

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

February 10-11, 2011

Richland, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary | 1 |
| Welcome, introductions and announcements..... | 2 |
| Confirm November meeting summary adoption | 2 |
| Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Updates..... | 2 |
| Draft Advice: DOE’s Open Government Plan and Hanford’s Community Relations Plan..... | 8 |
| Committee reports..... | 11 |
| Draft Advice: Medical Support Contractor..... | 14 |
| Draft Advice: Hanford Historic Properties and Artifacts | 16 |
| Draft Letter: Changes to the Beryllium Rule | 18 |
| Draft Advice: Request for Identification and Public Review of Documents | 21 |
| Board Business..... | 33 |
| Public Comment..... | 35 |
| Closing Remarks | 35 |

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not fully represent the ideas discussed or opinions given. Examination of this document cannot equal or replace attendance and public participation.

Executive Summary

Board action

The Board adopted three pieces of advice concerning:

- Medical Support Contractor
- Hanford Historic Properties and Artifacts
- DOE’s Open Government Plan and Hanford’s Community Relations Plan

Board business

The Board will have committee calls and meetings in April. The Board discussed:

- April Board meeting topics
- Advice for April Board meeting

Presentations and updates

The Board heard and discussed presentations on the following topics:

- Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Update
- River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment

Public comment

No comments were provided.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
February 10-11, 2011 Richland, WA

Susan Leckband, League of Women Voters and Board chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) to order. The meeting was open to the public and offered ongoing opportunities for public comment.

Board members in attendance are listed at the end of this summary, as are agency and contractor representatives and members of the public.

Five seats were not represented: Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Ex-Officio), Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), and the University of Washington (University)

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

Welcome, introductions, and announcements

Susan Leckband welcomed Board members and introduced the items to be discussed during the meeting. Susan welcomed back Norma Jean Germond and Sam Dechter, who have been experiencing health issues.

Paula Call, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), asked Board members to check in with herself or Barbara Wise, DOE-Mission Support Alliance (MSA), in order to address background details needed for the annual HAB reappointment member process. Paula noted that all federal agencies are asking for more information from all advisory boards. Paula said they have taken 38 alternates through the appointment process this year. Susan Leckband said the total appointment package will not be accepted until every detail is made available.

Confirm November meeting summary adoption

Board members did not submit any major changes to the November meeting summary. The November meeting summary was finalized and adopted over email within the operating ground rules requirement of 45-days following the meeting.

The adopted November summary was confirmed. It is available on the HAB website.

Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Updates

Stacy Charboneau, U.S. Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) provided an agency update for the Board. She covered recent DOE-ORP accomplishments and provided updates on tank farms, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding and projects, and the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP). Stacy also provided DOE-ORP near term focus information.

While discussing tank farm recent accomplishments, Stacy noted a new safety record for DOE-ORP: three million hours without a lost workday injury. She also noted that DOE-ORP has been under budget in their tank farm work, completing \$753 million worth of work for \$692 million.

Stacy spoke to the enhanced tank waste strategy and noted the future goals of DOE-ORP. Technology dollars will be deployed to look at future strategies and alternative pre-treatment technologies to supply plants that still need to be built. DOE-ORP will also look into supplemental treatment technologies for treatment and disposal.

Stacy said DOE-ORP used ARRA funding to focus on infrastructure upgrades and extending the life of facilities. She reported that all products are performing extremely well, and additional ARRA work will be brought on as they finish current projects early and under budget. Stacy said field work for ARRA and DOE-ORP will be completed by this summer.

Stacy noted some accomplishments and significant future dates for the WTP, including:

- Auto-sampling installation September 2010
- Large pretreatment crane installation December 2010
- Facility turn over from construction to operation in 2012
- Manufacture glass logs by 2016
- Fully operational by 2018-2019
- Operational Readiness Review (ORR) phase startup in 2022

Stacy spoke to the near term focus of DOE-ORP and said the new operations manager has been selected and will go through the approval process in the next one to three months. Stacy said Ben Harp is the current Tank Farms Integration Manager in charge of WTP and tank operations startup.

Stacy said DOE-ORP will have a mobile arm retrieval system in place in the 2012-2014 timeframe. She said DOE-ORP will be exploring new technologies through the Savannah River Site.

Stacy reviewed the many ways to stay involved and up-to-date with DOE-ORP and shared a brief video about Hanford.

Nick Ceto, U.S. Department of Energy-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), provided an update on DOE-RL accomplishments and goals. Nick said the site is seeing a lot of progress due to ARRA funding, noting that the site hasn't seen this much activity in the past eight years. Nick said the DOE-RL team will build off of the ARRA momentum to reach the inner area of the plateau and significantly reduce their footprint by 2015.

Hanford Reach National Monument

- Located along the river North of Tri-Cities
- Cleanup complete for 115 square miles
- 97 square miles cleared
- 302 waste sites complete

River Corridor

- Assessed contamination of 324 B-Cell by sampling underneath the building
- 309 building dome removed via crane; building goes down 80 feet and will be removed within the next couple of years
- Conducting experimental digging near the 618-10 Burial Ground; will begin full scale excavation in trench soon but are still designing retrieval system
- Plutonium vaults will be stored temporarily on site before being moved offsite; working carefully with cultural resources
- 30 miles of railroad track has been pulled to be more consistent with future land use
- Demolition of the 116 stack foundation and tunnel completed
- Sludge removed from K-Basin and K-East

- Removing contaminated soil from 105KE Discharge Chute
- Will soon begin work in the 100 K area

Groundwater

- DX Treatment Facility is operational and runs 600 gallons per minute; will keep chrome out of the water

C-7 Excavation for Chrome

- Chrome contamination found 85-feet below surface; began excavation
- Introduced new water line

Central Plateau Outer Area

- ARRA funding to do work in the 200 area
- Natural landscaping reintroduced in areas where buildings have been removed
- Fuel stored onsite temporarily
- Cask and rail cars have been preserved for eventual B-Reactor exhibit

Central Plateau Inner Area

- The Pump and Treatment Facility located on the north side of the 200 West area will be operational by the end of September; will restore groundwater onsite; has a team of dedicated truck drivers for supply delivery
- The Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) is being cleaned up with a completion goal of 2015
- Burial grounds in the 218 area have been enclosed in order to work year round
- Currently working on cells nine and ten of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility
- Currently conducting a Deep Vadose Zone treatability test and soil desiccation test

Nick announced that Colleen French would be taking on a new senior management role with DOE-RL, focusing on historic preservation, tribal relations, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) coordination of Hanford Reach National Monument, and more.

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided an update on EPA projects and accomplishments and provided dates for future plans and projects. Dennis said proposed work plans will be available to the Board in the next few months, with final work plans due September, 2011. EPA will provide a briefing to the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) in April, and will cover sludge removal from the river; the sludge removal delivery date is March 30, 2011.

Dennis said EPA is soliciting nominations for new Board memberships, including for the currently vacant Non-Union/Non-Management seat. The nomination period will close March 10, 2011, and Dennis hopes to see some new faces at the June Board meeting.

Dennis noted that the work load being completed in the K-area makes it look like a small city. EPA has found a way to get the major piles of concrete rubble in the 100-area released for capping material at the U-plant, and it will be moved within the next few months to be recycled for a useful purpose. Dennis addressed intake structures and said a base mat has been put down in the East-area; the West-area is also seeing work activity, and Dennis asked Board members to visit the site to see the incredible amount of work being done.

Dennis also spoke about EPA non-Hanford related accomplishments, including the completion of a five-year review for the Idaho National Laboratory (INL). EPA will also begin cleanup efforts for the Moses Lake Project. Dennis announced that a video produced by a DOE employee will be shown during the

April meeting; the video is produced from a new employee's perspective and features Board Chair, Susan Leckband.

Jane Hedges, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), thanked the Board for participating in the Tank Farm Closure Planning Committee of the Whole workshop on January 6, 2011. Jane said it will be a busy year for Ecology and for the Board, noting that Ecology will be issuing a Hanford site permit that is 7,000 pages long.

Jane said Ecology has a group of talented and creative people working in public involvement at Ecology; she thanked Dieter Bohrmann, Madeleine Brown, and Erica Holmes for bringing the program into the 21st Century. Jane showed a short video produced to inform the public about Hanford and asked for input on it; the video is meant to reach to a new, younger audience.

Discussion

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), asked if the savings from ARRA funded projects can be appropriated or carried over for other projects, or if the extra money will need to be returned to Congress. Stacy said DOE was required to put together a "buy back" list by the end of the 2010 fiscal year to identify what they would do with 2010 funding if continued into the 2011 fiscal year. DOE was able to put the saved money towards other already identified ARRA projects but doesn't anticipate carrying that money into the 2012 fiscal year. Jerry asked if projects will be cut if not finished by September 31, 2011. Stacy said the ARRA funding can be used through 2015 but the Hanford site has so many cleanup projects that the ARRA funding will be used before 2012; projects were specifically designed to end in 2011. DOE has the option to carry funding over without further approval and will do so to cushion the end of the funding.

Larry Lockrem, Benton County (Local Government), thanked the agencies for their great presentations and asked Nick about the high contamination numbers produced from the 300-area, specifically the 324 Building. Nick said they conducted horizontal drilling under the building and are continuing to explore due to the large amount of radioactive contamination. Nick noted that the contamination hasn't reached the groundwater in the area and DOE is working on how to manage the contamination and cleanup.

Larry asked what happens to current Board members after the selection process is completed in June. Paula said Larry's appointment was as an interim and the DOE field office only has authority to approve interim seats in-between regular appointment cycles. Larry's seat is up for reappointment in June, so DOE is resubmitting Board member packages to DOE headquarters to be approved by June 8, 2011.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), thanked DOE-RL for Colleen French's new appointment and said she thinks it will be terrific for the community. Pam noted that employees are working themselves out of their own jobs as they complete projects, noting that employees at the Rocky Flats Plant can look to future projects and be motivated without fear of losing their jobs. Pam said the City of Richland has met with Nick and Colleen to discuss the 300-area, and it was very instructive. Pam said that retention of 325 Building will be good for the community. Pam asked for ideas on public outreach and community briefings, noting that they have been given a half hour of TV to cover Hanford topics such as the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) and tank farms.

Pam asked what the consequences to Hanford will be when the president's new budget is announced. Pam said she has heard that funding levels will resemble those in 2008 and said she thought that DOE-RL and DOE-ORP may miss project milestones and deadlines due to budget cutbacks. Stacy said both DOE-ORP and DOE-RL will continue operating projects in the same manner they have been in the previous year because they have not yet been asked to operate at 2008 funding levels. Stacy said the DOE Environmental Management (EM) funding levels from 2008 and 2011 are very close, and DOE field

offices are optimistic that they will be able to make intelligent adjustments should they receive lower funding in the future. Stacy said lower funding could be potentially detrimental to project milestones. Nick said DOE-RL is also continuing to operate at 2011 funding levels and will have to scramble to keep commitments for this year should funding be lower when the president's budget is announced on Monday, February 14, 2011. Nick said DOE-RL will discuss the new budget with committees when they have something tangible to work with. Nick said there is progress at the site because of ARRA money and because the employees work well together. Nick said they will have an opportunity to show their collaborative working process and prove that the site is a good investment.

Pam asked what the state's approach would be to a 2008 rollback, and the effects this would have on implementation of the consent decree. Jane said they would sit down with ORP to look at what the funding will and will not cover. Ecology is working with a delegation to support funding of projects. Jane said the agencies will have detailed discussions on how to prioritize and stay on track.

Dan Serres, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), asked for more specific information on the proposed natural gas pipeline, including the diameter, supplier, and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping period. Stacy said the pipeline will be six inches and will be supplied by Cascade Natural Gas. Stacy said there is no schedule for the environmental impact statement (EIS) as of now, but they are working on what information will need to be gathered for the EIS; the EIS may be available in one to two years. Stacy said DOE will keep the HAB informed of activities.

Laura Hanses, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked how many of Hanford's newly trained and skilled operational workers will be subject to the layoffs of 1,600 Hanford employees. She asked if those employees can be carried over to another project and where the new Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) employees will come from. Stacy said DOE-ORP isn't planning any layoffs and the WTP will be fully operational by 2020. DOE-ORP is currently working on evaluating what kind of employees will be needed for the WTP workforce and strategizing on how not to lose the trained workers in future layoffs. Nick said the layoff numbers were reported in the paper, but downsizing won't be managed by DOE because they employees were hired by contractors. Nick said the contractors are putting together severance packages and layoff plans for those to be laid off, and have an interest in retaining some of the newly trained workers because the cleanup mission is long term. Nick noted that workers brought on under ARRA funding were told to expect only short-term employment. DOE is hoping the contractors will do the best they can to keep their trained and knowledgeable work force.

Laura asked if DOE-ORP and DOE-RL have a combined strategy to maintain some workers. Stacy said they are looking at the layoffs as a resource pool for future workers. Stacy noted that some contractors are working with Columbia Basin College to create courses to train future WTP operators for Hanford. Stacy said DOE-ORP is evaluating whether they can use ARRA trained staff for operations at the WTP, noting that the current contract does not require a labor force to be provided for the WTP. Laura said the WTP will not be a bargaining unit and if DOE wants workers to be secure in voicing their concerns, they need to be a protected work force.

Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, said that the one benefit to spending ARRA money will be to reduce downstream costs. Mike asked if any facilities have been demolished that will reduce operational costs. Nick said they have seen a reduction in "hotel costs" as facilities along the river and in the outer area are taken down. Nick said tearing down the PFP will reduce operational costs. Contractors have been given incentives to cut back 10%, which is around 25 million dollars. Nick noted the cost of training new employees and said savings won't be seen this year, but will be seen once more buildings come down.

Mike asked what the total head count of the Hanford Site is and if the number will come down after 2015. Stacy said there will be a peak in employment in the 2013-2015 timeframe, but they won't know what it

will look like after that until they can finalize the evaluation of the workforce needed for the WTP. Nick said the River Corridor workforce will be transitioned to the Central Plateau as the work along the river finalizes; cleanup decisions will affect workforce decisions, but DOE hopes to keep the same trained workforce.

Floyd Hodges, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), asked if DOE has any plans to look at how much waste will be in tank infrastructures, noting that there was recently a leak when a thought-to-be-empty pipe was cut. Stacy said she was unfamiliar with the situation Floyd mentioned but said it is hard to draw the line of where the tank waste ends. She said DOE has talked a lot about pipeline waste removal and will do radiological exploration for how to classify that waste.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), asked if the diesel gas use proposed for the WTP will be for emergency power or if it will operate all day. Stacy said the diesel will mostly be used for backup, noting that it will also be used for steam generation, but DOE is looking to use package boilers to replace the large steam plants being taken down. Jerry said the contamination produced from running diesel generators will only occur once a month when the generators need to be checked to make sure they still work. Jerry asked if spending millions to bring in natural gas is really worth it when the diesel generators are only minimally used. Jerry said he could understand the need for natural gas if the generators operated all the time. Stacy said they will replace the fuel for steam generation.

Larry said there have been several meetings, some featuring DOE Assistant Secretary Dr. Ines Triay, about what will be done with the Hanford aging workforce. Larry asked what will happen in terms of retirement and transferring knowledge to the younger workforce demographic. He also asked how a younger workforce out of other industries or universities is being enticed and shown the potential opportunities in the WTP plant and other energy parts of the site. Larry is not convinced there is plan going forward. Susan Leckband said the agencies have already addressed that issue earlier in the discussion and appreciates the Board's concern.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), said waiting to evaluate project impacts from potential rollbacks to 2008 funding levels until the cutbacks happen seems like a poor direction for the management to take. Dick said they can look at the magnitude of the difference without knowing what the actuality will be. Dick said DOE should be looking forward and not just wait until the cutbacks happen. Stacy said they are evaluating potential impacts for whatever 2011 may look like. She said the president's budget for the 2012 fiscal year will be an indicator as to where to go should they receive 2011 cutbacks. Nick said DOE-RL is not running scenarios, but that doesn't mean they're not thinking about it. He said all projects will face tough budgets ahead, whether state or federal, and they are looking at how to be safe and productive no matter what happens. Nick said they may be able to move money around to accommodate the projects that need it.

Shelley Cimon asked if there have been any lessons learned in terms of having to go back in for cleanup. Dennis said EPA has taken lessons learned from the INL CERCLA Five-year review and passed them along to Hanford, which has a review due in September. He said the INL review didn't produce any significant findings, but they are conducting bio-remediation on the plumes.

Susan Leckband asked for more information on identifying an operator for the WTP, noting that some organizations have asked for the operator to be identified and integrated into the project as soon as possible. Stacy said DOE has asked Bechtel National, Inc and other contractors to put together proposals, noting that there are a number of alternatives for commissioning and operating the WTP. She said the current Bechtel contract allows them to have others operate the WTP. Stacy said the scope for initial low activity waste (LAW) options are very similar to what they're looking for in glass operations in 2016. She

said the tank operation contracts, if extended beyond five years, will end in 2018, which is not ideal for the middle of commissioning the WTP. DOE is looking at how to remediate contracts across the entire site because all contracts end in the 2018-2020 timeframe, which is the WTP operations timeframe. Stacy said they will want to choose soon in order for the contractor to be successful in the future; she says they will have an answer between now and glass production in 2016.

Shelley said she read that it is already too late for the WTP contractor integration. She said there is a need for one decision maker and chain of command. Shelley asked how seriously DOE is taking that into consideration. Stacy said DOE-ORP has a chain of command in place for tank farms and the WTP project, and they are working hard on integration for all projects because the operational structures are changing.

Jean Vanni, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government) asked why DOE waited until now to identify a WTP operator when they knew they would need one years ago. She asked if the operational milestone hadn't been pushed out, would Bechtel be the operator. Stacy said Bechtel would not have automatically become the operator, and DOE tries to focus on the work scope for near term activities. Stacy said they had an understanding of the WTP operations timeframe when they awarded the 2008 contracts, and they included some of that knowledge and language in the tank operations contract. Stacy said they have an interest in re-competing the contracts because 10 years is a long time for contracts to be able to transition smoothly from one to another.

Draft Advice: DOE's Open Government Plan and Hanford's Community Relations Plan

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest) issue manager, introduced the advice. He thanked the Public Involvement Committee and Ken Niles for over six months of hard work on the advice. Gerry said that the TPA Community Relations Plan (soon to be known as the Hanford Public Involvement Plan) is up for revision in 2011.

Gerry introduced Sara Minkler, a new alternate for Heart of America Northwest (HoANW). Sara worked with HoANW while in law school at Gonzaga University, and she continues her work from her new job in Benton County.

Gerry provided background information on the Open Government Directive, issued by President Obama in December 2009 (available through a link on DOE's website, as well as at www.whitehouse.gov). The Directive is meant as a model plan for how federal agencies do business with the public. Part of the Directive requires a new initiative to provide online data for the public and stake holders that has not been available in the past. Gerry said the Directive requires agencies to take public involvement efforts into consideration for decision making.

Gerry said that the advice asks DOE to incorporate the Open Government Plan's three key elements: transparency, participation, and collaboration into a plan for Hanford cleanup efforts that will be summarized and included in an agency-wide Open Government Plan. The advice is for an EM plan, as well as a Hanford Public Involvement Plan. Gerry said that the EM program should trickle down to the Hanford Public Involvement Plan. The advice also covers continuing efforts to work with the Board on public involvement improvements.

Gerry asked the Board for comments and feedback.

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), noted that the advice contains in one document, previous documents and advice concerning how the public gets information and the quality of that information.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large, asked if the advice can still be incorporated into the Community Relations Plan. Dennis Faulk said they have been working on updating plan for a few years, and it will ready to publish within the next six months. Dennis said the plan is near completion and other incorporations may not be allowed at this point. Any work done for a potential Open Government Plan could be incorporated into the next Community Relations Plan.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), said that the advice did not seem to reflect that a Community Relations Plan and many of the principles of the advice have been in place at Hanford for many years. Betty asked that this be better reflected in the advice.

Bob Parks, City of Kennewick (Local Government), asked if the requirement for reading rooms could be handled through scheduling reading room use by appointment, rather than by extending the hours of operation. He asked how much the reading rooms are currently used. Gerry didn't know the usage, but noted that local members, graduate students, and himself have frequently found the reading rooms to be closed.

Susan Leckband asked if any Board members were conceptually against the advice going forward. Hearing no objections, Susan asked agency representatives for their opinions on the advice.

Agency Perspective

Dennis noted the quality and consistency of the advice. He asked that the advice noted that the public involvement and community relations plans are a work-in-progress. Dennis said EPA is trying to engage with other agencies to see what they do in terms of public involvement, noting the national EPA meeting for public involvement that Pam Larson attended last year. Dennis said that most reading rooms are located in libraries. Dennis asked that the 5th bullet of advice address the TPA agencies, rather than just DOE, as the TPA Community Relations Plan is something all agencies own and take seriously.

Gerry said that the head of EPA made a commitment for the development of a Region 10 Open Government Plan. Gerry thanked EPA for that commitment.

John Price, Ecology, said the advice is consistent with Ecology's Corporate Plan.

Stacy Charboneau said DOE welcomes any advice for improvements for public involvement and community relation plans.

Nick Ceto asked that the Board review the draft Community Relations Plan as it reflects much of the advice.

Susan Leckband opened comments to the Board members.

Discussion

Jerry Peltier asked how requirements addressed in the advice will be passed along to contractors. He showed concern over previous Hanford documents that would be displaced once the Community Relations Plan is approved. Jerry would like to see measureable commitments to improve transparency

identified in the plan, as well as how contractors can meet those commitments. Jerry said that the measurable work should be part of contractors' reviews. Stacy said that the communication departments of the agencies will transmit the Community Relations Plan to contractors through a Letter of Direction. Stacy said that contractor review can be considered.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), said he had no objections to the advice going forward but would like to see word changes to help with clarity. Harold was willing to help craft the language.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, asked the Board to consider the kind of reaction EM at the national level will have to the advice. Norma Jean said that other site-specific advisory boards (SSABs) may ask EM to go along with the plan, but they may not be willing to put together a plan separate from DOE.

Susan Leckband offered to take a summarization of the advice to the national SSAB meeting this spring in order to create a collective request from all advisory boards to put towards EM.

Gerry said that he has spoken to DOE Assistant Secretary Ines Triay, who is open to the idea of an EM Open Government Plan and who noted that many programs are currently being evaluated by the Office of Management and Budget.

Sam Dechter, Public-at-large, noted that the advice could protect the Board and public from surprise decisions made by EM during closed-door meetings. Sam said that some the closed door meetings are not required to be closed-door, and the advice could help to make the meetings public.

Betty said that the HAB is not in a position to review other boards' community relation plans should the advice be taken to SSAB for the creation of a national document. Betty said that the Board would lose some of its intent for the Hanford Community Relations Plan if it were taken to SSAB. Betty asked if there was a reason for renaming the plan and if it actually needed to be done. Dennis said that the title was changed based on Board advice, but the document will always have "community relations" in the title.

The group discussed the Community Relations Plan name change and how it will be scrubbed of local information in order to be provided as an example to SSAB.

Robert Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), thanked Gerry for his hard work and suggested the advice simply speak to local needs, rather than address national needs as well; national needs could be addressed at the SSAB meeting. Rob suggested Susan Leckband take three to four key points from the advice and use them to create a national document by the SSAB, for EM.

Gerry noted the importance to get the ball rolling for an EM Open Government Plan. Gerry agreed that Susan should take the advice to the SSAB, but felt this advice could address some of the national issues. He also noted that Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests take too long to address; a document can take six months to be made available, and by then the comment period is over. Gerry said that the Directive requires FOIA response time to improve by a certain percent every year and reduce backlog. Gerry noted some instances of screened requests, as well as simple requests sometimes taking a year to fulfill.

The group agreed that the advice should address national issues, such as FOIA, and that Susan Leckband will ensure the presentation of the advice to the SSAB.

The proposed changes to the advice were made, and the advice was adopted.

Committee reports

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP)

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large and HSEP Chair, said that HSEP has already been very busy in 2011. They held a meeting in January for review of Integrated Safety Management (ISM) and to talk about MSA and its program. Keith said that ISM has been implemented, but there are still some issues to correct. Keith commended the work done by HSEP in their ISM grassroots campaign.

Keith said that there have been several delays in regards to the beryllium corrective action plan. Keith said that it is hard to get every party to agree, and he noted that one contractor who was having difficulty implementing the plan had his fee withheld, which is providing an incentive for getting this done.

Keith said HSEP has been working hard on the draft advice for medical contractor support, as well as the letter addressing changes to the beryllium rule. Keith thanked everyone who worked on the two pieces, including Margery Swint, Mike Korenko, Liz Mattson, and Tony James. Keith said he is proud of their product. Mike spoke to a colleague from Rocky Flats Plant who had also made comments to the beryllium rule letter, and their responses were very similar to that of HSEP's. Keith said the medical support contract is a cross-cutting issue that is also being addressed by the Budget and Contract Committee. Keith noted that this advice has the opportunity to be included in the new Request for Proposal (RFP).

HSEP will hold a conference call in February to plan for future meetings. They will also join the Tank Waste Committee (TWC) on a tour of the tank farms and WTP plant in March. Keith said there has been a commitment from DOE-ORP to allow HSEP to speak to some of the workers about tank vapors and what DOE has done to mitigate these.

Keith said HSEP is currently accepting nominations for leadership; selection will take place in March.

Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC)

Gerry, BCC Chair, said BCC has not met in several months but is about to become very busy. BCC is about to enter the stage of the year when they prioritize budgets for the next several fiscal years as DOE prepares their 2013 budget. Gerry said that BCC will prepare draft Board advice on DOE's budget.

Gerry encouraged Board members to attend the Thursday, February 17, 2011 BCC meeting where Gerry will review the Obama Administration's new budget, set to be released Monday, February 14, 2011. DOE has declined an invitation to present on the new budget. Gerry will review what the budget means and what activities will be cut because of it. Gerry noted that these budget cuts will be simultaneous with the end of stimulus money, so the ramifications will be great.

Gerry said DOE will hold a full day budget workshop on Wednesday, March 16, 2011. He asked for individual input on what Board members would like to see included in the Tank Waste budget. This information will be vital to preparing for a workshop with DOE.

Gerry asked for Board input on what is happening with the Lifecycle Cost and Schedule Report. The report is supposed to look ahead at the lifecycle of projects and determine whether they can accelerate target budgets to affect compliance levels.

Gerry said that several stakeholders were successful in getting Congress to adopt a provision in the defense authorization in September; DOE will have to identify five years of activity in their upcoming budgets. DOE will also have to address whether the funding level is proficient to meet significant

milestones. Gerry said this information will be invaluable for public involvement and regulators. Gerry said there will need to be conversations about how it will be implemented.

Harold Heacock, BCC Vice-chair, added that it will be important to discuss funding and priorities as ARRA funding runs out.

River and Plateau Committee (RAP)

Dale Engstrom, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon) and RAP Vice-chair, said that RAP is working on important topics, including the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA), Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds, U-Plant demolition plan, 618-10&11 remediation and characterization progress, and the 324 Building B-Cell where they recently found new contamination. Dale noted the RAP advice coming forward about artifact preservation. Dale said RAP will have more advice ready for the April HAB meeting. He said they are also tracking the K-East Reactor decommissioning.

Pam Larsen, RAP Chair, said the January meeting presented challenges for RAP, as there are many interesting topics to be addressed.

Pam said that RAP looks forward to hearing what the Board has to say about RCBRA and looks forward to working with that information as the process progresses. Pam mentioned that the 324 Building B-Cell is on RAP's schedule every month. Pam said RAP is working jointly with PIC to draft advice for Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds.

Pam said RAP held an issue manager meeting Wednesday, February 9, 2011 to address aspects of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) site permit that is being worked on by Ecology. The next issue manager meeting will focus on how the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) will fit into the permit for RCRA. Pam said RAP is interested in providing advice for RCRA, but it may not be necessary. Pam said the document is 8,000 pages, and they are still trying to get their arms around it through issue manager meetings.

Pam said RAP is also tracking issues related to the Columbia River outfalls and intakes. Pam said this is an issue impacting a number of agencies, including the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, NOAA-Fisheries, and USFWS. Remediation work is needed along the river, and they need to put in fill in order to have a base to work from. Pam said this is an issue for people who are concerned the base could impact fish. RAP will look into those potential impacts and determine if this issue should be addressed by HAB.

Pam said RAP will be briefed on the issue manager meeting findings; she noted RAP's full agenda for March.

Tank Waste Committee (TWC)

Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon) and TWC Chair, thanked everyone involved in TWC for their hard work. He said there will be another committee of the whole meeting later this spring to continue discussions of tank farm closure, as it is an issue that cross-cuts all committees.

TWC's next meeting will address where they go next. Dirk said topics of interest to issue managers include the impacts of garnet cutting on tanks, public involvement for tank farm closure, and system plans. TWC will have a meeting the morning of Friday, February 17, 2011 to talk about various alternatives for tank farm closure, and to address the System Plan Revision 5 and the details of what the agencies have done. Dirk said the meeting will have a presentation on responses from the agencies, critical times, and looking ahead in terms of what needs to be done. TWC will also look at single shelf tank integrity in terms of the history of waste and whether the single-shells will last.

Dirk noted that the meetings of the Single-shell Tank Integrity Panel on February 26 and 27, 2011 will be very technical.

Dirk invited the Board to suggest TWC leadership for 2011.

Larry Lockrem, TWC Vice-chair, spoke to TWC's action items from the last meeting. They are looking into supplemental treatment and where DOE is with those; TWC will provide a response to DOE on how TWC would like to approach supplemental treatments. Larry noted there was a road map for supplemental treatment done in 2006, but they haven't done anything with it since.

Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC)

Steve Hudson Chair, acknowledged his Vice-chair, Liz Mattson, and said PIC has been very busy this year. He said that many issues covered by the other committees are also strong public involvement issues. Steve said the RAP meeting during the February committee week will be important for PIC because of the draft advice development on burial grounds, as well as RCBRA.

Steve said that PIC is looking for more members to help address all of the issues PIC is involved in, noting that everyone on the Board is a potential PIC member. Steve said there are a lot of projects coming up that will need public comment, including the TPA Community Relations Plan and information on tank closure. PIC is currently working on RCBRA, RCRA and State of the Site meetings.

Steve spoke to the new format that will be followed for the March 31, 2011 State of the Site meeting in Portland. The Thursday Board meeting will be followed with an evening State of the Site meeting. It is hoped the public will come to the Board meeting and stay for the State of the Site meeting. Steve also said the March meeting will have an educational component, as the TPA agencies will address the 2013 budget.

Steve directed HAB members to check out Ecology's new website on the RCRA permit.

Executive Issues Committee (EIC)

Susan Leckband said the EIC meets the Wednesday night before every Board meeting. She said they spoke about the following items at their February 9 meeting:

- Board schedule and priorities
- The draft advice on request for identification and public review of documents
- HAB budget and implications
- Issue manager meetings
 - No room in the budget to support facilitation -- Issue managers would be in charge of their own meeting facilitation and documentation
 - Creation of a SharePoint site for the HAB, which would also assist in issue manager work
 - Tammie Gilley could provide draft document circulation support
- Leadership retreat
 - Yearly retreat for EIC to talk about workload, priorities, budget, accomplishments to date, leadership development, etc.
 - Suggested dates: April 26-27 or 27-28, May 3-4 or 4-5, 2011
 - Susan Hayman will circulate the dates to find commonality between EIC and agencies
 - Three hours set aside at each retreat to coordinate with agency representatives

Susan said that the workload over the past three years has been extraordinary in terms of projects and document creation. She said that, as part of the discussion of work priorities and schedule, the EIC will address the need for any committee of the whole or special Board meetings. The EIC will also address

budget cuts and what the Board needs to move forward at the retreat. Susan said EnviroIssues will research locations for the retreat, as well as the costs for creating a SharePoint site.

National Liaison

Susan Leckband invited the Board to call in to the DOE/NRC meeting to be held at the end of the Waste Management Conference in Tucson. She said there will be two, one hour periods for public comment.

Susan said there will be an SSAB meeting at the Northern Nevada Security Site in April; members will receive a tour and talk about waste disposition and budget information. Susan will bring that information back to the Board. Board chairs and vice chairs, EM-1, and other DOE headquarters representatives will attend the meeting.

As a final note to committee reports, Larry Lockrem said he appreciated the packet provided by EnviroIssues to introduce the new project team. Larry suggested creating a similar packet with pictures of board members. Susan Hayman will look into its production.

Draft Advice: Medical Support Contractor

Mike Korenko, issue manager, provided an introduction for the advice and thanked contributors Tom Carpenter, Margery Swint, Gerry Pollet, Liz Mattson, Keith Smith, and Susan Leckband.

Mike said the medical support contractor plays a vital role at the site and should be a center of excellence for employee health. Mike noted a few of the issues that lead to this advice, including: leadership issues, lack of empathy for employees, lack of process, which contractor could do what, privacy, and a lack of working as a team. Mike described part of the advice as an attempt to determine who is in charge of employee health, in order to clarify the responsibilities of the authorities. Mike said the medical support contractor has data that will be crucial to determining areas of the site that are dangerous.

Mike said the Board has a rare opportunity to provide advice to DOE before the medical support report comes out. Mike broke down the sections of the advice. Advice bullets one through three can be done now to help with integration issues and recommending site wide workshops on who is responsible for what; this information will be used in constructing the RFP. Bullet four is a recommendation for questions that need to be answered in the RFP; Mike noted some questions are never answered and there are employees who suffer from it. Bullet five addresses the leadership issues; leaders (doctor or not) should have empathy for employees and try to improve their health.

Susan Leckband asked the Board if anyone objected conceptually to the advice going forward. No objections were raised.

Agency perspective

Nick Ceto said he appreciates the advice and thinks it will be valuable as DOE goes forward with contracting. Nick said DOE employees are equally interested in having a great provider as they too visit the site medical facilities and personnel.

Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP, deferred to Nick's comments and noted that she appreciates the process improvement advice. She said the health and safety of all Hanford employees is important to everyone.

Discussion

Jerry Peltier said he agrees with the questions. He asked that the language addressing the questions to be asked/answered in the RFP be clarified. The Board agreed to work on that section.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest) commended Mike and the other contributors for their clear, linear, and logical document. Paige liked that the advice spoke to the humanitarian side of the project.

Larry Lockrem echoed what Paige said and noted that Mike's team always does a good job. Larry asked if the RFP was for sub-contractors or for the site as a whole, noting that the site has two service providers. Mike said he didn't have an answer for that. He said there was a bullet in the advice to address reconsolidation of the medical support contractors, but that it was taken out; he said it could be part of another piece of advice. Mike said the deconsolidation is what is causing many of the issues. Susan Leckband said that is a question for DOE-ORP to answer and asked Pamela to get an answer back to the Board.

Nick Ceto made a personal observation about a visit he made to the site medical provider for a physical. Nick said he would like to see preventative care addressed in the advice because it is a large part of people's health. Nick noted that potentially, yearly physicals on site may be the only time an employee will visit a medical professional.

Margery Swint, Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local/Regional Public Health), said Hanford is a unique site for DOE as all other sites have one main contractor that provides medical oversight for the whole site. Margery mentioned that the University of California and Westinghouse both have medical support as part of their companies and are therefore responsible for health and safety of employees. Margery said it is more difficult at Hanford because contractors change regularly, and they don't communicate with each other. She said it is important for medical contractors to attend employee safety meetings to find out where the hazards are, noting the contractors are ill-informed because they are not involved in any other communication with employees. Margery asked that the contractors be required to be more intimately connected with the employees.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government) agreed with Margery's comments and noted the difference in state laws, mentioning that a site in New York was contracted by General Electric (GE) and a GE employee was the head of the medical team. Maynard said that arrangement looked good on paper, but that the medical lead was still under the thumb of GE and could be overruled. Maynard likes that Washington state law requires the medical contractor to be separate. Bob Parks said the contractor is legally separate, but feels like the same.

Harold Heacock said the introduction paragraph to the advice sounds like it is making allegations, and the Board should be careful if those issues are in fact not the cause for the problems. He asked that the language be clarified. Mike said staff changes and leadership confusion were core issues when HSEP was researching for the beryllium advice. Mike believes empathy should be a requirement because contractors that don't focus on the employees are a big problem.

Harold asked for clarification of page two, section G. Mike said the contamination being referred to is chemical, but that the advice addresses any kind of hazard that is not known ahead of time. Mike said the medical contractor should collect data on hazard location and inform site contractors about dangerous areas.

Bob said the medical contractor should be a totally independent health organization that is not influenced by site contractors. He asked if medical contractors are not currently involved in the Concerns Council. Mike said that was the Board's understanding.

Larry spoke about Employee Job Task Analysis (EJTA), which is an information transmission process for workers and what they work around. EJTA is reviewed yearly by managers and supervisors and delivered to contractors. All contractors and sub-contractors must fill out the information for all of their employees.

The Board discussed the language pertaining to the clear responsibility of DOE and its contractors towards employee health and safety, and the responsibility of the RFP to require contractors to answer the questions advised. Jerry noted the reluctance of DOE to accept advice on the RFP in the past. Susan Leckband said DOE had asked for advice on the medical support contractor and RFP process.

After revisions were made, the Board reached consensus and the advice was adopted.

Draft Advice: Hanford Historic Properties and Artifacts

Maynard Plahuta, issue manager, introduced the draft advice. He reported that the RAP Committee reached consensus on the advice after some iterations, and thanked Liz Mattson and Pam Larsen for their contributions to the development of this advice.

Maynard said this advice was generated from concern over the loss of significant historical artifacts at the Hanford Site, many of which are one of a kind. In 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was passed (and has been subsequently amended a number of times) to ensure the protection of these kinds of artifacts. With the funding made available through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), more work has taken place on the site, including the removal of many buildings. Maynard said some senior managers were not aware that they needed to be checking for these types of artifacts in the push for cleanup with ARRA funding. In addition, it appears that contractors may also have been unaware of the need to find and protect these artifacts, so many were tossed before anyone could decide if they should be preserved.

Susan Leckband asked the Board if anyone objected conceptually to this advice going forward. No objections were raised.

Agency Perspective

Colleen French, DOE-RL thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak about the draft advice. She expressed appreciation for the Board's interest and clarity of position on this topic. Colleen said she is now responsible for the program that ensures compliance with NHPA, and this advice is timely for her. Colleen reported that DOE has approximately 4000 photos and 3000 objects catalogued to date, and 10,000 square feet of objects that don't have a permanent storage location. She doesn't want to lose a single object that should be added to that inventory. She said it is important to preserve and publically display these artifacts in an appropriate location. In the mid-1990's, DOE signed off on a plan for preserving Hanford Site artifacts. Colleen acknowledged that implementation hasn't always gone as smoothly as hoped, including getting incentives for preserving artifacts into the cleanup contracts. She said that subject matter experts inventoried and tagged artifacts. But if the contracts didn't specify how these artifacts were to be treated, the contractors felt it "wasn't their job." She reported that DOE has recently instituted a pick-up process: Now contractors react to the discovery of tagged items by calling for a pick-up, which results in the artifact being handled carefully and taken to the storage area. Colleen said that is very important that the public has an opportunity to see these items that they have paid to have collected and protected for historical purposes. Colleen would like to see a database developed for these artifacts, as well as their physical display. She said DOE will sharpen its priorities in response to this advice, and thanked the Board for bringing this advice forward.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, agreed that the draft advice was very well written. He said that EPA usually focuses on the Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs). Dennis said he is glad that Colleen is managing this program, that DOE has tagged a lot of items, and that he is glad DOE has a process for getting these items safely into storage.

John Price, Ecology, said that Ecology has a limited role in terms of preservation of artifacts. Ecology's role comes when DOE applies to add a site to their permit. At that time, they provide Ecology with a checklist of historic objects included with the site. Ecology supports the preservation of artifacts, including B Reactor. If artifacts are preserved and people are interested in viewing them in the future, this will support long term institutional controls, something for which Ecology has a great deal of interest.

Discussion

Pam Larsen said she is pleased with this advice and with Colleen's new position. While there is legal direction to save artifacts, it is really at the discretion of the site managers. Colleen has a passion to save these artifacts. Pam observed the Nevada test site has a spectacular museum with a temperature controlled room with many Hanford artifacts because there was no one here to take care of them.

Maynard asked who should receive the advice. John said to send it only to DOE, with a copy to Ecology. A copy will also be sent to DOE Historian, Skip Gosling.

Emmett Moore said that if the Board asserts that "many significant historic properties and specific artifacts have been inadvertently destroyed," a list of these destroyed objects should be attached, otherwise the Board's credibility is at risk. He suggested saying, instead "may have been inadvertently destroyed." Emmett asked if Native American artifacts prior to 1943 would be included in the advice. The Board decided those artifacts should be covered in government to government agreements, and this advice will adhere to Manhattan Project era artifacts.

Emmett also suggested that the advice bullets should specifically reference the NHPA and Antiquities Act. The Board agreed to include this in a brief introductory paragraph preceding the advice bullets.

Mike Korenko expressed concern that the advice reference historical documents in addition to artifacts. Maynard added that documents and photos should be referenced. Susan Leckband suggested adding "potential documents" to paragraph four in the background section. Jerry Peltier said the thought any relevant documents would have come to DOE through the national archives. Colleen responded that DOE goes well beyond the indexing requirements for the national archives, including record copies plus an electronic index. She said that DOE would not object if the Board recommended adding documents to this. She said that the goal is to tell the story of the Manhattan Project, and DOE is interested in collecting everything relevant to telling that story. The group decided to change "documents" to "records" in order to reflect technical documents, charts, photographs, etc.

The group decided to ask DOE and its contractors to go beyond what is required of the law in order to preserve artifacts.

Bob Parks referenced a statement in the 3rd page, 2nd to the last paragraph, "Features incorporated into such a facility should be decontaminated and/or shielded to ensure the safety of the public." He asked if there would be an assessment of the cost and impacts to public safety when considering moving some of these artifacts to storage and/or public display. Maynard explained that the intent was not to display items that are highly contaminated or would be a risk to the community.

Bob asked Colleen about the future of the large warehouse where artifacts used to be stored. Colleen said that DOE assessed storage needs based on the artifacts and compliance requirements and no existing building met the needs. DOE has determined that a new building is needed, and is investigation potential sites now. She said that such a site would obviously need to be on the edge of the Hanford Site so that it would serve both storage and public display purposes. She said it would be a federal government facility, and DOE would work with the communities to optimize viewing that will help local economy to the maximum effect. Bob offered to help facilitate that process between DOE and the City of Kennewick.

Pam noted that through energy community outreach, 6000 people visited B-Reactor this year from 48 states and numerous other countries.

Bob Suyama said that his issue manager partner in long term stewardship, Doug Mercer, would say that as DOE moves towards closing up the site and putting caps down and signs that say “don’t dig here”, if there isn’t a museum or something to tell the story, people are going to forget what Hanford is and what is out there. Bob reminded the Board that when thinking about long term stewardship requirements, they are thinking about material with half-lives of thousands of years. A museum will help people understand what went on, and what remains.

Colleen said that she will work on exactly that issue in her new job. She said she managed the B Reactor Project, and if the National Park Service (NPS) is involved at B Reactor, DOE will bring the federal agencies together and see how they can bring an additional measure of confidence in raising public awareness of Hanford. Decisions about the remaining structures will be made in the next few years. The intent is that Park Service and national monument public access points will be layered with information as to what contamination remains at the site.

Bob Suyama commended Colleen’s work, and invited her to attend a future RAP meeting for a discussion of long-term stewardship.

Keith Smith mentioned that while radioactive materials will be hazardous for thousands of years, many chemical contaminants will also persist, and these do not have a half-life. This is an important consideration, and DOE should be concerned about addressing this hazard, too.

Hillary Johnson reviewed the changes to be made to the document. Susan Leckband thanked Colleen for attending. Susan Leckband also commented that this advice process went smoothly because of the issue manager and committee work that occurred before this came to the Board.

Jerry Peltier complimented the Board and the issue managers. He said it should be recognized that the Board has never adopted advice so rapidly and so cleanly.

Dennis offered to help walk the Board through the ARARS that affect the RODs. He said that DOE is responsible for protecting these artifacts, and the Board’s understanding of the ARARs will be helpful.

The Board reached consensus and adopted this advice.

Draft Letter: Changes to the Beryllium Rule

Susan Leckband said the draft letter is technically not advice and the Board has provided comments to DOE documents before. She said the Board was provided with a notice and opportunity to comment on changes to the beryllium rule. Susan said copies of the comment request notice published in the Federal Register was provided at the back of the meeting room.

Keith Smith introduced the letter and said he appreciates everyone’s comments that have helped to legitimize the document. Keith said he was able to use the Internet to research much of the information provided in the letter, and he believes HSEP has come up with a decent document. Keith compared the Board’s responses to the letter to similar responses from an advocacy group for the Rocky Flats Plant workers. Keith noted that in the draft letter, the questions being asked were abbreviated in order to provide a much smaller response letter; responses were drafted using the collective knowledge of the HSEP committee.

Mike Korenko said DOE changes the rules for the beryllium program every 10 years. Mike noted the importance of trying to institutionalize rules for the beryllium program by working with other sites, including Rocky Flats.

Agency Perspective

Nick Ceto said he thinks it is helpful for the Board to provide input on documents.

Pamela McCann said J.D. Dowell, DOE-ORP, has a lot of interest in the comments.

Discussion

Susan Leckband asked if anyone objected conceptually to the letter going forward. Hearing no objections, Susan opened comments to the Board.

Bob Parazin, Public-at-Large, asked if the genesis of each comment originated with Rocky Flats or if they were unique to Hanford. Mike said HSEP drafted their own comments separate from Rocky Flats comments. Mike received a copy of Rocky Flats' comments and said they are very similar.

Betty Tabbutt asked if there was a reason not to name a company that could develop a beryllium testing device. Mike said they have a company in mind, but made a judgment call not to include it, but to only mention that there are companies available for such development. Susan Leckband said the Board is not in the business of promoting one company over another. Mike spoke to the conflict of site managers when there is a safety call to make without a beryllium testing device.

The Board discussed the need for beryllium testing at length. Bob Parks believes that anyone entering the site should be tested for beryllium, citing administrative assistants who work on or frequently visit the site who may be exposed unintentionally. Bob said that since beryllium is a fine metal undetectable to the eye, it is impossible to always know when it is present. Bob said that testing shouldn't be viewed as violating rights, but as protecting people from potential hazards and protecting DOE from lawsuits. Keith said it takes an undetectable amount of beryllium to cause a person to become beryllium sensitive. He said any facility with found beryllium is off limits to anyone with sensitivity. Mike said beryllium testing for site employees is currently voluntary.

Mike said that through the ongoing corrective program, all contaminated facilities should be posted as such. He said corrective actions should be second nature if the site is implementing ISM. Mike thinks common sense would go a long way at the site, noting that in order to protect employees, what are viewed as extreme measures need to be identified as common sense measures. Nick added that he believes the grassroots corrective action program to be very effective. He said the corrective action group consists of workers and health advocates, and it will be hard to produce advice that they are not already putting into action.

Maynard Plahuta suggested that it be mandatory for employees to be tested before entering contaminated buildings and that it be posted along with the contamination sign. Keith suggested creating advice separate from the letter to address mandatory beryllium testing.

Gerry Pollet said there are workers designated to operate in known beryllium facilities, but that unsanctioned workers still enter the facilities on occasion. Gerry suggested attaching the Board's previously adopted beryllium advice about the need to mandate testing as the site expands testing, which has very explicit steps for DOE to take. He wants to add a bullet to the comments saying the rule should be revised to incorporate the steps mandating contractors and DOE to encourage and expand testing for

sensitization as described in the attached advice. Gerry believes this addition would be middle ground for not mandating testing and would help people understand the importance of getting tested. Gerry said that all workers in the 300-area received letters when some of their coworkers were diagnosed; the letter outlined the employees' options for testing. Gerry noted that Rocky Flats has achieved testing of 95% of their workforce.

Laura Hanses said that as she understands it, there's no benefit to testing before exposure because sensitization doesn't occur before exposure. Laura said that since all employees have the option to be tested, there's no reason to mandate it; it should be the employee's choice. Mike said this is where beryllium training and education would come into play, in order to help employees make better decisions about their testing. Keith said the only way to stop exposure and the need for testing is to wear protective gear, like a respirator. Keith said personal protective equipment is provided at Hanford by law. Betty agreed with Keith and added that the comment in the letter should say "therefore it's important for testing to be encouraged, and when there's uncertainty, respirators should be mandated." Paige Knight said employees should take personal responsibility for protecting themselves. Dick Smith added that those who opt out of testing should sign a waiver releasing DOE from responsibility if they get sick. Dick said it would be unreasonable to provide a compensation program for people who won't help themselves. Shelley Cimon said it is up to DOE to create a standard of rights for all site employees, noting that it shouldn't be up to the individual to protect themselves from hazards, but that testing shouldn't be mandatory; it should be up to DOE to monitor the air and filters.

Larry Lockrem asked how DOE would be able to handle visitors to the site if there were mandatory testing. Keith said it would be easier to mandate protective gear for workers and visitors.

Bob Parks asked what happens to workers who can no longer work in the facilities. Keith answered by referencing bullet #11, which talks about medical removal and how DOE should handle it. Gerry Pollet said employees who are medically removed receive two years of employment at a similar location, but that if there is no location available after two years, the employee is out of a job.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), suggested adding a comment about education between testing and protection, as the more people know about beryllium, the more likely they are to get tested. Liz added that the waiver issue could help people get the point about beryllium, noting that until one is actually standing in front of a beryllium contaminated building, one doesn't get the point, even with education. Mike said Rocky Flats provided images of lung biopsies with their contamination postings. Keith said DOE has already received advice from the Board on education at Hanford and that DOE-Headquarters recognizes that there needs to be a comprehensive education plan at Hanford. Keith noted that the letter will be going to Headquarters, not the local DOE. Nick said the letter should only address national issues, not Hanford specific details.

Gerry asked how many Board members still entered contaminated facilities on the last site visit. Gerry said the problem with the site is that uncontaminated people are *still* allowed access to contaminated buildings; they just have to be aware of it. Gerry reiterated the need to attach the former advice and say where there is potential for beryllium dust, protective gear should be required. Liz said there should be a conversation before entering contaminated buildings as a standard practice to warn people.

Larry had objections to mandating respirators, as they may not be the correct protective gear for all environments, e.g. a laboratory. Larry noted that areas without beryllium are still monitored because it is required, and signage is posted even if an area is only potentially dangerous. Larry supports administrative controls and protective equipment but would rather they not call out respirators specifically. Keith found it hard to believe that a worker would rather be exposed to beryllium than wear a

respirator. Mike said sites should decide what protection works in certain areas and what doesn't. Keith said that one manager cannot make the protection decision for the rest of a group.

Betty said that if the Board decides not to use mandatory for testing or for protective gear, education should be made mandatory. Norma Jean Germond agreed this would satisfy everyone's concerns.

Pam Larsen suggested dropping any comment where the Board did not have consensus. John Stanfill, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), said that if the Board feels the beryllium program is not adequate, then they should take the issue back to committee and create advice since it is a separate issue from just answering the letter. Keith and Mike agreed to take the issue back to HSEP for draft advice. The Board agreed that no one would object to the letter going forward if the word "mandated" was not included.

Floyd Hodges added that there's nothing wrong with mandatory because if an employer knows something is hazardous, they have the legal obligation to protect their employees. If an employee has a problem with that, they should get a job somewhere else.

Susan Hayman reviewed the changes to be made to the letter including adding ISM to bullet eight and adding the Board's previous advice on beryllium, protection, and education as an attachment with a precursor on the front page.

After revisions were made and the Board agreed to accept a specific use of the word "mandatory" as it applied to the use of personal protective equipment. The Board reached consensus and the letter was approved.

Keith said he really appreciates the Board's work on the letter. He thanked everyone for making the impossible possible, as the letter was due before February 22, 2011. Keith said the letter is important because beryllium affects so many lives. He said that Mike and he are invited to regular corrective action briefings and he considers the program to be effective. Keith mentioned that Dr. Triay also receives regular briefings on corrective action. He said the corrective action team is not making as much progress as they had hoped, but that they are all dedicated; the Corrective Action Plan can be updated or added to at any time. Keith also mentioned that some workers have been allowed extended testing opportunities on a regular basis.

Draft Advice: Request for Identification and Public Review of Documents

Susan Leckband introduced the advice as having been generated by EIC. Susan said that for large decisions, not all documentation is provided in order to support those decisions. The advice was prompted by the Board's concern over documentation policies.

Shelley Cimon said that it became apparent after committee meetings that the Board needs to understand all that will inform the final records of decisions (RODs). Shelley said Ken Niles, Liz Mattson, Steve Hudson, and Gerry Pollet also helped to draft the advice, noting that the advice is grounded in every committee.

Agency Perspective

Nick Ceto said he knew this had been a tough subject for DOE and the Board, and he provided a handout and presentation on the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) process. Nick said there are a lot of things that feed into the RI/FS, noting that the Board has been provided with those documents before. Nick said he is confused what the advice is asking for, as he believes the Board and DOE have a constant

dialogue on everything involved. He said DOE will continue to summarize the information and work with the committees on the information that feeds the RI/FS. Nick offered to come to any committee meeting to help the Board understand the documents.

Nick said that everything outlined on the timeline comes together; they have been collecting the data they committed to collect, as well as work plans for the RI/FS that have been approved by the agencies. Nick said it all comes down to getting everything on the timeline to feed into the draft of those plans, noting there will be a public comment period on the draft.

Nick said there is still time to address everything that feeds into the decision making, and that DOE is happy to continue speaking with the Board on these issues. Nick said it will be extremely difficult for DOE to accomplish all that the advice is asking for. He said there is a tremendous amount of data already available to the Board, and that the Board will be able to comment on the proposed work plans and draft RI/FS before it goes to public comment and completion.

Nick asked that the Board clarify what they are asking.

Dennis Faulk said that the information Nick just provided should have set the context a long time ago. He said that if that's the case, the TPA agencies need to put things in perspective of where it belongs on the timeline. Dennis said there is a document tracking system in place, the administrative record, and he thinks the administrative record is what the Board is asking for. Dennis acknowledged that the administrative record is very hard to search, and it behooves the agencies to work on that system. He said the information is all there, but that it needs to be easier to access so if the Board/public needs a document, they have the ability to find it. Dennis said EPA will make a commitment to do better.

John Price said Ecology used to get together with another stakeholder group to go through the documents to help them understand what was going on. John thinks it will be valuable to go through the same process with the Board to help prioritize.

Pamela McCann said ORP will be taking this advice as a lesson learned and an opportunity to move forward. Pamela thought the advice was valuable.

Discussion

Dick Smith said he feels encouraged after Nick's presentation and believes things are better organized than what he expected, noting that he thinks the Board should be able to look at the ROD and all of the documents that feed into it. Dick said he had had dismal success finding items on the administrative record. He said it would be helpful to be made aware of specific research and other items that are specifically referenced in the ROD in order to avoid spending time looking for things that may or may not be useful.

Maynard Plahuta said he wasn't sure if the advice addressed the real problem. Maynard suggested finding a better way to identify the problem and look at it another time, with an objective view of how the current system works. He said the Board needs to consider if they really want to ask for another mechanism that will require more manpower.

Gerry Pollet said that the agencies are wrong if they think this problem is solely a result of a bad presentation. He said it was understandable at the RAP meeting that the RI/FS, RCBRA, and a lot of other documents are critical decision documents for the 100-Area, as well as being important documents on their own. Gerry said these are important documents for the public to understand and to understand what the risks are; there are decisions being made without the public's knowledge. Gerry referenced the first bullet on page two of the advice saying the Board has said several times that there is a need for an

annually update public involvement plan, so that at the beginning of every fiscal year, the agencies will announce what decisions are going to be made based on which documents. Gerry said the advice is important because the agencies haven't understood this notion. Gerry wants the agencies to identify the process for decision making eight months in advance rather than 45 days, which leaves no time to inform the public. Gerry says the advice is saying that for key decision processes, the Board needs this identification; it's about sitting down together, planning for decisions, and identifying what is important for the public to know, how they find the documents, and if the documents can be reviewed in advance.

Liz Mattson said which documents go into decisions and which documents link together is really confusing for the Board and for the public. She said the Board is asking to understand how all of the documents relate to one another. Liz said the advice is speaking to creating a system for increasing public understanding on how to track a decision being made and when to weigh in; they are being asked to review documents without understanding the context of it. Liz said there are different needs for the Board and for the public, and that they operate on different timeframes.

Nick said it is incumbent on the TPA agencies to explain the processes of decisions to the Board. He said they have talked about things to stay on top of for RCBRA because those decisions are coming up. Nick said the agencies haven't kept anything secret; they have talked about priorities for the next year. He said maybe they haven't been successful, but it's not for a lack of trying. Nick offered to provide a workshop on the RI/FS process. He said clearly the documents ought to be accessible, but he doesn't want to invent something new that will detract from the work they are already doing. Nick said that every document is important, and they try to streamline the most important documents for the Board and the public.

Paige Knight said the Board is seeing two diverse views from the agencies: Nick is talking about dialogue to help the process, and Dennis acknowledges the Board is looking for verification of the trails for documents that inform decisions. Paige says the Board wants to be able to locate and assess information, noting the Board wants the information first and then the dialogue before the decisions are made. Paige said making the information more easily accessible will be easier on the Board and easier on the agencies.

Dennis said he thought Paige's comment was really well said. He said if the advice were as clear as what Paige had said, he would understand it. Dennis suggested using the 100-Area as an example in the advice. He thinks the advice would then coalesce into something understandable. Maynard said he agreed with Paige's comments and added that the dialogue has to be involved in every step; it should be continuous. Maynard said Paige's comments helped to clarify the advice for him. John summarized Paige's comments into having said, "Show your work." Paige reiterated, "Show your work and show me your sources." Paige asked that the dialogue not get in the way of providing the Board with information.

Art Tackett, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), said part of the issue is that the Board would like to be involved earlier in order to provide advice before the final documents so the agencies can still make changes.

Emmett Moore said the ROD process is supposed to be similar to the EIS process so it's not necessary to do it twice. He said the EIS has a draft process and asked for a draft process for the ROD, making all the documents that feed into it available 45 days before the final so the Board can review everything before the ROD is finalized. Nick said the proposed plans are the equivalent of the draft EIS process; the agencies don't move forward until after the public comment period. Nick said that all documents are already provided in the administrative record, noting that some documents were prepared 20 years ago and some two months ago. Emmett asked that the administrative record be made available online.

Shelley asked if there was a disconnect between the development and the feeding of the RI/FS information into the ROD. She asked if, according to Nick's timeline, the process was out of sync. Dennis

said they will get into that information with the RCBRA sounding board. Nick agreed with Dennis and explained that the yellow diamonds on the timeline represent the draft proposed work plan, saying everything has to come in to feed those, so the process is in line.

Pam Larsen said she thought Nick's timeline was helpful in terms of laying out documents that feed the process. She would like to see this information for every decision and for it to provide a link to all of the documents. Pam said it would be helpful to visually get a sense of what we're looking into, and then decide what we want to know more about and figure out how to find it.

Liz said the advice is beyond documents; it's about a decision tracking system. Liz said this could be accomplished with a decision process chart; the Board doesn't need to know about every single document because outside of really involved Board members, most people just want to know how the agencies get to decisions. She said it could be as easy as saying "We did a study" and providing a link to that study, and then everyone would weigh in via a dialogue. Liz said the decision making process is intuitive to the agencies, but it is hard to understand from the outside. She thinks they spend too much time trying to inform the public without a context.

Dick said that as the system is now, the Board has no opportunity to provide comment until a plan is issued, noting the swiftness between the RI/FS, the proposed plan, and the ROD. Dick said sometimes the RI/FS doesn't examine alternatives; changes can't be made if the Board can't see it before the proposed plan. Dick provided an example of an RI/FS several years ago that provided a ludicrous alternative that would get thrown out, just so the agencies could say they provided an alternative. Nick said the agencies have been engaged in dialogues with the Board for 14 years because they want feedback on their documents. He said everything they've done up until this point has been feeding into decision making. Nick said that Board advice is taken to heart in every matter, and that DOE has public comment so they can show their work. He asked if the Board wanted the information simplified or if they want to look at the whole document, because he was hearing both ends.

Dick asked if Nick was implying the Board would get to see the RI/FS before it was published. Nick said the agencies already talk about it and pointed out the RCBRA presentation during the next day's meeting.

Dennis said that if the advice moves forward, he wants the Board to think about setting the context, which doesn't jump out in the advice. He said the agencies do assume everyone knows the process. He commended Liz for her comments.

Susan Hayman said a decision needed to be made concerning whether the advice would go forward. She suggested a discussion group with the agencies and some Board members in order to decide if the Board would still like to provide this advice.

Paige thought the advice would be hard to edit before the next day's meeting and suggested simplifying the language. Maynard agreed with Paige and thought the advice should go back to committee.

Shelley said the advice is not time sensitive and she will take it back to committee for refinement. She asked the agencies how the Board is supposed to get the agencies to come back to the Board when there's been a fundamental shift. Shelley thinks the Board may be upset down the road when all of the investigation is not done by the time of the final ROD.

Susan Leckband thanked Shelley for shepherding the advice. She said the Board has the attention of the agencies and noted that everyone needs to be reminded that the dialogue is just as important as the written advice.

River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment

Gerry Pollet framed how the RCBRA presentation and subsequent sounding board would work. Susan Hayman introduced a handout with prompt questions for the sounding board with background information attached. Gerry said that RCBRA is a really critical building block for the final cleanup decisions along the entire river corridor; this will be the decision about whether DOE needs to clean up more. Gerry described RCBRA to be a fundamental document that answers the question of “how clean is clean” based on human and environmental safety. Gerry said the public should play a critical role and provide input on who will be using the resources, and how much they will be using the resources. Gerry provided background information on public involvement with RCBRA, saying that up until two years ago, the public was very involved through technical and exposure scenario workshops. Gerry believes that the public and the Board have had little information in the recent past concerning RCBRA, and it should be the Board’s job to make sure the public input from years ago is included in the final RCBRA and final decisions for the River Corridor (due at the end of 2011).

Gerry noted that the agencies have only released the second volume of RCBRA, with the first volume still due out. The second volume covers human risk; the first volume covers ecological and environmental risks.

DOE-RL Presentation

Nick Ceto said RCBRA was scoped and published in draft a few years ago, but it was sent back to DOE because of problems. Nick described RCBRA as covering multiple exposure scenarios, from the casual visitor to a resident who receives food and water from the site; Tribal scenarios provided by the tribes were also included. Nick emphasized that RCBRA is not a decision document, but it feeds into decisions; it provides preliminary remediation goals and clean up goals for a wide variety of land uses.

Nick introduced Jim Hansen, DOE-RL, who provided a presentation on RCBRA, covering Volume II-related work.

Jim provided an outline of the goals and uses of RCBRA, and introduced all of the scenarios being considered, including scenarios provided by local tribes.

While presenting on the Interim Action Records of Decision (IAROD) resident scenario, Jim clarified:

- 156 sites were evaluated for cancer and non-cancer risks
- Risk information is largely based on a 15 milligram dose of radionuclides
- Data was collected after site remediation, with samples collected from the sides and bottoms of holes that had previously been filled in with clean material
- All scenarios are based on a reasonable maximum exposure

Jim said the agencies have spent a considerable amount of time on the subsistence farmer and tribal scenario risk estimates, noting that they will continue to evaluate the concentration of chemicals in the soil that could be transferred to food and crops. Jim said there is a high level of arsenic in the soil, presently, which is a problem all over the country; the arsenic transfer factor is currently at 53%. DOE will also continue to evaluate the risk to animals in the area, noting that some of the sites are not suitable for cattle and wild game due to size.

Jim provided supplemental information for the Board to consider and review.

Regulators' Perspective

Beth Rochette, Ecology, said Ecology has received an extension on the review period for their comments; the new deadline is April 5, 2011, and they are halfway through their review. Beth noted the changes in the document from previous drafts and said Ecology will review all of them. Beth addressed the lack of research of contaminated soil entering the groundwater, something Ecology would like to see addressed in the RI/FS documents.

Dennis Faulk distributed a letter drafted by EPA's risk assessor, noting that EPA had three national experts help review RCBRA. Dennis highlighted the third paragraph of the letter that noted the many other items that go into cleanup decisions. Dennis said the chemical side of RCBRA was completed using state law requirements, and DOE will be using the Subsurface Transport Over Multiple Phases (STOMP) code to calculate the levels needed to protect the Columbia River and groundwater.

Dennis directed the Board to the general comments portion of the letter, noting that because DOE uses cleanup verification data, they over-calculate in order to be sure. Dennis said EPA is in an ongoing discussion with DOE over comprehensive land use plans; an agreement was made that did not show up in draft C of RCBRA. The general comments ask DOE to abide by that agreement. Dennis said the general comments also addressed Ecology's opinion that the mercury levels were calculated incorrectly, and they hope DOE will make changes before the RI/FS and preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) are completed.

Dennis said EPA is looking forward to the ecological part of the assessment.

Discussion

Susan Leckband asked that Beth provide Ecology's comments to the Board when they are complete. Susan opened the floor to questions from the Board.

Jean Vanni had some concerns on the exposure doses presented on Jim's slide about interim action record of decision (IAROD) scenarios. She asked if sites are actually meeting the legal risk range, which is one in ten thousand. Jim said that 14 out of 156 sites currently exceed the 1 in 10,000 requirement, noting that 142 sites are less than 1 in 10,000. Jean asked if DOE went back to evaluate sites based on updated cleanup standards. Jim said all sites have been updated to reflect the new standards.

Jean asked about Jim's slide 7, which addressed the remediation of some waste sites. She asked if it was a general statement or if DOE knew how the remediation will be done. Nick said DOE has derived a series of concentrations in the soil that will be used to compare to every site they have already cleaned up; they will use current direct contact values. Beth said other pathways will be addressed in a different document that will also feed into the RI/FS.

Jean asked if DOE used the Residual Radioactivity (RESRAD) model for non-radioactive contaminants. John Sands, DOE-RL, said RESRAD was used but with different coding. Jean asked if animal and plant sampling will take place during the RI/FS process. Dennis said they are not recommending sampling animals, but will continue to sample plants to help with arsenic issues.

Jean asked about the other documents that will support the RI/FS process and if there are documents to support non-operational pathways. Jim said there is no documentation to date for the non-operational pathways. Nick named a few documents that will support the RI/FS, including a biological assay and step-out work.

Jean asked if there was a report on how DOE is evaluating their knowledge. Nick said DOE is making a very intensive effort to look for other waste sites based on history, aerial photography, and radioactive detection equipment. He said the non-operational area will be used to fill in data gaps in order to make sure they haven't missed anything; this work will be documented as part of the work plan and will also be in the RI/FS report.

Emmett Moore asked where he could get a copy of draft C of RCBRA. Susan Hayman said the Board has distributed a link to the document but haven't had access to hard copies. Barb Wise, DOE-MSA, said she would be happy to get a hard or electronic copy to any Board member that wants one. Nick asked that Board members be sure they want a hard copy before asking for one. Susan said she will re-distribute the link.

Tom Carpenter asked if river contamination information provided in the Tank Closure & Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) will be incorporated into RCBRA. Nick said it will not be in it because DOE does not expect the TC&WM EIS predictions to occur due to cleanup actions that will prevent it. Nick said they didn't use the predictions for the rest of the Central Plateau, either. Tom noted that the predictions will need to be put into RCBRA should budget changes prevent DOE from preventative cleanup actions.

Dick Smith asked if the calculations assume contaminants are infiltrating the clean backfill that was used to cover in holes and if they have measured doses along the surface area of the backfill. Dennis said yes and that they are conservative estimates. Jim said that RCBRA is a very complicated process that is looked at from many different perspectives. He said they have samples from the top six inches on or near several waste sites, which gives them an estimate and a calculation that puts them on the upper level of what is actually present. Jim said the recreation scenario is based on operable units because there's an assumption that the recreational user will be moving around the area. He said they use reasonable maximums, not extreme values; they are trying to identify potential risk and the pathways that drive that risk. This information will feed into the RI/FS and proposed plans in order to make informed decisions.

Dick asked what dose level DOE is using for remedial actions. Nick said they still have the goal of 1 in 10,000 risk range. He said they will try to explain the guidelines and how the Washington State Model Toxic Control Act (MCTA) differs slightly. Nick said DOE will note that some sites fail their screening when they project the PRGs; the decision on how to deal with those sites is made with the RI/FS.

Sounding Board Framing

Shelley Cimon, issue manager, thanked Jim for his presentation. Shelley noted that the Board can still provide advice on RCBRA because of the comment period extension provided to Ecology; the issue managers are looking into providing advice before April 5, 2011, and Shelley asked the Board members to keep that in mind during the sounding board. Shelley said all comments from the sounding board will be taken to the next issue manager meeting for advice consideration; the issue manager meeting will address the contents of the document and will look at what needs to be provided in terms of public involvement.

Shelley acknowledged other team members, including Tony James, Liz Mattson, and Jean Vanni. Shelley said it is important for the Board to weigh in on RCBRA because it involves risk and will be one of the documents feeding the RI/FS and final ROD process. She said the Board has concerns about understanding all the documents that feed into the final ROD. Shelley referenced Dale Engstrom's seven steps for final cleanup, the last step of which is post cleanup monitoring.

Shelley noted concern about this decision document that may have flaws that go unseen before it feeds other documents. She also spoke to the issues of not being able to see both volumes of the document and

not being able to see how the two parts overlap. Shelley said it was acceptable for the Board to weigh in with their concerns because the agencies had asked for feedback, though not on content and that it was the Board and the public who asked for revisions to previous drafts that have been accepted.

Gerry Pollet offered some expansions on the information Shelley provided. Gerry pointed out the background handout provided to the Board and said it began as advice that asked for not only an extension for the review period, but to require a comment and response document to advise remediation goals. Gerry thought it would be more efficient for the agencies to take comments on the proposed remedial action levels outline in RCBRA rather than to accept comments on every RI/FS. He said RCBRA is not only important for a comment period but important to use in public information workshops and meetings. Gerry said the presentation made by Jim would be easy for the public to understand and ask questions about.

Gerry referenced a cleanup project at Harbor Island in Massachusetts; within five years of completing cleanup, workers and the public were exposed to contaminants because there was a failure to stop construction companies from digging where they weren't supposed to be digging. Gerry said it was important to look at construction near the Richland River in the residential scenario as basements and water and sewer lines would need to be dug for future development on site. Gerry said that because of this, it is reasonable to say there is potential for likely exposure, and that is why the public needs to review and comment on the document with responses from the agencies. Gerry said there are many substantive issues to be addressed. Gerry expressed concern over the "shockingly high" risk levels, noting that any risk factor is too high.

Sounding Board

Susan Hayman reminded the board they are allotted two minutes each for comment, and may choose to pass. The following prompts were provided with the issue managers' background paper in advance of the sounding board, and projected on-screen during the sounding board:

- What are your initial thoughts about the RCBRA? Are there additional issues or concerns you think the agencies should consider?
- What do you think THE PUBLIC needs to know about this assessment?
 - Do you have any thoughts on how key messages from the RCBRA (e.g. Preliminary Remediation Goals, risk characterization) should be communicated in CERCLA Proposed Plans that will go out for public comment?
- What more, if anything, do YOU need to know about the RCBRA?

Bob Parazin

No comment.

Dick Smith

Dick said he had some concerns about how measurements are taken and how 15 millirem (mrem) can really be measured anywhere other than a laboratory. He noted that there is more of a potential hazard from arsenic in the soil than there is from radiation.

Lyle Smith

As a citizen of the state of Oregon, Lyle is most concerned about the health of the Columbia River. He said that it doesn't work to look at the ecology and human health effects separately, and to not address vadose zone and groundwater as part of one package.

Gerry Pollet

Gerry said his comments were on behalf of Heart of America Northwest, rather than as an issue manager. He is greatly concerned about how the treaties of 1855 (the right for Native Americans to live along and fish from the Columbia River) are being addressed under the “Non-resident Tribal” scenario in the risk assessment. He believes the risk assessment only addresses the right to fish, not the right to live along *and* fish. He noted that the risk associated with this scenario is 1/100 for cancer, and he has serious questions for how the cancer risks were analyzed. He believes a radiation dose of 15 mrem is no longer 1/10,000; it is closer to 8/10,000. He said that EPA guidelines require that the agencies combine radioactive and non-radioactive risk calculations into one risk rating when presenting to the public and when making decisions. According to Washington State’s MCTA standards, chemical contaminants are carcinogens that should be addressed in cleanup efforts, yet this has been put off in Hanford for years. He wants the site cleaned up to the actual cancer risk standard. He said the RCBRA should receive public review and comment before the cleanup decisions are made. He said the public should understand the risk, cleanup, and potential actions before they make comments. He noted that this was a commitment made by TPA years ago.

Jerry Peltier

Jerry said that it is important to get this document right, as it is a tremendously technical document that becomes the driver for every decision to be made for cleanup efforts at the site. He said the question was whether the Board should challenge the assessment and the numbers presented, or challenge the overall depth of the document; whether DOE has done enough. Jerry would like to see the EPA, MTCA and other standards and requirements clearly outlined in this document. He noted that he, and the public, can’t determine whether the assessment figures are good or bad without something to compare them to. He asked how the Board would like to pursue the document, whether to ask DOE to expand the depth of the assessment, or just to better define the numbers.

Margery Swint

Margery said everyone is going to die, and some will die of cancer; partly because of genes, partly because of lifestyle, and partly because of environment. She noted that the Tri-City area has a lower risk of cancer compared to King County. She said that cleanup efforts should be completed to the extent possible within the means of the government. She said that cleanup couldn’t be done to a level to guarantee no one within 100 hundred miles of the site would die of cancer. She asked DOE to do the best they could with the money allotted, and to inform the public. She would rather swim in the Columbia River near Richland than downstream from Portland.

Dan Serres

Dan asked how the toxic burden that Columbia River animals already carry fits into the risk assessment. He noted that the studies should reflect that the animals are not clean of toxins to begin with, and they may have contracted mercury or other diseases from different parts of the river; he will look for that information in the risk assessment. He said the EPA has been working to control where certain toxins are found in the river. He also noted that in looking at the resident farmer figures, the consumption rate for eating fish seemed low. He also asked if the figures capture the upwelling in the river, in which case there could be a data gap that needs to be understood.

Mike Korenko

Mike said that the Hanford Site is a 3-D entity, and he is interested in risk assessment integration. He noted that the scenarios in the risk assessment are universal to Hanford issues (tank closure, etc). He would be interested in simplifying the criteria, e.g. the level of the contamination of the groundwater as it enters the river. Mike thinks the closure scenarios should be integrated into the document. He asked what the implications are for timing of remediation. He would like DOE to be careful about how conservative the numbers are; they should be based on what the Columbia River levels are today, noting that it is

nowhere near drinking water standards. He would like to see the river analyzed before the feasibility studies are done, as radon levels drop as the river flows.

Paige Knight

Paige said that for her, this process feels “piecemeal.” She feels that the most important thing is to look at the vadose zone, ecological risk (volume 1 of risk assessment), and the human health risk (volume II) together. She feels DOE and the Board should look at cumulative impacts, what they are, and what they mean. She said everyone has a duty to protect future generations, and there is a need to look beyond the easy answers if they aren’t the best answers.

Pam Larsen

Pam said she attended the workshops several years ago mentioned in Gerry’s introduction to the risk assessment. She noted that back then, there was a complexity of information and process, and she’s not surprised it is all still challenging to understand. Pam said that the seven steps laid out by Shelley should be included in any conversation about the risk assessment to help understand why, in the midst of everything else going on, people should care about this document and the documents attached to it. She said that basic information from which DOE makes their decisions needs to be presented. She mentioned that in the early workshops she attended for the risk assessment, the Natural Resource Trustees Council (NRTC) helped the public understand the technical terminology. Pam suggested engaging the NRTC to help the Board and public understand the process.

Jean Vanni

Jean noted that vadose zone information, MCTA standards, and river upwelling data are available but not included. She said that DOE shouldn’t just be using institutional controls to mitigate long term risk when they can remove the long term risk now. She is concerned about the process for elimination of the contaminants of concern and was unclear how the contaminants evaluated were chosen. She would like to see DOE do a better job of representing that information. She is not supportive of using the STOMP model, and would like to know how and why DOE chose their models for the risk assessment.

Betty Tabbutt

Betty addressed taking the risk assessment to the public and the pitfalls involved. She said that the public will look at the risk assessment as a scientific tool, but noted that it is more of an art than a science. She said the flaws in the assumptions will make a huge difference for what comes out of the other end of the process. She thinks it would be more correct to use cumulative effects in the assessment. She said there is a level of uncertainty and that uncertainty compounds itself as one moves through the process. The public needs to understand that it’s an art, not a science. But she noted that there might not be a better tool for measuring the effects, and DOE can’t go back and redo the whole risk assessment. She wants the uncertainty and subsequent cautious approach addressed by the agencies. She asked how to institutionalize that caution. She wants to see the agencies take action that goes beyond the numbers, not just study the effects.

Rob Davis

Rob noted that the assessment is a calculation, and the discipline requires that assumptions be made. Rob would like to see verified and non-verified data and supporting documents in the assessment.

Larry Lockrem

Larry said he routinely examines his tap water, which is better than the bottled water he buys in the store.

Liz Mattson

Liz thanked the agencies for allowing more time for the Board to comment on the assessment. She noted that the biggest thing this risk assessment provides is an opportunity to start engaging the public in

discussions about risk, which is the biggest issue for the public. She said it also provided an insight into decision making at Hanford and the complexity of information and process that goes into the decision making, including how much to remediate and the uncertainties that are a part of it. She said this is an opportunity to have higher level discussions about risk without having to dive into the document. She said they should also address what other decisions relate to the risk assessment and show how everything fits together. She said this is also a great opportunity to bring the public into a conversation about long term stewardship.

Gene Van Liew

Gene said that the public needs to be informed about the “Broad Area/Avid Hunter” exposure scenario, and what hunting areas may contain. He said the information is pretty complicated and needs to be clarified. He thought the consumption rate for fish was too high, noting that if 3.5lbs per week were correct, that would mean eating fish approximately 8 times a week. He also thought the “Non-resident Tribal” scenario consumption rate was too high. He thought that most of the general information was done well.

Keith Smith

Keith commended Board member Tony James, and said that the HSEP Committee was lucky to have Tony review the assessment. He felt confident that if Tony found anything alarming in the document, that he would alert the rest of the Board and DOE. He said that Tony made an important observation: “You can’t control risk to zero.” The number just has to be down to where it is practical, and doesn’t keep DOE from completing future work.

Shelley Cimon

Shelley referenced Bruce Ford, a groundwater specialist who once told her, “I imagine floating on a raft under the site and look up at all the plumes.” She said that when addressing interim RODs, DOE has already measured and filled the holes where there were high chromium levels, so it’s easy to say from the surface, that all is safe. She would like to see groundwater addressed in the assessment and decisions, as “filling in the holes” didn’t help to address the ambient water quality.

Floyd Hodges

Floyd said that anyone who uses the area will use the groundwater and therefore it should be addressed in the assessment. He noted that if groundwater is contributing to the pollution of the Columbia River, this would be a serious problem because some of the risk numbers are really high. Given the uncertainty, he said groundwater data would be useful, since no one knows if the risk is at 1 in 1,000 or 100,000.

Norma Jean Germond

Norma Jean asked that the assessment reflect the perspective of the public attending a public meeting dealing with risk on the Columbia River. She said it should be stated simply, clearly, and not confused with “a zillion numbers.” From her perspective, all the public wants to know is if they can fish, if they can use the water, if they can drill wells, and if their kids can play there safely. Safety is the long term focus. She referenced a study that said 25% of the country will die from cancer. She told a story about sitting next to a young man from the Umatilla Tribe who said he would not let his family eat fish from the Columbia River. She noted that people’s fears are real, so the information needs to be put together and presented as simply as possible in order to address those fears.

Harold Heacock

Harold said that any discussion with the public has to produce data that is easily assimilated, noting that it will be easy for the public to misinterpret the numbers and what is and what is not a risk. He said that from the public viewpoint, the real question is whether the cleanup measures proposed will make the river and the area safe, and what DOE means by safe. He said the public is most concerned with whether or not

they can use the land and water. He said there is a great need to reduce the risk. He asked if the groundwater from Hanford will affect the activity already present on the Columbia River. He noted that there is an assumption that if radioactivity is present, it's bad, even though a certain amount of radioactivity already exists in the Columbia River. What is acceptable activity and what's not acceptable activity needs to be addressed. He referenced an area East of Denver that can't be developed because of contamination in the groundwater. He said the area is still accessible, but just can't be developed.

Susan Leckband

No comment.

Sam Dechter

Sam said that he spent 40 years proving to himself that nuclear reactor power plants are safe operations, but he can't convince his neighbor using those facts. His neighbor only wants to know if it's safe, and he only wants a yes or no answer. He noted that for many people in the area, Hanford is a black box, meaning they have no idea what goes on. Sam asked that DOE put the risk assessment into language the public can understand, noting that DOE should present the information and ask the public if they believe, given the information, that the Hanford site is safe. Sam noted that for the public, a 2,000 page document is not proof that it's safe.

Steve Hudson

Steve spoke about a book he had as a child; a book of human anatomy with pages with stackable body parts to see and understand what worked with what, and what went where. Steve would like to see documents and information for the risk assessment in terms of the interconnected parts. He believes this would be a great public tool as it would be specific, concrete, and visual.

Maynard Plahuta

Maynard noted the common thread in the Board comments: Is it safe, and to what degree? He said that everyone had different ideas of what constitutes safe, but that most would feel safe if they knew DOE was meeting the state requirements. He was also concerned with whether the estimates were conservative or not. He thinks they have been conservative, but with the Tank Waste EIS, nothing was being done to rectify what was outlined; the effects described in EIS's are based on assumptions that nothing will be done (worst case). How does the risk turn out in the end? How does this compare with what was projected?

Tom Carpenter

Tom noted that even after a robust cleanup of the site, there will still be contaminated groundwater. He was confused by Nick's comments about there being no need for the Tank Closure EIS because the area will already be cleaned. Tom said that Hanford is the most contaminated site in the U.S. and that it got that way through years of contaminants being dumped in the ground and the river. He asked what to do now that the era of production is over. He said the decisions made now will impose risks on the future generations; those who potentially may not even know there are contaminants in the area. He said there is a need to look at the issues from a future perspective, assuming that people will see an area or structures they want to dig around. He asked DOE to focus on a public presentation in ways the public can understand and to not assume that simply saying "safe" or "not safe" will be accepted; the public will want an explanation.

Dale Engstrom

Dale said that the risk assessment represents a huge amount of work, much that is done very well, that uses conservative methods and cleanup verification data. He said that all the plant uptake materials have contaminants. He said that even from a conservative viewpoint, the numbers for the resident models are shocking; noting that DOE is minimizing the impact of these numbers by saying no one will live in the

area in the future. Dale said this might not be true for future generations. He wants the HAB to talk about future risk levels, and that cleanup should be directed to achieve these levels. Overall, Dale thinks this is a good study and DOE should use the numbers they have produced, but that they should start to look at redefining what plant uptake is and into revising some of the models as necessary.

Second Round (Two HAB members asked to make additional comments)

Floyd Hodges

Floyd wanted to note that DOE and the Board are talking about real people, not just numbers. He referenced hilltop mining in West Virginia, and how he was once told by a resident of Kentucky (while completing water testing in the area), that he shouldn't drink the water because people who drink the water die. Floyd wondered how many people in that area died before the technology was available to tell them not to. He noted the difference in between 1 in 10,000 and 100,000, saying that no matter what, that number is too large when considering that people will be dying.

Jerry Peltier

Jerry noted that DOE will be using basic cleanup scenarios in this document to help make decisions, adding that the document took a cut in time and did actual measurements. Jerry said that the problem is that the potential pathways to the river from Hanford have not yet been closed. He said to make a decision on for final cleanup will go on for hundreds of years based on data from today, and if the information changes, DOE will have to go back and revisit their decisions. Jerry said that we can't ever get to point where we can say "This is how it is for the rest of our lives."

Board Business

Potential April Board Meeting Topics

- System plan revision advice
- RCBRA advice
- Announcement of committee leadership
- Formal introduction to the 2010 HAB Annual Report
- Videos provided by DOE
- Budget advice
- Update on single shell tanks
- Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds Advice

Rob Davis said he wanted to recognize that the Board provided single shell tank waste advice to DOE two and a half years ago. Rob said there will be a workshop at the end of February for DOE's completion of this advice; Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, will be able to provide the date of the single shell tank workshop. 10 experts from around the agencies will be attending the workshop. TWC will give a completion status update at the April Board meeting. Rob asked that the Board continue to recognize the efforts of getting all of the waste out of tanks, noting the importance of surveillance of structures and leakage. TWC has asked to spend some time speaking with DOE's contractor about single shell tanks.

Rob said that through the single shell tank study, leaky tanks are being reclassified, and there are a significantly lower amount of leaky tanks than what was originally proposed; the tanks are sounder than what was believed. TWC and DOE are working to determine whether tanks are leaking because of overflow from the liner or from infrastructure, noting that there will be a continuing need to reclassify tanks. Susan Leckband said Board members beyond those involved in TWC may be interested in

attending the workshop. Susan Hayman said workshop information will be provided in the upcoming HAB Events-at-a-Glance email update.

Jerry Peltier asked for the Board to be provided with a presentation on tank waste capacity to go along with the tank waste assessment. Jerry asked what DOE is doing to rectify the possibility of running out of tank space, noting that the tanks are 70 years old and won't be completely cleaned out for another 20 years. Jerry wants an estimate of how long the tanks will last. Nick Ceto said the system plan updates should cover tank capacity. Susan Leckband said Jerry's presentation request should be taken to TWC to be developed.

John Stanfill said the Nez Perce Tribe has done some research into tank leaks and volume, and there are significant differences in the data they found from what DOE is reporting. John believes DOE is underestimating tank waste volume. John asked the Board to be careful with any thoughts in regard to fewer tank leaks, because the volume might be far greater.

Susan Leckband asked Larry Lockrem to take everything discussed back to TWC and determine appropriate TWC-generated agenda items for the April Board meeting.

Mike Korenko said the State of the Site meetings will now be in three parts: open house, state of the site update, and an educational component. Mike said experts will attend the meeting in order to address issues of concern and provide background information for the educational component. The Portland state of the site meeting will use the new budget as an example of an educational component. Mike said PIC has scheduled the next meeting to follow the Board meeting, asking that a State of the Site meeting always be scheduled after the Board meeting to attract public attendance. Pam Larsen asked if the Board could video-tape the State of the Site meeting. It is being looked into.

Steve Hudson said that since the Portland meeting is on the river close to Vancouver, it would be nice to invite the Vancouver public to the meeting as well as the Portland public. Steve said a flyer is being produced to attract more attendance. Steve thinks the dynamic of connecting the Board meeting and the State of the Site meeting will be healthy.

Susan Hayman reviewed action items noted during the meeting thus far.

Public Comment

No public comments were provided.

Closing Remarks

Shelley Cimon said it is an honor to serve on the Board.

Dale Engstrom said the issue managers will need to review RCBRA comments from the sounding board and the last RAP meeting, and then decide if advice is necessary.

Jean Vanni asked how the ecological report will be melded with the overall risk assessment. Nick Ceto said there are many documents to be combined for the risk assessment. He said the vadose zone is being studied in direct contact and beyond 15 feet via monitoring. DOE will look at pathways and determine alternatives to address pathways; they will make a risk management decision and bring it to the public.

Susan Leckband thanked everyone for attending and encouraged Board members to join a committee.

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

| | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Tom Carpenter, Member | Keith Smith, Member | Mike Korenko, Alternate |
| Robert Davis, Member | Lyle Smith, Member | Larry Lockrem, Alternate |
| Norma Jean Germond, Member | Bob Suyama, Member | Liz Mattson, Alternate |
| Harold Heacock, Member | Margery Swint, Member | Emmett Moore, Alternate |
| Rebecca Holland, Member | Eugene Van Liew, Member | Wade Riggsbee, Alternate |
| Paige Knight, Member | | BC Smith, Alternate |
| Pam Larsen, Member | | Dick Smith, Alternate |
| Susan Leckband, Member | Al Boldt, Alternate | John Stanfill, Alternate, |
| Jeff Luke, Member | Shelley Cimon, Alternate | Betty Tabbutt, Alternate |
| Todd Martin, Member | Gerry Dagle, Alternate | Art Tackett, Alternate |
| Bob Parazin, Member | Sam Dechter, Alternate | Jean Vanni, Alternate |
| Bob Parks, Member | Dirk Dunning, Alternate (phone) | Steve White, Alternate |
| Jerry Peltier, Member | Dale Engstrom, Alternate (phone) | John Stanfill, Alternate |
| Maynard Plahuta, Member | Earl Fordham, Alternate | Betty Tabbutt, Alternate |
| Gerald Pollet, Member | Laura Hanses, Alternate | Art Tackett, Alternate |
| Mike Priddy, Member | Floyd Hodges, Alternate | |
| Dan Serres, Member | Steve Hudson, Alternate | |

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

| | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Paula Call, DOE-RL | Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology | Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues |
| Nick Ceto, DOE-RL | Madeleine Brown, Ecology | Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues |
| Stacy Charboneau, DOE-ORP | Jane Hedges, Ecology | Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues |

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP | John Price, Ecology | Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues |
| | | |
| | Janice Williams, CHPRC | Andre Armstrong, CH2M Hill |
| Dennis Faulk, EPA | Sharon Braswell, MSA | Peter Bengston, Washington Closure Hanford |
| Emy Laija, EPA | Dru Butler, MSA | Michele Gerber, URS Corp |
| | Barb Wise, MSA | Janice Parthee, PNNL |

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald | Scott Ruebsamen | Anthony Smith |
| Josiah Pinkham, Nez Perce Tribe | | |