

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**  
**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
**RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE**

*November 6, 2012*

*Richland, WA*

<b>Topics in this Meeting Summary</b>	
Opening.....	1
F-Reactor Area Operable Unit.....	1
Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Update.....	5
Committee Business (Part One).....	9
Draft TPA Change Package.....	9
Central Plateau M-15 Milestones.....	11
Committee Business (Part Two).....	13
Attachments.....	14
Attendees.....	14

*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**

Committee Chair, Pam Larsen, River and Plateau Committee (RAP), welcomed the committee and introductions were made. The committee approved the October meeting summary.

**F-Reactor Area Operable Unit**

*Agency Briefing*

John Neath, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) provided an update on the F-Reactor Area Operable Unit. John explained that F Area is the third of nine plutonium reactors that was placed in interim safe storage in 2004. John noted that 112 facilities were demolished, and 188 waste sites were remediated under the interim action Record of Decision (IAROD). Work to remove waste called for hazard controls. 150,000 tons of waste were removed from the sites. Work included draining a pipeline that contained sodium dichromate concentrate, which resulted in groundwater protection. The last site was cleaned up in April 2012. Backfill has yet to be completed. John provided photos that indicate re-vegetation that will occur. The effort also saved the largest maternity colony of bats in the U.S. that live in underground concrete clearwells at F-Area.

John noted that the next steps for the site may include remedial investigation. A remedial investigation and feasibility study (RI/FS) is being drafted (Draft A), which will address the risk remaining based on

cleanup to be done and will include a proposed plan and proposed alternative. Draft A is targeted for issuance in December 2012. This draft will be sent to the regulators for review and then go out for public review and comment. Eventually a final ROD will be issued. John explained that the next steps for TPA agencies depend on the findings in the final ROD. DOE will monitor re-vegetation and mitigation, and the cleanup remedies will be evaluated in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) five-year reviews.

### *Regulator Perspective*

Chris Guzzetti, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), noted that cleanup of all waste under the action is what occurs between the interim and final RODs. The interim ROD did not address groundwater, but the final ROD will. Brenda Jentzen (Ecology) followed up and noted that EPA will follow normal process with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). Ecology reviews RODs to determine if they have met state corrective action requirements. All actions will still be monitored against ROD remedial action requirements.

### *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.*

Q: Structurally, how long will the bat cave survive?

*R: [DOE] The cave has been found to be structurally sound. There are concrete pillars throughout, and the underground concrete is one foot all the way through.*

Q: Have all of the excavation sites been backfilled?

*R: [DOE] I do not have the current status of backfill. Once the site is excavated, the next step is to backfill and re-vegetate.*

C: There is concern about backfilling when you may need to go back and do more cleanup work.

*R: [DOE] DOE has a conservative approach with interim action. DOE cleans the soil on top of the groundwater, and it is not likely that will need to be further remediated.*

Q: The big problem in groundwater is chromium. How did DOE integrate the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) standards in cleanup?

*R: [DOE] CERCLA cleanup is mandated in the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). The CERCLA approach is the more restrictive of the two standards. DOE will address this based on the ROD's*

*standard of protectiveness. It also depends on which protective element is being discussed, whether it is groundwater or surface water.*

Q: There is a two-year clock for natural resource damages. When does the clock start? The public might not understand.

*R: DOE is working with the Hanford Natural Resource Council on this.*

Q: Does the fact that the farm was located in the area make cleanup any more challenging?

*R: [DOE] Some of the orchards overlap with waste sites. This is discussed in the RI/FS. Any of the waste sites that are co-located with orchards will be addressed as part of the waste sites in the final ROD. The animal farm is included in this RI/FS.*

Q: Can you review the dates for Draft A, and the RI/FS?

*R: [DOE] Draft A will be issued by the end of December 2012. There will be a standard 45-day review period for EPA. There is no set date yet for issuance of the proposed plan. The document will go out as Draft A for regulatory review and then for public review as Revision 0.*

Q: Can you provide clarification on review for lead and arsenic in the orchard sites?

*R: [DOE] DOE has remediated those contaminants that are co-located with waste sites.. However, the orchard lands will be addressed in a separate operable unit.*

Q: Is DOE cleaning up F-Area to “pristine” condition? Will there be radioactive contamination left over in this area?

*R: [DOE] DOE is cleaning up to meet applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARRAs) and risk-based cleanup levels. DOE will have residual contaminants that likely will reside above the background and will be protective of human health and environment.*

Q: What is the future of F-Area? What is the long-range vision?

*R: Some of F-Area will be part of the national monument. There is no intention of industrial development. The Federal Government cannot give up control (release) unless it has been cleaned up to unrestricted use. The rest remains in DOE control in perpetuity.*

Q: What systems are used to survey sites? What processes are you using to verify all sites are identified and documented?

*R: [DOE] These undocumented sites are known as orphan sites. DOE does record searches, radiological surveys, and conducts walk-downs of those areas to identify those waste sites that are orphan sites. DOE has a successful program to identify waste sites not identified in original scope.*

C: DOE is cleaning up to interim RI/FS standards, but these interim levels might not be as protective as the final levels will be

*R: [Ecology] If a waste site is filled in and later we find it does not meet the standard, and additional cleanup is needed based on final cleanup levels, then DOE will need to go back and clean it up. (EPA) If contamination poses a risk, DOE is required to dig it up. Cost does not weigh in. It is not certain that it is accurate to say final cleanup numbers would be stricter than interim numbers. Over time, the cleanup numbers that are adhered to may change. If cleanup numbers become more restrictive, the levels adhered to would be adjusted.*

Q: Throughout the process there is no opportunity for the public to weigh in on what the standards ought to be until Revision 0, and that does not happen until after the RI/FS is out for public review. Given this structure, how do we make sure things are cleaned up?

*R: [DOE] DOE has taken protective action. DOE's interim standards are based on conservative estimations.*

Q: Do the regulators have any suggestions for how to proceed so that the committee can weigh in during the process?

*R: [EPA] The RI/FS will frame the final cleanup that would be done in F-Area. It would be best to be proactive in reviewing it. The best way to be involved is to comment the draft RI/FS. Draft A (draft provided to the regulators) will be shared with the committee as well.*

*R: [Ecology] Brenda Jentzen noted that cleanup does not mean removing all waste. Final cleanup actions in the ROD identify the final remedies and what contamination is left in place. To fulfill the final cleanup levels identified in the ROD, the interim actions would still have to be evaluated. If they do not meet the standards, they still have to be evaluated against the standards. Frequently the standards change, and there can be a discrepancy against the RODs at the current stage in the process.*

C: I'm concerned that the public may be misled by the word "cleanup." A different word should be used. Some people are not as familiar with Hanford Site and think cleanup means no contaminants will be left in the ground when cleanup is complete. The agencies' justification in determining that there is no problem with the contaminants that remain after cleanup must be better communicated to the public.

Q: What is the background for the statement that the interim standard is often set at ten times the contaminant level of the potential final standard, and when DOE cleaned up the sites, was it trying to clean it up to the interim standard or to the final standard?

*R: [DOE] There are certain standards already known. The initial action was based on ten times the standards to get to the heart of the plume in groundwater. When the cleanup level was selected it was selected conservatively enough for future cleanup levels to be protective. Risk basis is the basis of background levels. Hexavalent chromium does not have a background level, but there are background levels for many of the sampled constituents.*

Draft A will be issued at the end of the December 2012 at which time it will go to the regulators for comment and response. The draft will go out for public comment as Revision 0 in spring 2013.

The committee requested a copy of Draft A from DOE for committee review.

### **Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Update**

#### *Agency briefing*

Dawn MacDonald, DOE-RL, and Mark Hasty, CH2MHILL Plateau Remediation Contract-CHPRC, provided a presentation on the progress of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) closure project.

#### *Regulator perspective*

Rick Bond, Ecology, noted that there are four milestones remaining for PFP. Work was supposed to be accelerated ahead of the TPA schedule for completion in 2013. Due to funding shortfalls, the current plan is to complete PFP transition according to the schedule in the TPA, with three milestones due before 2016 and the work being done by September 30, 2016 (M-83-00A). However, DOE recently announced that the September 30, 2015 milestone (M-83-44) is in jeopardy. There is concern because the work that was originally supposed to be accelerated for completion in 2013 is now in jeopardy and may not even be completed by the TPA due date of 2016. The number of crews working at PFP has been reduced from 17 to 12 in the past year and there is the potential of further funding cuts that could further reduce the number of crews on the job.

#### *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.*

Q: What does slab-on-grade mean?

*R: [DOE] If classified as low-level waste, a building can be decontaminated and demolished such that all that remains is the structure's concrete floor.*

Q: There is a lot of unexpected plutonium. In the furnace, for instance, there is twice the amount that was expected. I would like assurance that DOE is looking at criticality aspects to make sure that this does not happen again. How will you go about cleaning up a floor with plutonium on it?

*R: [DOE] The team is looking into ways to go about this.*

C: I am concerned about the funding to keep these crews intact moving forward.

*R: [DOE] The number of crews decreased from 17 to 12. DOE is trying to maintain 12 crews at this time.*

Q: On October 26, 2012, the Tri-City Herald reported that the glovebox removed was tallest, but also reported there were 55 more gloveboxes to come out. How long will that take?

*R: [DOE] This will take more than two years. The gloveboxes are of various shapes and sizes, and the best way to deal with them appropriately is still being determined. There is a glovebox in 242, where the criticality accident occurred. Workers will not be sent in to remove the gloveboxes unless they are safe.*

Q: How do you move the gloveboxes in PRF that back onto the central canyon and seal them simultaneously without spreading the contamination to the canyon?

*R: [DOE] Different alternatives are being looked into. This facility was not designed with demolition in mind.*

Q: How does DOE deal with the several layers of contamination beneath the surface of paint layers? Are there any lessons learned that can be included in building future facilities to make it easier to tear apart?

*R: [DOE] Absolutely. DOE has been collaborating with other agencies and is looking at getting lead shielding blocks to assist in the effort.*

Q: What kinds of residuals are you finding inside of the tanks?

*R: [DOE] Thus far no liquid residual hold up has been found in the pencil tanks. There is buildup "gunk." A high level of silicon was found, and the only way to dissolve it was high concentrations of acid.*

Q: Are you running across residuals that you are sending back to Savannah River?

*R: [DOE] If residuals containing plutonium are found, they can go to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Thus far no residuals with plutonium concentrations have been found to be too high for WIPP. No residuals are being sent back to Savannah River.*

Q: Why did DOE choose a slab-on-grade approach? The slab is highly contaminated. Have you considered using scaling?

*R: [DOE] DOE is looking into using nitroscision, which takes liquid nitrogen at high pressure, and can scale down to an inch in concrete. DOE is looking into using this across the project, not just for the PFP.*

*R: [Ecology] Slab-on-grade is not the final decision. The plan is to go to slab-on-grade and then look at the final disposition (2017-2018). The Final Remedial Action Work Plan (RAWP) for PFP will address many of these questions. It is due by June or July of 2013. It is uncertain if drafts of work plans have been shared in the past.*

C: The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) will want to comment on the RAWP. The committee should request to see a draft. Sampling is traditionally done three feet below slab. If plumes are discovered, sampling continues at greater depths. Also, there are tunnels beneath the PFP structures. There will still be contamination in the concrete tomb and at the bottom of the basement.

*R: [DOE] Traditionally the bottom has been defined as the bottom of basement, but that could change because they might decide they want to leave the contamination there.*

Q: What is the status of draining the chemical lines (nitric acid lines), and what are the next steps for this process?

*R: [DOE] DOE has assigned an experienced work team to deal with these lines. There is evidence that the lines are not drained. 25 Lines have been identified that still need to be drained. The teams are out conducting Ultra Sonic Testing (UT) inspections through the duct level. The teams are starting on lower levels and making sure the equipment is compatible with nitric acid. Over the past two months there have been several issues with two lines that had tags indicating the lines were drained, but they were not. DOE has assigned a dedicated team and will assume the lines contain fluid until it is proven that they have been drained.*

Q: How is the timeline of this process changing with budget changes?

*R: [DOE] The timeline of this process will be known after analysis is completed. Once the UT work is finished, DOE will know how much work is left and then be able to determine the work schedule moving forward.*

Q: Are you working on the mechanical glove line as well?

*R: Miscellaneous treatment gloveboxes will continue to be worked on. There are a total of 181 to be completed.*

Q: Have you found any problem in any of the buildings with neptunium? At one point the plant made four pits for neptunium.

*R: Mark Hasty, CHPRC, noted that he had not heard of any findings of neptunium. Mark will go back and ask that question. The number one goal is to protect the workers.*

Q: What happens if there is a problem with the ventilation system at Dash 5? You need to have a backup ventilation system, is this correct?

*R: [CHPRC] If the primary system goes down, the backup kicks in. If the primary system cannot restart and the backup will not start either, all operations within the facility are shut down. The facility cannot be operated without a ventilation system.*

Q: How much money should be put back into the ventilation system for a plant that is being shut down?

*R: [DOE] Management's philosophy is that as long as the equipment is in use, it will be maintained. This will be true until the project is at a point to back out of the Documented Safety Analysis (DSA). Backing out of the DSA is based on Material at Risk (MAR). Until the MAR is gone, the plan is to maintain the ventilation system.*

Q: Is it most cost effective to decontaminate gloveboxes or to cut them up at a higher level of contamination and then package them? How are those decisions made?

*R: That is determined on a job-by-job basis. If a glovebox has 1200 grams, it makes more sense to package it up than to decontaminate before processing, but this is not always the case.*

Q: Is this facility being operated at category 2 or category 3?

*R: Category 2.*

The committee decided to request another briefing on this topic in April. Vince Panesko is the issue manager. Barb Wise will work with HAB to determine when the RAWP draft will come out.

## **Committee Business (Part One)\***

### *Update the Issue Manager Table*

The committee updated the issue manager table to capture new framing questions, update issues, and include new issue managers for topics as appropriate.

### *Update the 3-month Work Plan*

The committee updated the 3-month Work Plan. The committee decided the topic on public understanding of cleanup levels would be best as a joint topic with the Public Involvement Committee (PIC). Issue managers will coordinate and develop framing questions for this topic.

The committee discussed that the TC&WM EIS webinar is still a possibility for December, as there is no Board meeting or committee meeting scheduled in December. Issue managers will develop questions for the webinar. The committee decided to discuss the following topics in January: Groundwater modeling consistency and methodology (transport from source down into groundwater) as a joint topic with the TWC; F-Area RI/FS Draft A; D & H Area RI/FS Draft A; Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) and the viability of concrete basins; and the Draft TPA change package. The committee determined that the February committee meeting would be timely to discuss the following topics: 2015 Vision, land transition from EM programs and contractors (between cleanup and long-term stewardship) and the 300 Area Proposed Plan.

Dirk Dunning proposed a new item that may become a crosscutting issue related to WESF (as noted in the work planning above). A high gamma dose was found in the facility wall concrete and it is uncertain if there is damage to the structural integrity. Evidence suggests concrete in the wing walls has crumbled and has no structural integrity. The gamma dose may reach high enough doses to also become an issue for the German glass logs. Dirk suggested a briefing on the viability of the concrete in the WESF basins relative to gamma dose would be useful for the January committee meeting.

### **Draft TPA Change Package**

Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues, noted that due to the agencies not having a signed TPA change package yet, there would be no formal presentation to the committee on this topic. A presentation from the briefing at the November HAB meeting was provided for reference, but there were no new updates since that time. The intent of holding this topic at this meeting is to address committee questions and hold informal discussion.

---

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

Hillary introduced Dave Einen (EPA) and Kim Welsch (Ecology), who came to the committee to answer questions.

### *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.*

Q: How do the agencies decide whether changes to the TPA are acceptable or if existing milestones should be legally enforced? What is the classification system of changes?

*R: [EPA] These changes are not of the type to be brought to a judge. There are procedures and classifications of changes within the agreement that describe who has the authority to make what changes. There are certain aspects of the cleanup (mostly for the tanks program) that relate to consent orders. Any changes on those milestones must go before the court. Milestones that are part of the TPA, for example Milestone 89, require signatory levels. Other changes, like most of these, are at the InterAgency Management Integration Team (IAMIT) level.*

Q: In prior years the committee has held budget discussions on topics including prioritization and TPA milestones. How do you prioritize which should be the focus?

*R: [EPA] EPA is not a party to court decisions. EPA's priority for funding is what EPA has milestones on. DOE is forced to prioritize funding to the TPA.*

Q: Is the "color of money"/"stovepiping" budget issue still true?

*R: [EPA] That is true for the continuing resolution. Money cannot be moved from one bin to another. Tank Farms are the easiest example. They have two bins of money, operations funding and capital funding. The Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP) is covered under capital funding, and tank farms are covered under operational funding. They are in separate stovepipes that cannot be mixed and matched. Those control points are different from Richland's.*

C: This committee might be interested in following up on the fallout from changing these milestones and how those changes affect the RCRA permit. The RCRA permit uses a lot of dates. The Yakama Nation's preference is that Ecology put these dates in the permit rather than reference the requirement to do something. Would like DOE to take a stronger position on requiring the adequate budget to meet its TPA obligations rather than changing milestone dates.. This is an issue that should be tracked. As soon as the TPA goes through, the permit will have to be changed.

*R: [Ecology] Kim Welsch noted that specific dates for TPA milestones are not put in the RCRA permit because if TPA milestones change, the permit has to be changed. The TPA is the more flexible process for EPA, Ecology, and DOE.*

C: Single shell tanks are being emptied at a rate lower than will allow the process to be completed by 2031, as the permit requires. It is important to include a stipulation that the permit need include a schedule. Including a schedule in the permit would allow the public to be aware that DOE is following a reasonable schedule to satisfy the TPA. The schedule is a way of monitoring DOE progress.

Q: What's the path forward for this?

*R: [EPA] The tentative agreement will be signed soon and the draft change package will go out for public comment.. A 45-day public comment period is anticipated to begin prior to Thanksgiving. There is potential opportunity to write advice on this, but the committee should see the draft change package before deciding if advice is necessary.*

Q. Is the final RCRA permit going to accept the changes to the TPA? If so, that would not be the same permit that went out for review, and the public will not have had an opportunity to review the changed permit.

*R: [Ecology] Kim Welsch noted this and will pose that question to Ecology to find out the answer. Kim said he does not believe any of these milestones affect the permit. The 324 building does have Temporary Storage and Disposal (TSD). There are no TSDs associated with these changes. Ecology can meet with the committee during the comment period, after the committee reviews the draft change package.*

The committee decided to review the draft TPA change package when it is released and consider the potential need for advice.

### **Central Plateau M-15 Milestones**

#### *Agency Briefing*

Briant Charboneau, DOE-RL, provided a presentation on Central Plateau M-15 milestones and what is necessary to complete the CERCLA process. These milestones were deferred for 30 months. The agencies will look at these milestones in spring 2013.

John Morse, DOE-RL, discussed 200-DV-1. He noted contamination could not be removed by removing the surface contamination, noting that in most cases there is contamination greater than 15 feet. Uranium and technetium-99 have been found at depth. There are permanent disposal areas in this area. There is no commitment to dig up the first 15 feet; however, John said that DOE is not going to ignore the surface problem. To be protective, the surface contamination needs to be addressed, it will be cleaned up. John noted that many of the waste sites in this operable unit are near the tank farms and the tank farms have a

different schedule for remediation. Cleanup schedules will need to be coordinated, so we do not need to redo cleanup work. Briant noted that it is ideal to execute the remedy all the way down. Soil contamination migrates downward instead of laterally like a plume in groundwater.

Briant noted that there are other perch water zones, for example, in the 200-West Area. In the 1980s a monitoring well was dug 50 feet deep. The well went dry when the water was turned off. DOE anticipates finding other perch zones in this area.

### *Regulator Perspective*

Emy Laija, EPA, noted that as much as possible will be done with the current funding available. Craig Cameron (EPA) is the issue manager for 200-WA-1.

### *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.*

Q: Is it possible to get a copy of the Vadose Zone conceptualization plan?

*R: John Morse noted that he would send copy to Dirk Dunning. The regulators agreed on the sampling and analysis plan ahead of the work plan. The conceptual model processing shows the sequence of sediments trapped. Many models have not been based on what is actually in the soil. It will be useful to have those reports to get a better idea of how to plan future remediation.*

Q: In general, has the HAB commented on work plans?

*R: [DOE] No, the HAB has not commented on work plans in the past. Before scoping issues can be scheduled and before understanding what milestones will look like, DOE needs to see what the Tri-Parties say they would like to address in their work plan. HAB comment is not requested at this time.*

Q: Why is Central Plateau work being delayed?

*R: [DOE] There is more work to do and issues are more complex than had been assumed previously. Work costs more, is more difficult and will take longer than was anticipated. The Tri-Parties have acknowledged that the priorities focused on over the past fifteen years are still the priorities to focus on in years to come.*

Q. How long are you going to do treatability studies for remediation of the groundwater in the Deep Vadose Zone?

*R: [DOE] DOE will continue to do treatability studies for remediation of the groundwater in these areas as long as it takes. DOE-RL is funding the work to do extraction tests that may be able to remove technetium-99. These tests would run through 2015 or 2016. DOE would also like to run other tests if funding were to become available. The work plan defines the tests that can be done. Tests conducted include ammonium tests, and desiccation tests to dry out soil. A substantial amount of technetium-99 that does not volatilize has been removed. It is likely that the Plateau Remediation Contract (PRC) will provide the equipment and do some work to conduct some testing.*

C: The Tri-Parties need to resolve major technical approach issues and how to gather characterization data. There are several disagreements about how to do the sampling.

The committee determined that if the draft work plans are simplified and not too technical for the committee to understand, then it would be something the committee would be interesting in looking at. Emy Laija noted that it is important that the interest in reviewing the document be in providing policy-level advice and not technical review. Issue managers were identified and will track the deep vadose zone topic. Framing questions were developed to address if the documents reflect a clear understanding of the technical issues involved, what is happening in the subsurface, how these interface with the rest of the cleanup, and are the agencies preferences aligned with HAB values.

### **Committee Business (Part Two)\***

#### *Review Follow Up Items*

The committee will follow up on the definition of “cleanup” and explaining the level of risk involved. The committee decided also to follow up on Draft A for F Reactor OU the topics. Draft A will be issued at the end of December 2012. The regulators and DOE will have an opportunity to provide comment and response. The draft will go to public review and public comment as Revision 0 in spring 2013. The next PFP briefing will take place in April 2013. The committee decided to follow up on the draft Remedial Action Work Plan.

Follow up for the Central Plateau M-15 Milestone includes the following work plans: 200-WA-1, 200-DV-1, and 200-SW-2. The committee decided that these work plans require issue manager work to help advise the committee of whether or not committee involvement will be necessary. The committee also decided to track and review the TPA change package once it is released and to assess the potential need for advice. A 45-day comment period will follow the TPA change package release. The committee will review the package and, if needed, request a comment period extension.

---

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

### *Complete the 3-Month Work Plan*

The committee completed the 3-month work plan. The committee decided not to meet in December but instead to potentially hold a webinar on the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) and a committee call to discuss the TPA change package and the potential comment period extension. The committee decided to discuss modeling, consistency, and methodology and transport as a joint topic with TWC in January. Other topics to be discussed at the RAP January meeting include the F Area RI/FS Draft A; the D & H RI/FS Draft A; the status of WESF related to the gamma dose and viability of concrete in basins; and the TPA change package. For March, the committee planned to discuss the 2015 Vision, the land transition between programs and contractors, and the 300 Area Final Proposed Plan and RI/FS.

### **Attachments**

Attachment 1: Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

Attachment 2: Issue Manager Table

Attachment 3: RAP 3-Month Work Plan

Attachment 4: Progress on the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) Closure Project Presentation

Attachment 5: Proposed Changes to Tri-Party Agreement

Attachment 6: Central Plateau M-15 Milestones Presentation

### **Attendees**

#### Board Members and Alternates

Shelley Cimon	Pam Larsen	Dick Smith
Dirk Dunning	Gene Van Liew	John Stanfill
John Howieson	Liz Mattson	Bob Suyama
	Vince Panesko	Jean Vanni

#### Others

Briant Charboneau, DOE-RL	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Robin Varljen, ECY
Michael Cline, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Lorna Dittmer, CHPRC
Dawn MacDonald, DOE-RL	Brenda Jentzen, Ecology	Mark Hasty, CHPRC
John Morse, DOE-RL	Kim Welsch, Ecology	Sonya Johnson, CHPRC
John Neath, DOE-RL	Dave Einan, EPA	George Klinger, CTUIR
Tiffany Nguyen, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Alex Norgard, CTUIR
Jim Laity (phone) DOE-HQ	Chris Guzzetti, EPA	Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
		Abby Chazanow, EnviroIssues

		Barb Wise, MSA
	Earl Fordham (phone) DoH	Mark Hasty, CHPRC
		Jeff Lerch, WCH

Follow up/ Holding bin

- “Cleanup” definition and comfort with risk (Vince)
- Clarify TPA change package potential effects on RCRA permit
- F Reactor RI/FS and D & H RI/FS – distribute end of December
- Thorium vault at U Canyon?
- PA integration WM Area C (TWC lead, joint)
- Public understanding of cleanup level (PIC lead, joint)
- 200-WA-1 Work Plan (May 2013)

Page 1

---

F Reactor OU Follow Up

- Draft A issued end of December 2012
  - Regulators/DOE comment/response
- Then to public comment = Rev 0
  - Spring 2013
- IM (Dale) request Draft A – Committee review
  - EPA/EnviroIssues distribute

Page 2

---

PFP Update Follow Up

- Next briefing – Spring 2013 (April)
- Remedial Action Work Plan (draft)
  - IM = Vince

Page 3

---

Central Plateau M-15 Milestone Follow Up

- 200-WA-1, 200-DV-1, 200-SW-2 Work Plans
- IM =Jean Vanni, Dale Engstrom
  - Needs issue manager work, help advise committee when/if committee involvement is necessary
- Do documents reflect a clear understanding of technical issues, what is happening in subsurface, and what is the interaction with the rest of cleanup?

Page 4

---

TPA Change Package Follow Up

- Track, review when released

Attachment 1 – RAP Transcribed Flip Chart Notes

- Assess potential need for advice
- 45-day comment period
  - Committee will review package and, if needed, request comment period extension.

---

Page 5

*(THREE MONTH WORK PLANNING)*

December (no meeting)

- Potential Webinar for TC&WM EIS
  - IM = Liz\*, Vince, John, Pam, Dale
- Committee Call – TPA Change Package
  - Potentially request comment period extension

---

Page 6

January

- Modeling, consistency and methodology, transport (with TWC)
- F Area RI/FS Draft A
- D & H RI/FS Draft A
- Status of WESF – Gamma dose and viability of concrete in basins (DOE)
- TPA change package

---

Page 7

February

- 2015 Vision
- Land transition between programs and contractors
- 300 Area Final Proposed Plan and RI/FS

---

Page 8