should also be considered. It will be important to have the whole picture before presenting to the full Board.

Announcements

RAP is continuing to work on a letter responding to DOE's response to HAB Advice 242 - Historical Artifacts at the Hanford Site. In general, the letter states that the Board is generally pleased with the progress being made since the advice was issued, and feels the actions are consistent with the advice. The draft letter will be shared with the Board during the September Board meeting announcements, as it does not require Board approval to be submitted.

RAP is also drafting a letter related to 200-UP-1 and whether the Board agrees with the preferred alternative. Since the Board has not issued advice on 200-UP-1 previously, it will be important to bring the letter before the Board and see if there is concurrence about the preferred alternative. RAP agrees with the approach DOE is choosing and the decision to incorporate extra capacity for the waste. The letter has gone through several edits since the content was initially discussed during a previous RAP meeting. RAP will continue working on the letter through email. There are some concerns that the proposed cleanup approach does not deal with the chromium and nitrate plums. These concerns are not included in the letter. Any objections should be brought forward during the email review and consensus process.

Committee Business*

Review the 2013 Priorities/Work Plan

Dale and Pam worked with Susan H. to refine the fields for in the 2013 Hanford Advisory Board Priorities/Program of Work (Attachment 3) for those topics that pertain to RAP. The committee reviewed each of these priorities and filled in additional details where possible. Agency representatives also provided input on priorities. RAP identified potential Board actions, topics to track, and relevant documents/decisions related to the topics. RAP also discussed appropriate timeframes for when to discuss topics.

The committee will update their Fiscal Year 2012 Issues Table (Attachment 4) through email. The HAB Values White Paper (Attachment 5) will also be sent for review through email. The Values Paper will be a topic for the November Board meeting. The six month work plan will also need to be updated. Susan H. will send these documents to RAP for review.

RAP next reviewed potential October meetings topics. RAP requested agency input on the proposed topics in order to determine if there would be agency support before the agenda is developed. There are

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

several topics the Board would like to have J.D. Dowell, DOE-RL, discuss with the Board. His schedule will need to be considered.

RAP would also like PIC to take the lead on a discussion of an “event-based” schedule for the upcoming release of the final TC&WM EIS. It was agreed that PIC would propose this as a joint topic with RAP at the September 5 PIC Committee meeting.

RAP decided not to have a committee call in August.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Attachment 2: DOE Response to HAB Advice #257 – 300 Area RI/FS and Proposed Plan

Attachment 3: Hanford Advisory Board 2013 Program of Work

Attachment 4: River and Plateau Committee FY 2012 Issues Table

Attachment 5: Draft Hanford Advisory Board Values, April 11, 2012

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Dale Engstrom	Liz Mattson	Gene Van Liew
Pam Larsen	Vince Panesko	Jean Vanni
Susan Leckband	Maynard Plahuta	

Others

Dana Bryson, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Bruce Ford, CHPRC (phone)
Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL		Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
		Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
		Barb Wise, MSA
		Tom Rogers, W-DOH