

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

*March 31-April 1, 2011*

*Portland, OR*

**Topics in This Meeting Summary**

Executive Summary .....	1
Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements .....	2
Confirm February meeting summary adoption.....	3
Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Updates .....	3
Board’s 6-month Accomplishments .....	11
Committee Reports .....	11
Draft Advice: Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds .....	15
Draft Advice: FY 2011-2013 Budget .....	19
Debrief the State of the Site Meetings .....	23
Board Business.....	23
Public Comment.....	25
Closing Remarks .....	26

*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 two pieces of advice concerning:

- Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds
- FY 2011-2013 Budget

**Board business**

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

- June Board meeting topics
- Potential draft advice for the June Board meeting

**Presentations and updates**

The Board heard and discussed presentations on the following topics:

- Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Updates
- Board’s 6-month Accomplishments
- Debrief the State of the Site meetings

**Public comment**

Public comment was provided.

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
*March 30-April 1, 2011 Portland, OR*

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: City of Pasco (Local Government), Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Ex-Officio), Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), and the Yakama Nation (Tribal Government).

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. She encouraged Board members to have some patience while discussing the budget advice that has not had a large amount of time to be polished in committee. Susan said the Board speaks with one voice and a lot of power; the local Department of Energy (DOE) office will have the opportunity to hear what the Board thinks before they submit their 2013 budgets to DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ). Susan reminded Board members that they are able to send in their own separate comments should the Board advice not address their individual concerns.

Susan noted that there will be a State of the Site meeting following the day's Board meeting. The Open House starts at 6pm with displays; the actual meeting starts at 7pm. Susan said the last few State of the Site meetings have had very positive attendance. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, said that comments from Board members will be welcome on various aspects of the State of the Site meeting, including the effectiveness of the display boards.

Susan Leckband said an article about the Board was recently published in the *Tri-City Herald*; copies will be provided at the back of the room.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union/Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked if the tax-exempt problem with the front desk of the Red Lion has been worked out. Paula Call, DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL), said that it hasn't been resolved yet, but they are working on it.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, noted Tony James' empty seat at the Board. Keith said Tony has been experiencing poor health lately. Susan Leckband asked that a get-well card be placed at the back of the room for Board members to sign for Tony.

Susan Hayman introduced Darby Johnson of Integrated Work, EnviroIssues' new teaming partner. Susan said Darby is at the meeting to see firsthand how the Board works and to answer any questions or receive comments about the Board setup and logistics. Susan said Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues, will continue as EnviroIssues' on-site contact for the Board.

Susan reminded Board members to fill out their Board and agency evaluations and return them to EnviroIssues as soon as possible. Susan will send a reminder email.

Susan reminded Board members to review the ground rules at the back of the room and to silence all cell phones.

Susan Leckband said that on a personal note, her husband is being tested at Harborview for beryllium sensitivity in part due to the Board's instrumental contributions to the successful implementation of a beryllium program at Hanford. Susan encouraged Board members to spread the word about beryllium testing at Harborview. Dennis Faulk, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), said that he is scheduled to be tested for beryllium later in the month due to the awareness brought forward by the Board.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), said that Hanford completed an earthquake check the week after the earthquake in Japan. She said Hanford is well prepared to deal with potential earthquakes and has been evaluated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Department of Homeland Security. Pam said she attended a panel on emergency operations at a FEMA workshop.

### **Confirm February meeting summary adoption**

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

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

### **Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Updates**

#### *DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)*

Paula Call said she will be providing the DOE-RL update on behalf of Nick Ceto, who had to deal with an emergency at home. Paula reviewed the goals and accomplishments of DOE-RL and highlighted some of the challenges:

- Work plans were delivered to the EPA on March 30, 2011, with proposed milestones for remaining work at the K area, including K West Interim Safe Storage, KW fuel basin removal and sludge removal, treatment, and shipping.
- The agencies will be discussing the proposed work packages further.

#### Hanford Reach National Monument

- Over 400 debris sites are currently being cleaned up. The debris on the site is comprised mostly of old tires, household dumps, abandoned cars, and miscellaneous; the debris sites do not contain hazardous material.

#### River Corridor

- Contaminated soil was found under the 342 Building B-Cell. Samples are being collected in April. DOE-RL will update the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) once the onsite 222 S-Laboratory provides testing results in September.

- The 308 Building will be demolished this summer. It was a radiological research facility with 50 glove boxes; 15 glove boxes were sent to the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF), while the others contain transuranic waste (TRU) and will be shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP).
- The 337-B Facility was demolished; its debris is clean and will be recycled as fill at excavated sites in the 300 area.
- Ground-penetrating radar to pinpoint the perimeter of the 618-11 Burial Ground Pipes will be placed in the ground to lower instrumentation to detect contaminant levels. This will be a one to two year process to analyze data and plan before remediation can occur. Briefings have been held with Energy Northwest personnel to keep them informed.
- 200 gallons of sodium dichromate was secured from pipelines at F area. It will eventually be moved offsite for treatment.
- Demolition of N Reactor Fuel Storage Basin is underway.
- Sampling along the bank of the river indicated some contaminants of concern including cesium and uranium just above groundwater protection levels. DOE will do additional sampling and develop a cleanup strategy for the riverbank.
- Pumps, screens, and hazardous materials like oil and asbestos are being removed from the river structures. Design efforts are still underway for installing a bench along the river structures to provide access for removing them in consultation with Army Corps of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries Service, and others. The KE Sedimentation Basin has been completely drained. A new water treatment and fire and electrical system to support KW basin work has been installed. Final samples of sludge were taken to Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) for analysis in January.
- Demolition of the 105-KE administration buildings is complete.

#### C-7 Excavation for Chrome

- Excavation has reached 35 feet deep and is expected to go 80 feet deep to remove the chromium plume.

#### Groundwater

- DOE is making great progress towards their 2012 goal of meeting aquatic standards, which are more stringent than drinking standards.
- The DX Treatment Facility is at fully operational status and is treating groundwater.

#### Central Plateau Outer Area

- More than 40,000 tons of soil have been removed and the area backfilled and revegetated at 216-N4 and 6. Planning is underway for transporting two historic engines and two cask cars from the 200-N Building to the B Reactor National Historic Site, where they will be displayed.
- BC Control Area
  - More than 335,000 tons of soil removed.
  - 31 waste sites complete.
  - 130 of 140 acres have been revegetated.

#### Central Plateau Inner Area

- Construction of the 200-West Groundwater Pump and Treat Facility is 53 percent complete.

- 2015 vision is to have the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) to slab on grade, but 2012 funding could impact the accelerated schedule. So far, 132 glove boxes have been removed (about 50 percent).
- Material being retrieved from trenches is being processed at the trench face to increase efficiency and save on costs by minimizing time workers have to handle the material.
- Work to prepare U canyon for demolition continues. Canyon equipment was placed in the canyon cells that were grouted. Clean rubble from the KW sedimentation basins are being stockpiled for backfill and barrier construction.
- On March 15, a new daily record was set for ERDF: 928 waste containers were disposed of in one day. Dome covers on two new leachate storage tanks at ERDF that are supporting super Cells 9 and 10 have been completed. Super Cell 9 has received its first containers of waste.
- A number of buildings have come down in the 284 area. (Some of the explosive demolitions can be viewed on Hanford Youtube pages.)
- Soil desiccation tests of the deep vadose zone are in progress. The Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies plan to hold a one-day informational exchange on deep vadose zone preliminary technologies June 7.

#### Public Involvement/Outreach

- DOE has reinstated the Hanford Speakers Bureau and has given 27 presentations so far this year.
- *The Hanford Story* and *The Area: a Journey through the Hanford Nuclear Reservation*, two education and outreach videos are being shown in a multitude of public meetings.
- The Hanford tour program is very popular, with seats filling up quickly. DOE is providing an increasing number of educational information and tours for university students. Beryllium program success factors were developed by the Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council, Beryllium Advisory Group, DOE, and contractors. All employee briefings were held across the Hanford Site in March. A meeting was held for former Hanford workers to provide education on Beryllium and the former worker medical screening program. About 120 people attended and 40 people signed up for the former worker medical screening program.

#### *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)*

Dennis Faulk said the solicitation for the employee seat on the Board has ended. He said the field is being narrowed, and EPA will make a recommendation in the next month in order to have the seat filled by the June Board meeting.

Dennis said he would like to discuss the process of deliverables and how they are handled, as EPA had a troubling week with the deliverables they received from DOE. He said EPA and DOE don't agree on the remedy for the Process Waste 1 (PW) feasibility plan, but they are working on a solution and will produce a record of decision (ROD) by the end of September 2011. Dennis said the 200 UP-1 should have been an easy proposed plan and decision; the Board will receive it soon.

Dennis said the Board is aware that EPA and DOE were in dispute over the first deliverable for K Area and K Basin. He said EPA rejected the deliverable and settled the dispute with the expectation of another deliverable that EPA could sign by the end of March. Dennis said the deliverable provided to DOE on March 30 pushed all tank farm work back by four years, from 2024 to 2028. Dennis asked the Board if this significant change should be put to public comment.

Dennis said that when EPA lent its support to the 2015 vision for the site, they were not aware that some of the asterisks attached to some items like K Area and K Basin meant that cleanup of these areas would not be complete until years after the 2015 deadline. Dennis said the K Area and K Basin sludge removal

are two out of three of DOE's biggest priorities and that there should be concern for the rest of the site if these big priorities are being pushed back already. Dennis said it is a concern of EPA to address issues along the River Corridor. Dennis noted that he would like to talk with the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) about moving forward with deliverables.

*Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)*

Jane Hedges said Ecology is pleased with the State of the Site turnout in Seattle and the Tri-Cities, noting that there has been tremendous outreach from the Board, their stakeholders, and constituents. She said there is always a wide variety of questions and information.

Jane said Ecology's attorneys went to Washington DC last week to argue the Yucca Mountain case for the DC district court. She said the court is struggling over the administrative process after DOE pulled the license application for Yucca. Jane said Ecology is concerned that DOE defunded Yucca and has stopped monitoring the site. Jane said the panel for the district court hearings is presided over by three judges who ask tough questions of both sides.

Jane said Ecology is working on the Hanford site-wide permit; they are meeting with RAP to provide updates as they occur. Jane said the permits are currently being drafted. She said there isn't a firm date for the Board to review the permits, but there will be at least a 120-day comment period for review.

Jane said that on a personal note, she thinks the state budget is woeful. She said the state has required furlough days for state departments. Jane reported that Ecology was able to meet its monetary contribution this year and has therefore been able to take seven furlough days rather than ten. Jane said she appreciates the Board's patience when Ecology employees have been unavailable and when delays are caused by their absence.

Jane said Ecology's sister agency, the Washington Department of Health, is the lead agency for issues with nuclear problems in Japan. Jane said Earl Fordham, Washington Department of Health, has agreed to answer the Board's questions concerning the issues.

*DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)*

Stacy Charbonneau provided an update for DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), covering recent accomplishments and near term goals for tank farms and the WTP. Stacy also spoke to the site-wide integration of the tank farms and the WTP in order to accomplish a one system approach by 2020. Stacy reviewed the field work being done on the tank farms, noting recent accomplishments and highlighting the following:

- A new pump was installed in C-104; waste retrieval restarted on the tank on March 30.
- \$326 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding was awarded to DOE-ORP; a recent audit shows they will come in within cost and schedule for projects funded by ARRA money.
- A mobile arm retrieval system (MARS) will be installed within the next couple of months.
- DOE-ORP has been given permission to move forward with a number of projects via a consent decree (CD) from DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ).
- Bulk retrieval for C-111 is in the midst of being completed.
- Construction has begun on C-104 and 107; retrieval for C-107 will begin this summer.
- DOE-ORP completed sampling on C-108 and will be doing hard heel removal in the spring.
- Design for the C-112 construction project is in progress; construction will begin in the fall.

- A significant plume has been found under the SX Tank Farm; construction on the area will begin this year.

Stacy reviewed the 3-6-9 approach for the WTP Operational Start-Up Basis, noting that plant design should be complete in 2013 and construction complete in 2016 with a fully operational status by 2019. Stacy said turnover from construction to operations will begin in 2012.

Stacy spoke to the WTP Functional Integration Strategy and said that the WTP and tank farms may be integrated into one system as early as 2020. She said that in order to accomplish this, DOE-ORP will utilize technology from the Savannah River Site for tank farm pretreatment, and the WTP must reach a 70 percent throughput by 2020. Stacy said contractors have submitted changes that can be made to reach an earlier milestone for the WTP. Stacy said six one-system projects must be completed before the one system integration can occur. Those projects include:

- Create a waste feed delivery system by 2018.
- Build an interim Hanford high-level waste storage facility by 2019.
- Build a secondary liquid waste treatment facility by 2019; this will mean significant modifications to the existing facility.
- Build a supplemental low-activity waste (LAW) treatment facility; this project is a part of the October 25, 2010 agreements, and as such, is already undergoing alternatives analysis.
- Multiple infrastructure baseline upgrades.

Stacy said the tank farms will be prepared to give and take waste to and from the WTP as part of a whole system approach to waste treatment.

Stacy reviewed the recent accomplishments of the WTP, noting that the design phase is 70-80 percent complete, while the construction is 40-50 percent complete.

Stacy spoke to the near term focus of DOE-ORP, mentioning that a selection for the DOE-ORP manager has been made, and there will be an announcement made within the next week. She said DOE-ORP aims to complete ARRA funded projects by July. Stacy said the MARS for the tanks is a significant improvement, but it is not the answer for all of the tanks. Stacy said they are currently in the analysis period for the draft Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). She said they have over 5,000 comment documents to review, and there will be a final draft published by the end of the year.

Stacy said she added a slide to the presentation to demonstrate how the DOE-ORP funding profile works. She said they are asking DOE-EM for a new funding profile, rather than the flat profile, to help bring contingency dollars forward to cover risks as they occur. She said most construction funding profiles follow the bell shape curve, to allow contingency dollars to be used when needed, rather than when appropriated. Stacy noted that DOE has allowed funding for the WTP to be carried over from year to year until peak years are met. Stacy said between \$100 and \$300 million in carry over funds have been used in the past few years across the DOE-EM complex. Stacy said that everyone supports the change in the funding profile, noting that the funding levels will not change, and they are just asking for backend costs to be allotted upfront.

### *Board Q&A*

Ken Niles, Oregon DOE/Department of Water Resources (State of Oregon), welcomed everyone and said it is nice to have the Board in Oregon. Ken said he is disturbed by Dennis's comments and demeanor but appreciates that he highlighted EPA's concerns for the Board. Ken asked Stacy to clarify whether or not the Canister Storage Building is still in the plans to store vitrified high-level waste. Stacy said increased security at that facility (because of the spent fuel now stored there) would make it difficult for them to easily use the Canister Storage Building, so they are considering other options. Alternatives include a new modular facility or an above ground vault with a cement pad.

Ken asked Paula if any consideration has been given to restricting people from participating in the public Site tours in consecutive years (to address issues of too much interest for the number of slots available). Paula said she would take that idea back to DOE. She said it may be possible to screen for duplication. Ken said allowing visitors to tour every other year could increase the amount of different people to the site, given that only a small number are allowed to tour each year. Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), said he was surprised by the amount of site visitors from other countries. Paula said non-citizen visitors go through a more rigorous screening process before being allowed access to the site. Cameron Salony, DOE-RL, said even more non-citizens take part in the B Reactor tours.

Doug Mercer, University of Washington, thanked Paula for her presentation and said there are a lot of interesting things currently going on at Hanford. Doug said he thought time ought to be set aside to ask questions about Dennis's concerns. He said he thought he saw Dennis very excited about goings on at Hanford at the last State of the Site meeting, but his excitement is obviously gone today. Doug asked what Dennis will say at the next State of the Site meeting given his present demeanor. Dennis apologized for his demeanor and said he never plans what he will say at the State of the Site meetings. Dennis said he was excited at the last meeting, which is why the turn in progress has made him so upset. Dennis said he should provide more context on why the deliverable was troubling, as some agency and Board members do not know the history that Dennis does.

Dennis said that when the TPA was signed, all non-tank farm cleanup was supposed to be completed by 2018. When it became obvious in the mid 1990's that cleanup wasn't going to be done by 2018, the milestone was changed to 2024 to accommodate work on the Central Plateau, with the idea that the River Corridor 100 areas would still be complete by 2018. Dennis said the milestone for River Corridor 100 areas was not set in stone, and by default the major compliance date for all non-tank farm cleanup was set at 2024. Dennis said EPA accepts all proposals that show cleanup being completed by 2024, but the most recent deliverables were for 2028. Dennis said he assumes this means that 2028 is DOE's best offer for cleanup, but he hopes that it is not. Dennis said he wondered what the actual date is for the Central Plateau given that it's going to take until 2028 for the River Corridor. Dennis said he has to believe these are DOE's priorities, and if that's the case, the Board should weigh in on it.

Dennis said deliverables and decisions are done in the following manner: DOE provides deliverables for remedial action to EPA, EPA reviews the deliverables, and the two agencies ultimately resolve whatever the schedule will be. Dennis said the deliverables contain draft milestones. Dennis said that from a policy standpoint, 2024 is the ultimate cleanup date. He said EPA believes going beyond 2024 is a negative and will need to involve more rigorous public involvement efforts. Dennis said EPA challenged PIC to identify and design more robust public involvement for the Remedial Design/Remedial Action post decision for K Basin, and he may ask them to do the same for the cleanup milestones. Dennis said the TPA regulations are still silent on what type of public involvement is done for cleanup efforts.

Paula said she appreciates Dennis's concern and hopes the Board is reassured that the TPA agencies are passionate about cleaning up the site. Paula said DOE's commitment to remove sludge from the river by 2015 is still in place. She said the sludge will be moved to a facility in the Central Plateau until a technology is available to treat it. The goal is to package and ship it offsite. Paula said DOE cannot sign

up for deadlines that they may not be able to meet. DOE will work with the regulatory agencies to develop an achievable schedule. Should a technology be identified sooner, the milestone can be accelerated. Paula said DOE's proposal is to begin treatment of the sludge in 2024 and have it shipped offsite by 2028 before WIPP is expected to close; remotely handled TRU waste is scheduled to be shipped offsite by 2030. Paula said there will be many discussions on the deliverables and milestones, and DOE will discuss further with the RAP. Susan Leckband said the issue will go back to the RAP committee.

Doug asked about big picture risk, noting that is easy to get bogged down by the hidden risks of smaller projects. Doug asked the agency representatives to acknowledge what projects on the site worry them in order to better communicate goals. Doug noted that he appreciated DOE not wanting to overpromise on their milestones, as failing to meet a commitment will hurt the public trust. Dennis said the three biggest risks are the K Area, 618-10 and 11 burial grounds, and the uranium in the groundwater issue in the 300 Area. He said those are the most dramatic issues but he is optimistic they will be resolved. He said the plan is for the burial grounds to be complete by 2018, K Basin by 2024, and for there to be a decision for how to resolve the groundwater issue in 2012.

Stacy said her first concern is making sure DOE-ORP ends up in the appropriate place regarding waste acceptance criteria for the WTP. She hopes the tank farm waste will be able to be treated at the WTP; she is concerned the bandwidth for waste treatment will become too restricted. Stacy said DOE-ORP is conducting studies to determine how tank waste can be mixed and/or treated. Stacy said her second concern also has to do with the WTP, its completion date, transfer from construction to operation and how it is managed, and how to deal with the waste coming in and out of it. She said DOE-ORP is testing secondary waste, recycling, and the robustness of these two different forms. Stacy said her third concern is about funding. She said DOE is very supportive and has said that the WTP is the top priority for the department.

Pam said the Hanford Communities is offering a briefing on the 2012 strategy on April 22 at 7:30am; the briefing will be filmed. Pam said there will be an Energy Communities Alliance meeting in June to discuss concerns and gain support nationwide for funding issues. She said RAP is interested in what happens with PW-1/3/6 and is optimistic that DOE will put forward a proposal for reasonable recovery. Pam said it is obvious the WTP is the top priority for DOE and the president because they are still allotting funding for its completion in a year when all other budgets are being cut. Pam said she is, however, frustrated by the large cut DOE-RL is receiving. Stacy said Hanford has made out well in terms of the 2012 budget, noting that it is at the expense of other sites in the DOE-EM complex. She said that while DOE-RL is not receiving their funding requests, they are receiving level funding from 2011 to 2012, which is good. Stacy said it will be important for the DOE field offices to layout their priorities and why it is important for DOE-EM to fund Hanford.

Dennis said he is happy to brief RAP on what's going on at the site, including why energy has been moved away from capping the plutonium site. He said EPA is working on the natural gas pipeline idea for Hanford. Dennis noted that sometimes proposals and information are rejected where there needs to be further discussion.

Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, said that she hit a wall at the 2013 Budget Workshop that made her feel as upset as Dennis does about DOE priorities. Shelley said the Board has to remain focused on issues that are still important, like the Solid Waste Burial Grounds (SWBG). Shelley said that she is excited for the WTP progress and funding, but she refuses to accept that because of the WTP, issues like the deep vadose zone, groundwater, and the River Corridor cannot be appropriately funded.

Keith asked if the records for what went into the 324 Building were lost, given that there seemed to be some surprise at what kind of contamination was found. Dennis said there were records, but DOE was hoping the contamination wasn't as radioactive as it turned out to be. Dennis said DOE knew there was a crack in the liner and foundation of the building where they lost some material.

Keith asked where the dirt used for fill is taken from and whether or not it hurts the environment to do so. Dennis said that in the 100 BC area, the fill needed was provided in the same area. He said that area has been turned into a wetland. Keith said he is interested to know how the infrastructure of the demolished U Plant will be filled in. Paula said the borrow pit identified is Borrow Area C, across the highway from the U Plant., which allows for very direct transport to the U Plant.

Keith asked what the difference between the performances of the 222 S-Laboratory and the laboratory at the WTP will be. Stacy said the majority of the work being done at the 222 S-Laboratory is for characterization for retrieval and waste feeds, meaning they are trying to understand what kind of material is currently at the site; the WTP laboratory will be for waste sent through the plant. Stacy said it is yet to be determined where the waste feed sampling work will be examined.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), asked Stacy if the documentation for the interim storage facility is available for review. Stacy said DOE wrote a CD that was sent to DOE-HQ for approval. She said DOE-HQ gave them the go ahead for the storage facility, as it was already provided in the baseline budget. Stacy said a CD01 report needs to be done for any project that needs to be built in order to complete the environmental restoration mission. Stacy said she can brief the HAB Tank Waste Committee (TWC) on the alternative that was evaluated for the storage facility. Dick said he wanted to see if the alternative of glass formulations would be analyzed. Dick said some Board members have been pushing DOE to analyze the cost of the WTP lab for seven years or more. He said DOE-EM created a program to do so but then the funding was cut and it has still not been analyzed. Stacy said there are technology development needs, and there are desires. She said analyzing iron phosphate glass is a desire that does not need to be done with funding from 2011 or 2012. Stacy said the technology funding is being spent to analyze a tank waste strategy in pursuit of significant life cycle costs. Stacy said the funding needs to go to other developments before it goes to exploring iron phosphate.

Laura Hanses, Non-Union/Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), suggested that the DOE field offices take an integrated look at the future staffing needs of Hanford, rather than look at it by contractor. She said it is important to evaluate the critical skill sets, like hygiene technologists, safety professionals, planners, and field work supervisors with nuclear credentials before the upcoming site-wide layoffs. Laura said employees with these skill sets should be maintained rather than the sub-contract employees. She said there will be continuing needs at the tank farms that can absorb these skill sets. Laura said there will be attrition on site if employees are laid off and then more employees retire. Stacy said that the layoffs are a sensitive issue for DOE, as they try not to get involved in the contractors' decisions. She said the contractors have their own forum and plan for workforce loads. Stacy said that because they knew the ARRA funding would be running out, they have already been looking for opportunities to retain skilled workers; this pre-planning will be needed if staffing needs to be reduced due to budget cuts.

Laura suggested being open to voluntary reductions on the tank farm contract to reduce larger impacts to different contracts. Laura said that employees are finding misfortune depending on which contract they were hired under. Laura said that most contractors are not in a position to look at the long term work force.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), said she thought the agency presentations were really positive. She said the photos were helpful, the graphics were understandable, and the agency representatives did a good job presenting. Liz spoke to the play between project cost and expectations. She said that focusing on the project taking additional time and funding takes away from wanting to do

the job correctly and completely. She said it is important to try to stick to milestones, but it is more important to take the time to do the projects right for future generations. Dennis said the schedule is used to drive cleanup efficiently. He said he is struggling with the new projected date of 2028 for the soil cleanup of the K Area. Dennis said pushing that date calls the timeline for the rest of the site into question, noting that if it's going to take 30 plus years to clean up the River Corridor, it is unreasonable to think the Central Plateau will be done in 6 to 11 years.

Larry Lockrem, Benton County (Local Government), asked how the gap is being bridged from site cleanup to future use. He asked where the funding for energy development is coming from since it is not a part of the DOE-EM funding. Larry asked where the funding for the gas pipeline for the WTP is coming from. Stacy said the gas line is not for energy development but to offset the diesel gas usage at the WTP with a cleaner fuel supply. Paula said there will be more information on the gas line proposal in the upcoming months. Paula said that DOE-EM recognizes that cleanup funds should not be used for energy development. She said they have formed a task force to look into what other sites have done to transfer parts of the site into industrial and economic opportunities for the surrounding communities. Paula said Hanford is represented on the task force by Colleen French, DOE-RL, and their mission is to evaluate how Hanford assets can be used to support reducing the carbon footprint, energy efficiency and diversification, and green energy goals. DOE policy may then be written from the report. Paula said there will be an environmental impact statement (EIS) for the gas pipeline, which would support carbon footprint reduction. The same EIS will also include coverage for solar power development in the area zoned for industrial uses, which would also support green energy goals.

### **Board's 6-month Accomplishments**

Susan Leckband presented the 6-month accomplishments table. The table tracks accomplishments related to priority issues for each committee. Susan noted that a lot of issues span multiple committees, and the table works to track the overarching issues. She said the table also helps Board leadership to make sure they are accomplishing what the TPA agencies need from the Board. Susan said there will be a 6-month check up with the agencies at the upcoming Leadership Retreat to let them know what the Board is working on; the agencies will also be able to tell the Board what they would like them to work on. Susan provided an overview of some of the issues the Board and committees are working on, including:

- Hanford Site-wide Permit/Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) advice is expected to be coming to the Board later this year. The RAP and PIC Committees have started discussions with Ecology about the permit and are thinking about how to structure the advice.
- There have been public workshops on the deep vadose zone; both the Board and the TPA agencies are very interested.
- The Beryllium advice has been a success story for the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP). The agencies are very appreciative of the hard work.

Susan said a link to the priorities tracking table will be distributed to Board members. Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, noted that the table is a working document that will be updated again in September.

### **Committee Reports**

#### *Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC)*

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest) and BCC chair, said the committee is about to embark on its busy season. Gerry said there was a day-long

workshop on preparing the 2013 budget, but there is still a lot of attention on the 2011 and 2012 budget. Gerry said the 2012 budget is going to cut many of the activities the Board cares about. He noted that 700 million dollars will be cut from the Hanford site that takes 2.9 billion to operate.

Gerry said that he has been working with Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), and Jeff Luke on providing advice on budget priorities. That advice will be presented to the Board in the afternoon. The BCC will continue to follow what is happening with the 2011 continuing resolutions, as it will provide insight into what will happen with future budgets. Gerry noted that Hanford hasn't had to deal with up-in-the-air budgets in quite a while.

Gerry said the BCC's 6-month plan includes following up on the Life Cycle Cost and Scheduling Report and comparing it to the new congressional mandates on five-year projections. BCC will also review the site contractor presentations and the first year of performance for the Mission Support Alliance (MSA).

Harold noted that the budget advice has to do with more than just money; it also includes some very hard choices on which projects to fund.

#### *River and Plateau Committee (RAP)*

Pam announced that she and Dale Engstrom, Oregon DOE/Department of Water Resources (State of Oregon), will continue to be co-chairs for the upcoming year. Pam said Dale was the primary author of the radioactive solid waste burial ground (SWBG) advice, noting that it was challenging and exhausting for the whole committee. Pam said she has hopes to complete the advice in this Board session. She thanked RAP members for their hard work.

RAP will hold a full day meeting on April 13, 2011, beginning at 8:30am at the Richland Library. Their agenda includes updates on PW-1/3/6, as well as the Columbia River Outfalls/Intakes Structure Purpose, which has been delayed by one or two months.

Pam said RAP is currently tracking the leak in 324 Building B-Cell. She said there may be an update in April if there is new information available. She said the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) advice is almost complete and may be brought forward at the June Board meeting. Pam said RAP continues to work on the Hanford (RCRA) site-wide permit, which has not been looked at comprehensively for more than ten years; RAP is in discussion on how to deal with a large document.

Pam noted RAP's significant holding bin and other items on the RAP agenda for the next few months, including:

- Greater than Class-C Environmental Impact Statement (GTCC EIS)
- Long-term stewardship
- Reverse Wells Characterization

Pam commended the technical abilities of RAP members and shared a story about a retired Hanford employee who was in charge of the inventory for the burial grounds. He recollects liquid waste being collected and transported in vegetable cans. Pam has invited the gentleman to visit and speak with RAP.

#### *Tank Waste Committee (TWC)*

Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon) and committee chair, said TWC issues frequently overlap with other committees. Dirk thanked the TWC members who have been working very hard.

Dirk said that TWC is following a dozen major issues, but their three largest are TPA milestones, system plans, and the WTP. Dirk noted that the system plan is the way the agencies see how the tank farms work. He said there will be an issue manager meeting over lunch today to talk about how TWC gets through that issue; they will have to go over technical details like pretreatment, staging, and how the plant works today. They will also need to discuss what happens to tank farms and what is underneath them once they are emptied.

Dirk said TWC will look at the wastes the WTP won't treat and what additional forms of treatment may be needed. He said there will also need to be alternatives for how to treat low activity waste (LAW).

Dirk thanked his capable co-chair, Larry; both Dirk and Larry were re-elected as chairs for TWC. Dirk said he appreciates the support received from the DOE field offices.

#### *Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC)*

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest) and PIC chair, said PIC had a meeting yesterday and that he and Liz were both re-elected to their chair seats. Steve suggested that since any Board members can become a PIC member, they should be kept apprised of what PIC is doing, and in order to do this, PIC would like the agendas and summaries sent electronically to all Board members. He said they can opt out of the emails. Steve asked that all Board members review PIC meeting agendas and read the summaries for issues they are interested in, as all of the issues that PIC takes on are also issues for TWC, RAP, BCC, and HSEP.

Steve said the PIC meeting yesterday featured a presentation from Arnie Edelman, DOE-EM, who is the document lead for the GTCC EIS. Steve said the summary for the GTCC Draft EIS is well organized, well written, and available online. He suggested that anyone interested in the background information for GTCC should read the summary. Steve noted that Arnie and other GTCC EIS team members will be in the Tri-Cities and Portland for public meetings in May and have agreed to meet with Board members.

Steve said PIC provided a debrief of the 2013 Budget Workshop at the meeting yesterday, as well as discussing what does and does not work for the State of the Site meetings. He asked Board members to attend the State of the Site meeting in the evening and provide their comments on what works, what doesn't work, and what should be considered for future meetings. Steve said the State of the Site meetings have been doing very well, especially with the phenomenal support from the agencies.

Steve said that PIC is concerned with an array of activities, as proven by the amount of issue manager updates Liz provided to the committee yesterday. PIC also went through their six-month plan with a lot of issues going back into the holding bin due to the large amount of issues already on their agenda. Steve noted one issue that went back into the bin was a request from Dennis Faulk to discuss post-decision agency public involvement techniques.

#### *Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP)*

Keith Smith thanked HSEP members for their continued support of HSEP issues. He said HSEP held a meeting on March 10, 2011 that was very informative and featured an update from Pete Garcia, Director of Safety and Engineering for DOE-RL, who is great at providing information and answering the questions of the committee. Keith said they also received an update on the beryllium program which is finally getting adequate attention. He said the plan for the program is to move along deliberately rather than speedily to get consensus on what is next.

Keith said HSEP needs a report and update on the chemical exposure at the 222-S Laboratory and what employees were exposed to. Keith said he knows the exposure had to do with filter media that was being investigated and the chemical that was used to clean it. Keith noted that symptoms as a result of the exposure are real and some of the cases are significant, but there is still no specific finding at this point.

Keith said HSEP has some concerns about corrective action on radioactive controllers in the tank farms, but that DOE-ORP is taking the steps to rectify it. Keith said part of the problem was that there was too much influence on what should be done from the line management officers, rather than from the contractor RadCon, which is now a separate organization that should have more influence. Keith said he and Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, were both re-elected as chair and vice-chair, respectively, for HSEP. He said there will be a tank farm tour in April that will provide updates on the improvements being made. Keith thanked Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metals Trade Council (Hanford Work Force), for stepping up as an issue manager to work with Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP, on making the tank farm tour successful. Keith said the current preferred date for the tour is April 14, 2011.

Keith said HSEP will have a call on April 19 to decide if they need to meet in person. Keith said there are a number of issues HSEP is interested in, including traffic and road access to the site and the request for proposal (RFP) for the medical contractors.

Jeff thanked HSEP and Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), for their tremendous efforts on the beryllium issue and bringing Hanford work force health issues to light.

#### *National Liaison*

Shelley Cimon said the national level meetings are just beginning. She reported that the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) recently issued a What We Heard Report on developing safe and long-term plans for nuclear fuel and nuclear waste. Shelley said the Board will have an opportunity to weigh in on that document, and she encouraged Board members to view the report online. Shelley noted that a deliverable is due from the BRC on July 29, 2011. Tammie will make copies of the report for Board members.

Shelley said DOE and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission are engaged in an ongoing discussion on building the technological basis for a decision on blending nuclear waste. She said she will have a better idea of what is happening programmatically after the national meeting in Las Vegas.

#### *Executive Issues Committee (EIC) and Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB)*

Susan Leckband said the SSAB will consider three pieces of advice at the upcoming meeting. She said she has submitted the Board's Open Government Plan advice to the SSAB per the Board's request. Susan noted that another organization also submitted their advice on rail transport of waste for the SSAB's consideration. She said there is potential for another group to bring forth advice as well. Susan said she is worried about the absence of the top-level DOE employees at the next SSAB meeting.

Susan said she learned something on the March 24 SSAB conference call that she would like to share with the Board; she learned that in this continuing resolution status, DOE-EM is operating at the lower of the two budgets proposed by Congress. Susan said the DOE Office of Management and Budget hopes the resolution will be finalized by April 8; she will learn more at the next SSAB meeting. Susan noted that DOE-HQ has provided staff briefings for Congressional staff while Congress moved into the hearing phase for the Fiscal Year 2012 budget; caucus briefings have also been held. She said DOE-HQ is working on a testimony for the hearings and is responding to a steady stream of questions from Congress.

Susan noted the GTCC EIS meeting with Arnie Edelman. DOE will hold public hearings in both Pasco and Portland, and Arnie has agreed to meet with the Board in person, with call-in capabilities for out of town members.

Susan reported on the topics discussed at the previous evenings' EIC meeting. Topics included:

- The leadership retreat.
- The Board's schedule for the next year.
- Budget reductions and what that means for Hanford.
- Board development (how to encourage more participation and issue manager involvement).

Susan Hayman said the EIC had decided on a venue in Boardman, Oregon for the leadership retreat but the hotel adjacent to the meeting venue is now fully booked; Darby is looking into other venues in Wenatchee and Yakima, Washington.

### **Draft Advice: Radioactive Solid Waste Burial Grounds**

Susan Hayman said the advice being presented is very complicated and long. She said that from a process standpoint, this advice has been discussed a number of times in committee by both RAP and PIC. Susan said there has been a lot of discussion over the length, amount of detail, background information, and so on. Susan said that the advice reached consensus in committee despite all of those things. Susan said that she is not trying to suppress the dialogue, but would ask the Board to remember to focus on concepts and areas where they find agreement. She said that questions about the length and other questions like that may be of lesser quality than questions about the advice fundamentals and needing to feel good about what is being communicated in the advice.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), said he objects to the lengths of the background sections that are now becoming the status-quo for Board advice pieces. He said he does not want to lose the amount of research and work the authors put into the document, so he suggested changing the format to accommodate the longer background sections, while still allowing the advice to be the main focus of the document. Jerry suggested that future advice have an introduction paragraph followed directly by the advice, which will then be followed by the background information, the Board's concerns, and how they got to this certain piece of advice. Jerry noted that in his time in Congress, if a point wasn't made in the first two pages, the audience was lost. He said he isn't saying the background should be lost, but should be used to support the advice.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), asked that Board members and agency representatives scrub their acronym usage for those in the room who do not understand all of the abbreviations.

Shelley introduced the advice and reiterated the items that Susan noted. She said she thought Jerry's ideas about the background information are very good.

Shelley said that RAP members have a very long history and extensive understanding of solid waste, and said she thought this advice is the culmination of that understanding. Shelley said there are 12 bullets in the advice section, and that the background information should be left in to leave a trail of understanding for the public. Shelley said RAP aimed to capture the complexity of the site, noting that there are 450,000 cubic meters of radiation waste onsite. She said the drivers for the advice are the 100 Area burial grounds

which have any number of anomalies. Shelley said those anomalies need to be considered when approaching cleanup of the trenches.

Shelley said the advice was broken into sections in order for RAP to get their minds around it. She said background information is provided for each topic. Shelley said nomenclatures are featured in the advice, like for the use of landfill in unlined trenches. Shelley pointed out that the numbers featured in the second paragraph of the background need to be scrubbed for citations and RAP will work on those before the advice is finalized.

### *Agency Perspective*

Paula thanked RAP for their exhaustive research and quality of work in this advice. She said the advice is timely for consideration in the work plan for SWBG that is due to Ecology by December 31, 2011.

John said he thinks the background is very good, and he will contribute some wording changes before the advice is reviewed for finalization. John said that Ecology and DOE have been working on a plan for the burial grounds since 2003. He said DOE has been good about providing a first set of public workshops on the issue, but that the second set may affect the December 31 deadline for the work plan. He said he was unsure which draft of the work plan may be submitted to Ecology if the draft comment period is too long or late in the season.

John said the likelihood of DOE completing what is asked in advice bullets nine and ten is pretty low. The advice asked for pilot retrievals of TRU waste in years they say they don't have the funding to do so. John said the investigation described in bullet ten for fiscal year 2012 is likely to be expensive and with lots of remediation components. John said the agencies can determine work load once there is an approved work plan, but noted that DOE and the regulators have to consider where the SWBG fall, priority wise. He said it will be tough to accomplish everything the advice is asking them to.

Dennis said his comments relate to what John said about advice recommendations. Dennis referenced the handout from the Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Workshop that outlines the agencies' priorities. He said the Inner Area of the Central Plateau is a low priority compared to issues like in the K Area, where larger funds need to be allocated. Dennis asked the Board if this advice and what it is recommending is really a priority for the Board, given the present state of the budget. Dennis asked that the Board think about it from a priorities standpoint. He said the Board may need to validate whether or not they agree with the agencies' priorities, noting that if they don't, there is a fundamental problem.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters, asked if Dennis would like to see the Board send advice on SWBG or not. Dennis said he knows the work will get done at some point, but that he feels the Board is asking DOE to complete work on SWBG when it is not a priority for 2011. Dennis asked the Board if they felt this issue should be moved to the top of the priority list. Dennis said the work plan will just lay the foundation for work to be done over four years. He said the ROD will not be published until after remedial investigations are completed in 2015, and only if funding allows it. Dennis said he feels that if he receives this advice, the Board is saying that SWBG is their top priority.

### *Board Discussion*

Harold said he would like to express his serious reservations about the advice, noting that he also voiced his concerns while the advice was still in committee. He said he thinks the background is an interesting tutorial but does not adequately set the stage for the advice points.

Jeff thanked Shelley for mentioning his concerns about references to facts and numbers in the advice and said he thought the lack of reference limits the Board's credibility. Jeff asked the Board whether or not they would like to respond to Dennis's inquiries at this point in time, or wait to discuss it during the budget advice. Susan Leckband said the Board will first address issues of the advice itself, and then move on to whether the Board would like to see SWBG as a priority. Jeff said it is not the place of the Board to tell DOE which issues should be the priorities in tight funding times. He said the Board always says to fund everything at the TPA funding limit, but cannot get involved in determining which project is more important.

Ken said he agrees with Jeff's comments, but if that is the path forward, advice points nine and ten need to be reconsidered or re-worded as they address prioritizing earlier expenditures of funds. Ken said the Board is not in the position of ordering priorities for DOE, but SWBG is a priority for the Board.

Dick said he didn't read the advice as implying an imperative schedule, but rather asking DOE to consider a list of things the Board wants to see happen when it comes due. Dick said that the plan was to have the burial grounds capped, which was unacceptable to the Board. Dick said the advice is a list of things DOE should complete before capping the burial grounds. He said nothing on the list is a high priority because the burial grounds are not an immediate danger. Dick said that waiting to accomplish the tasks for the burial grounds doesn't scare him, but there are parts of the process that need to be dealt with properly. John pointed out language in advice points 9 and 10 that referenced an accelerated timeline and for parts of the process to occur in 2012.

Liz asked Dennis to clarify whether it's a given that DOE will address burial grounds but not a given that they will do it the way the Board is advising. Dennis said he is simply saying that DOE is responsible to remediate the waste sites in the timeframe of the TPA agreement. He said the time scale may change, which is why he asked about the advice containing specific dates. Liz said that since Dennis is saying the milestone for burial grounds may move, there needs to be an outline provided in the document to say which steps need to be addressed so many years ahead of completion, without naming specific dates. Dennis said he thought that would help the advice. He said four years are scheduled to work on the burial grounds no matter when the start date is. Dennis said it is fine for SWBG to be a priority for the Board.

Gerry said the advice has to serve an important function for public involvement between now and 2017. Gerry said the Board needed to provide information that explains what the burial ground issues are for the public attending workshops. Gerry said that where to place the background information is not important in terms of presenting the advice at workshops, but noted that for some audiences, the advice first is better. Gerry said that to not include the background information will undermine the advice in terms of the next debate. Gerry said RAP spent a long time thinking about how to trim down the document while still providing a public involvement function.

Gerry said prior drafts of the advice contained full citations for the facts and numbers, but he thinks the agencies will look at the final advice and think the advice didn't go through the full process. Jeff said that he would not hold up the advice if the citations were left out in this advice, but he would like to see a document go through the Board to establish a protocol for referencing statements of fact and numbers. Jeff said that when DOE doesn't properly cite their work, the Board asks them to provide their references. He said the standard should be held to both parties. Susan Hayman suggested that the EIC draft a protocol and bring it to the Board in June.

Gerry said the issue of prioritization needs to be considered while reviewing the budget advice later in the afternoon. Gerry said the Board is advising that it is a serious error to stop work on retrieving TRU waste, which is a precursor to the SWBG work. Gerry said the Board has been right to worry about changing milestones, as Dennis showed concern about it today. He said the advice asks that DOE work their way

backwards from 2024 in order to complete the work on SWBG by the milestone. Gerry said work has to begin between 2012 and 2017 in order to accomplish the milestone, and some of that work needs to be identified now in order to make it into the budgets for the upcoming years.

Maynard said he agrees with Gerry on the background issue. Maynard said the Board has used appendixes for backgrounds before, and suggested that an introductory background paragraph be used with reference to the appendix. Maynard said he agrees with Ken and Jeff about changing the language of bullets nine and ten to not name specific timeframes, but he thinks it should be emphasized that the SWBG work needs to be done by 2024. Maynard said the issue can be addressed more in the budget advice. Maynard suggested wording changes to change the negative tone of some of the advice points. He said the issues need to be addressed in a more positive light to show the spirit of team work with the TPA agencies.

Jerry asked if trench cleanup on the Central Plateau will also be halted due to budget cuts. Paula said the work scope for the Central Plateau cleanup is a separate operable unit from the SWBG as it is retrievable stored waste. She said they are separate projects.

Paige asked if all work on TRU waste will be stopped if the advice does not go forward. John thanked Paige for asking about TRU waste. John said there are many TRU waste issues to track, referencing specifically the PW-1/3/6 unit that will have a decision by September, and the 618-10 and 11 burial grounds that may contain TRU waste from before 1970. John said milestone 91 may stop TRU waste work for the next three years. Paige asked if that meant the advice can prevent the stoppage of TRU waste retrieval for the next three years. She said the advice is important on its own, without having to prioritize or go through budget work. John said he thinks the advice is good as it is, and he agrees with Gerry's logic that some of the work needs to be put in the budget before 2017. John said there is no room in the 2011 or 2012 budgets, but that there may still be some room to work some of it into 2013.

Gerry said it is important to note that when the advice was first being developed, the Board had no idea that DOE would determine to stop all TRU waste retrieval in 2012. Gerry said they learned that information only two weeks ago. Gerry said that characterization and profiling needs to be built into the investigation profile before 2017, noting that the only thing referencing immediate action is the 2012 date in advice bullet 10. Gerry suggested removing 2012.

Paige said the advice is too complicated to understand, noting that the explanations from Gerry and John have made the issue much clearer.

Susan Leckband said the Board needs to decide on format for the advice, should it go forward. She asked the Board to consider Jerry's suggestion of moving the background to the back of the advice.

Betty said she thought the paragraph explaining the overuse of nomenclatures should remain before the advice to inform DOE that some of the terms are confusing to the public. Betty suggested that DOE needs to clarify what exactly is in the referenced landfills, and that advice can be incorporated into number 11 or 12. Gerry said the use of the word nomenclature is ironic as the Board is asking DOE to not use jargon. The heading "Nomenclature Terminology" was changed to "Landfill Terminology."

Ken said he is happy to be rid of the 2012 date in bullet 10 and suggested more changes to alleviate the timeframe issue. He said the Board needs to say that starting work on the SWBG in 2017 will not work. Ken said that Jerry's background changes can be incorporated into the next piece of advice, but that the authors of the SWBG advice spent a lot of time creating the right flow for the document, and to change it now would be a disaster. Jeff said he supports the advice going forward and agrees with Ken's assessment

that the format should not be changed today. Jeff said the agency representatives who read the advice are used to the format and read according to what information they want first.

Maynard said his suggestion wasn't to move the background entirely, but to leave a few sentences at the front to keep the flow. He said the background can be summarized with its entirety sent to the back of the document. Maynard said he knows there is an interest to leave the background in the front for the public, but acknowledged that the agency representatives that will read the advice will not need the background. Dick said it is bad business practice to make a reader go seven pages into a document to get the information they need; it should be upfront. Jerry said the Board needs to consider who the advice is being sent to and the little amount of time they have to devote to reading advice. Jerry agreed that the format does not need to be changed until the next piece of advice.

Liz suggested keeping one page of the background before the advice and moving the Board comments to behind the advice. The Board agreed to Liz's suggestion, and the format was changed accordingly. After the format was changed, the Board made changes to the language of the advice to help create a better flow. Word changes were also made to better illustrate the intention of the advice.

The Board discussed the appropriate way to communicate their wishes for characterization, noting that total characterization is not possible. They discussed how to strengthen the language of why they care about the SWBG in order to substantiate the advice.

The advice was adopted.

### **Draft Advice: FY 2011-2013 Budget**

Gerry said Hanford is currently operating under a budget of \$2.2 billion, which may be cut by Congress. Gerry said the DOE is requesting a slight increase in funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2012. Gerry said there are important differences between the funding levels for DOE-ORP and DOE-RL. He said there will be an increase in the DOE-ORP budget due to the progression of the WTP, while there will be a reduction in funding for DOE-RL. Gerry noted that there will be a significant difference in spending between 2011 and 2012 due to the ending of ARRA funding; DOE-RL had more of the stimulus money, and therefore has a larger drop in funding for the next year.

Gerry said DOE has identified the level of funding they will need to continue projects in FY 2012 as \$2.9 billion, which is an increase of \$700 million. He said one major budget concern is that out of the proposed budget of \$972 million for DOE-RL, \$740 million of that is identified as basic maintenance costs. Gerry said the difference does not allow for any new cleanup work to occur. Gerry said this is worrying when there is much uncertainty over how to complete the unlined burial grounds, retrieve TRU waste, and complete demolition of the PFP. Gerry said stopping work for one year causes a three year delay, and the work won't start up again when the time period is over. Gerry said it is unreasonable to think that funding levels in FY 2013 will be any better.

Gerry said the advice for FY 2013 advises that DOE ask Congress for more money now because level funding will not allow projects to go forward, which will create more problems. Gerry said there needs to be a discussion about DOE-ORP placing a high priority on the WTP; He said he is concerned that its budget is no longer \$12.2 billion. Gerry noted that it is nice to see DOE-ORP has begun the early startup of LAW, which the Board has advised them earlier to do. Gerry thanked Jeff for the hours he spent reviewing the budget to identify which projects would suffer under the current DOE-RL budget proposal. Gerry noted that Jeff's work will be a great backup for making the case to DOE-HQ, Congress, and the region for why they should increase DOE-RL funding.

Gerry said the advice is broken into sections, first for the overarching site, and then specifically to the different field offices. Gerry clarified that the figures for what is being spent in FY 2011 does not include the ARRA funding. He noted that DOE-RL will be spending \$781 million in ARRA funding this year, and DOE-ORP will be spending \$164 million.

Jeff said it was difficult to tie the TPA milestones to the Analytical Building Blocks (ABB). Jeff said he wrote a majority of the DOE-RL discussion, yet having done that, he cannot support the advice going forward if there is any discussion on budget prioritization, which is present in the DOE-ORP background.

### *Agency Perspectives*

Paula thanked the Board for the advice and said DOE-RL appreciates it. She said whatever the Board submits will be sent to DOE-HQ as an attachment to DOE-RL's budget request. Paula said difficult choices have to be made in lean budget years, and said that Hanford is very lucky to have received the funding they have already been given. Paula said Hanford is in line with the rest of the DOE-EM complex to begin shipping waste in turns; one site will ship one year, another site will ship the next year. Paula noted that under the current budget, TRU waste retrieval will begin again in the latter half of 2013. She said DOE-RL shares the Board's desire to keep the momentum of the PFP demolition going.

Stacy said DOE-ORP is very fortunate to be receiving their requested budget. She said they requested funds for what they believe will be necessary for the inner barriers, for waste retrieval, and for the start of the WTP in 2019.

Dennis said everyone was optimistic that the momentum on site could be carried through to future years, but given the economic realities, the numbers are not there to support work for DOE-RL. He said the President's mark looks promising. Dennis said there will be tough decisions to make this summer.

Jane said Ecology had hoped to have a letter prepared on the budget, but it is not ready yet. Jane said Ecology continues with the same priorities they identified last year. She said Ecology believes DOE has taken a hard look which office receives more funding and Ecology is supportive of their decision. Jane said in this economic climate, to talk about reducing funding to give to someone else can be a very slippery slope. She noted that other states did not do as well as Hanford, and they want some of the money allocated to DOE-ORP and DOE-RL budgets. Jane said she thinks to show unhappiness with the budgets will give the government a reason to give it to someone more appreciative. Jane said TRU waste is a concern for the state, but she herself is not worried about; she knows starting and stopping a project is dangerous, but sometimes it is just the reality.

### *Board Discussion*

Larry said there are currently two mechanisms for the budgets at Hanford, base funding and the option of transferring money, which is similar to a pay as you go system. Larry said there appears to be a massive restructuring of the system with contractors moving their money from the base funding to the pay as you go side. Larry said he is concerned that more cost will be incurred because of the money going between contractors. Larry said that if the advice does not go forward, the Board will need additional information on the costs incurred from the transfers.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large and Board vice chair, asked if there is still time for the advice to affect the FY 2012 budget. He asked how quickly the advice needs to be finalized. Susan Leckband said DOE will submit it when they submit their budget requests to DOE-HQ in mid-April. Gerry said the FY 2012

budget will go in front of Congress and it is important to have the advice with the budget requests in order to stand regionally for an increase in Hanford funding. The audience for the advice is Congress.

Jerry said the advice is a long and actually provides three pieces of advice: one for the site, one for DOE-ORP, and one for DOE-RL. He suggested adding a statement at the beginning of the advice that illustrates the three types of advice so the reader does not get lost.

Pam said Hanford has long received the support of Congress, and in past years have had money restored when the President's budget falls short for Hanford. Pam said Congress is not in the position to help them this time. She said she agrees with Jane that Hanford fared well compared to other sites in the DOE-EM complex. Pam said the advice should not contain any negative language. She said the advice needs to be political and respectful and not demonstrate any malcontent. Pam said the Board cannot afford to damage the credibility of the Hanford work. Todd Martin, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), said using language about concern and appreciation does not give the advice the needed vigor.

The Board discussed reiterating their support of early startup of LAW in the advice. Stacy said the Board's comments about how DOE should not be preparing facilities goes against being supportive of the LAW startup, as the Integrated Disposal Facility needs to be funded now to support the startup of LAW in 2016.

Ken said that while the public is not the main audience for the advice, the Board still wants them to be able to understand it. He suggested scrubbing the advice for DOE's jargon. Ken asked if the upgrade in the pump-and-treat system for the K area will still be funded. Dennis confirmed that the increase to 900 gallons a minute is still funded and the work will continue. Dennis said there are not any problems with the groundwater remediation in the K area, but there are some problems with the soil. Jeff said the target date for the K area will not be met because the activities required will not be completed. Dennis said there are some related work suspensions tied to the K area but that is different from funding being halted. Dennis referenced target milestone T110 which is to stop the flow of chromium into the Columbia River by the end of 2012. Dennis said this work will be completed with ARRA funding by the project milestone and should therefore not be an issue for the FY 2013 budget.

Harold said there is disconnect between what the Board wants and how it is being said in the advice. Harold said that the Board is advising on what projects should be funded, but is also saying that they will not set DOE's priorities.

Keith said he agreed that the Board should be careful about how they word the advice. Keith said DOE needs to also be careful how they move money around, and advised them not to look for extra money in the minimum safe and infrastructure budgets. Keith said the advice says the Board is worried about life support funding, but is also advising money be scrubbed out of it to support projects. Keith said money does not go as far from a pool system as it does from a base system. Keith said infrastructure budgets have been cut before, and there were negative consequences that once resulted in him having to make his own tools to get projects done on site. Keith said that most fatalities at Hanford have been from skimping on infrastructure. Keith does not want public safety or the mission to be compromised. Jeff said the advice talks about certain projects that are being suspended or put on life support in hopes of funding one day.

The Board discussed the use of technology dollars to research and analyze alternatives to vitrification and whether or not the Board needs to provide advice in addition to advice on the issue from the past. Stacy said the TPA has confusing language on the requirements for vitrification that is interpreted differently by the different agencies. Jane said the state has reservations about alternatives to vitrification that are not

supported by technology dollars. Ken asked if the TPA says DOE will investigate alternatives to vitrification. Stacy said the TPA says DOE will make a decision on how to reach supplemental needs but does not specifically address alternatives analysis. Gerry said vitrification is the legally required treatment and baseline funding should not be cut to support alternatives analysis.

Stacy explained how the \$50 million allotted for technology development in this fiscal year is divided. Half of the budget is used for baseline development that has already been identified, such as development for single shell tanks, and technology to better monitor leaks in the deep vadose zone. Stacy said the other half of the funding goes toward researching paths forward for steam reforming and next generation filter systems. She said these items are not specifically identified in baseline needs.

The Board decided to remove the advice addressing alternatives analysis, as it was not pertinent to the main goal of receiving more funding.

Liz said it is important for the figures represented in the advice to be accurate and to be consistent with the numbers DOE-ORP and DOE-RL are requesting from DOE-HQ and Congress. Liz said it is confusing to not list how ARRA funding affects the FY 2011 figures. Liz suggested including the calculation for how the Board arrived at the numbers they are presenting, in case the document is source checked. Paula said the advice reflects the correct numbers that are used in the budget request, but the figures vary because of the separation of safeguards and security requests; there is a difference of \$69 million. Gerry said some DOE-RL staff objected to the \$69 million being included.

The Board discussed how to appropriately note that they are appreciative of the funding being given to the site, while still asking for more money. Pam said the background section provides the appropriate place for the Board to mention their appreciation while noting that there is work required of the TPA that cannot be funded at the proposed budget levels. Gerry said the advice is supposed to emphasize the shortfall in the budget while pointing out that the Board is concerned about stunted projects as well as compliance levels.

The Board discussed how to include references to the figures generated in the ABB. Jeff said the titles for the sections of the ABB are complicated. The correct ABB and milestone references were added to the figure information and advice sections.

Liz expressed concern over the different perspective on what minimum safe means. She said it is important to make a distinction on what the Board means by minimum safe before providing advice on it. Gerry said the advice asks for minimum safe to be explained because the different definitions can mean a world of difference to the budget. Dick said there was once a budget presentation on what minimum safe means that could be used to clarify for the Board.

The Board discussed removing the reference to funding for U Canyon in the advice. Pam said that while it was nice to see the buildings come down in the canyon, it will not look good for Hanford if more funding is requested to rid the skyline of the remaining buildings. Pam said the U Canyon does not pose any risk and is not one of the true issues the Board and the Hanford Communities are concerned about, like TRU waste and the PFP. Jeff said the reference to U Canyon should remain in the advice as it is another example of what will not be funded in the proposed budgets.

Doug suggested that the advice should ask DOE to give justification for the shortfalls of the budget. Doug said DOE should explain what their obligations are and what funding is required to meet them, what funding they are requesting for those obligations, and what the consequences of the budget shortfalls are. Pam said she agrees with Doug's comments, but that they should be addressed in different advice or in a

different avenue. Dick said the explanation Doug described would make it easier to understand why DOE made the decisions they did.

The Board discussed the format of the advice and how the background and Board concerns should be incorporated to maximize the effect of the advice. Jerry suggested that advice points be numbered so respondents can better reference which specific bullet they are addressing. Susan Leckband said the advice is not numbered because it might infer priority.

Stacy spoke to the DOE-ORP system plan and said the proposed DOE-ORP budget does not allow for new tanks to be developed. Ken suggested that if DOE-ORP builds blending tanks, they could use the tanks both for blending waste and for retrieval from single shell tanks, which would give the new tanks a double use and provide a way for waste retrieval to continue. Ken suggested DOE-ORP should identify their blending needs and figure out how to use those tanks for retrieval. Susan Leckband suggested Ken's idea be sent to TWC to develop as a new policy topic.

Jerry asked if there are storage tanks that will feed the WTP that can also be used for single shell tank waste. Jerry suggested that the above ground tanks at the WTP be used to get single shell tank waste out of the ground and ready for vitrification. John said Stacy's presentation spoke to creating a waste feeding system before 2018, therefore, the Board has time to create policy or advice on what that feeding system should cover.

The Board discussed leaving the advice on systems plan in the document. Ken and Jerry's ideas on the DOE-ORP system plans will be sent to committee to develop a new policy.

The advice was adopted.

### **Debrief the State of the Site Meetings**

Steve said that due to lack of time, the debrief will now be held during the next PIC meeting to be held in the afternoon on April 14, in the Federal building, room 152. Steve asked that Board members email him with comments on State of the Site meeting strengths, weaknesses, appropriate changes, and differences between the meetings.

Steve commended the efforts of Dieter Bohrmann (Ecology), Emy Laija (EPA), and Sharon Braswell (Mission Support Alliance), for making sure everyone in attendance at the meeting found the information they were looking for. Steve also thanked Todd Martin for doing an excellent job as meeting facilitator, and Earl and Ken, who answered some very difficult questions and handled them well. Steve said the whole meeting was very well done. He noted that Todd will participate in the PIC meeting debrief via webinar.

### **Board Business**

Susan Hayman said the Hanford Advisory Board Annual Report is complete and is available at the back of the room and in the Richland EnviroIssues office. Susan thanked Board members who commented on the report before publication.

Susan said the leadership retreat is now set for April 27 and 28 at the Oxford Suites on the River in Yakima. She said it is an accessible location for all retreat participants.

Susan said she will send out a reminder for the Board and agencies to complete their evaluations. Susan reviewed the HAB calendar, noting the committee meetings in April, including the April 13 RAP meeting and April 14 HSEP tank tour. Keith said other Board members are invited to participate in the tour, and an agenda for the tour will be distributed soon. Stacy said the bus will hold 23 people for the tour. Cathy will help get out the information about the tour.

Susan also mentioned the April 14 PIC meeting, noting that the committee schedule will be distributed in the HAB events-at-a-glance email.

Susan said she had some concerns about the committee week to be held July 5-7, noting that Monday is the 4<sup>th</sup> of July Holiday, and Friday is the DOE alternative work schedule day off—it may be hard for people to participate. Susan Leckband asked the Board to seriously consider cancelling the July committee week. She asked that Board members and agency representatives rearrange their committee schedules in order to provide the Board with a well-deserved break.

Susan Leckband led a round of applause for the re-elected committee chairs, noting that all leadership remained the same as the previous year.

Susan Hayman reviewed the June meeting topics, including:

- RCBRA draft advice
- Budget draft advice
- System Plans draft advice
- 3 SSAB letters seeking Board approval (tentative)
- Life Cycle Cost and Schedule draft advice (tentative)
- PW 1/3/6 draft advice (tentative)
- Board priorities from the leadership retreat
- Other information from the leadership retreat
- Presentation on Board evaluations (from the agencies and Board members)
- Review proposed Board calendar for fiscal year 2012
- Advice protocols
- Regular program updates and committee reports
- State of the Site Sounding Board

Shelley asked about the placeholder for a June 30 Committee of the Whole (COTW) meeting. Jeff said he is concerned about not having a COTW because of the timing of the decision on the closure of C-farm. Susan Leckband said there is nothing scheduled at this time, and the EIC has been instructed to bring potential topics for a COTW to the leadership retreat. Cathy said the C-farm issue is on the agenda for the May TWC meeting and will not yet be brought to the full Board. Jeff said he would like the Board to know the current plan for the closure of C-farm is to cap it, which will be a landfill closure. He said the decision is fine with him but he wants the Board to be aware of what decisions are being made. John Price, EPA, said he has objections to Jeff claiming a decision for C-farm has already been made. John said the State of Washington still believes that decision to be in the future, even if DOE-ORP has made some planning assumptions. He said the decision cannot be made until the EIS is finalized. John said he thought the issue going to TWC in May is a good idea.

Dick said a study on tank removal is available on the DOE website. He said the study is on high-level, conceptual ideas, not solutions, but would be a good read for Board members.

Pamela said the tank closure website features plans and tank integrity reports, as DOE is trying to address the Board's concerns with tank closure issues. Pamela said DOE is aware there are tank farm issues and is beginning to go down the path of solving them.

Keith said Susan Hayman will provide a link to the latest version of the Open Office Suite, noting that some people are having problems opening documents with their older versions of Word. He said the new version is free to download and will open and generate documents in the latest format.

### **Public Comment**

Marilyn Dunston, of Burien, Washington said she is awed by the amount of content and material that is discussed at Board meetings. Marilyn asked about the online availability of what is being done with budget issues. She said she would like to see how DOE and the Board are working with the budgets. Marilyn said she is also interested in mathematical modeling for pollutants publicly available. Marilyn specifically mentioned tank leakage pollutants, how quickly the pollutants progress downward into the soil and groundwater, whether there is stress testing, and what the expected concentration of the pollutants will be. Marilyn said she would like to know how the mathematical modeling and the actual numbers compare.

Stacy Charbonneau said DOE-ORP is currently looking into how to make modeling data available to the public, noting that most of the modeling and demonstrations are available in the TC&WM EIS, which is a 7,000 page document. Stacy said Pamela will provide information on how to access the document.

Earl addressed US monitoring of nuclear material from Japan. He said there are 12 air samplers in the Hanford area, as well as nationwide EPA samplers of radioactive material that take samples every day. Earl said this information is available for the general public. Earl said anyone can sign up for an account to view data at [www.epa.gov/cdx](http://www.epa.gov/cdx). Earl said the Department of Health website posts daily averages of radiation, as well as historic averages and other information. Earl said the Department of Health is working with Energy Northwest to look for iodine in rainwater; he said their system for testing is extensive. Earl noted the recent finding of iodine in milk in Spokane. He said samples are taken from Tacoma and Spokane twice a year, but the spring sample date was pushed up due to events in Japan. Earl said there are four EPA monitoring stations in the state of Washington: Seattle, Olympia, Richland, and Spokane.

Marilyn asked the Board and DOE if there is any consideration to privatize gain and subsidize risk and loss for the site and site contractors, noting that some companies have suffered financially from the nuclear crisis in Japan that was a result of the recent earthquake.

Stacy said DOE-ORP works closely with the contractors at Hanford, noting that because it is a small community at Hanford, there are always talks about profits, fees, etc. Stacy said the profit margin for contractors working in high hazard areas is not high since the contractors work at cost plus. Stacy said that the contractor and DOE determine how much it will cost to do the work, and the contractors frequently provide bids lower than what DOE estimated; the contractors save the government money.

Marilyn provided some suggestions about how to clarify DOE-RL cleanup descriptions for the general public, noting that trying to keep track of all of the locations has been extremely hard. She suggested adding a column for each location for a description and the pollutants present in the area. She also suggested adding a qualitative list of risk in order to give the public a relative magnitude of risk profiles.

Gerry provided public comment on behalf of Heart of America Northwest. He mentioned an article printed in the *Tri-City Herald* and the *Seattle Times* that reported Heart of America Northwest had filed a

lawsuit under the Public Records Act to view redacted documents from Energy Northwest concerning the use of the 300 Area facility. Gerry said Energy Northwest was in discussions with the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNL) for over two years about using the 300 Area facility for the reprocessing of test rods, an activity that would create more nuclear waste. Gerry said this discussion points to the reason the facility in the 300 Area has not been taken down as of yet. Gerry said there are DOE documents that say the activity would create an island of contamination in the center of the 300 Area. Gerry noted his disappointment in learning about the situation in redacted documents from Energy Northwest. Gerry said it will be important for the Board to follow this issue and hear from DOE about it. He said one of the important concerns about this issue is that there aren't any plans for an environmental review of the activity. Gerry said there is a disturbing secrecy about this issue, and noted the *Seattle Times* article that described DOE staff emails saying this issue should be kept quiet and away from the media.

John Howieson, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility and retired oncologist, said he was first involved with Hanford in 1957 when he was a physician for the armed forces in a special unit for people who may be able to mitigate the effects of a nuclear attack. He said he was glad to be at the Board meeting and he is impressed by the level of Board members' expertise.

### **Closing Remarks**

Susan Leckband said the video, *The Area: a Journey through the Hanford Nuclear Reservation*, will be put on the agenda for the next Board meeting. Cameron said the video will be streamed online in May, noting that it hasn't been put online yet so the Board and participants in State of the Site meetings could see it first.

The meeting was adjourned.

**Attendees**

**HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**

Tom Carpenter, Member	Jerry Peltier, Member	Dirk Dunning, Alternate
Earl Fordham, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Member	Dale Engstrom, Alternate (phone)
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Laura Hansas, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Mike Priddy, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	Dan Serres, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate
Rick Jansons, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Lyle Smith, Member	Liz Mattson, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Mecal Samkow, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Dick Smith, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Eugene Van Liew, Member	John Stanfill, Alternate,
Todd Martin, Member		Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Doug Mercer, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Ken Niles, Member	Sam Dechter, Alternate	
Bob Parks, Member		

**AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF**

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Doug Hildebrand, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues
Cameron Salony, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
		Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues
Stacy Charboneau, DOE-ORP	Sharon Braswell, MSA	
Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Dru Butler, MSA	Darby Johnson, Integrated Work
	Barb Wise, MSA	
Dennis Faulk, EPA		
Emy Laija, EPA		

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Sabine Hilding, Alliance for Democracy/Hanford Watch	Nancy Murray
Marilyn Dunston, Marilyn Dunston Photography	John Howieson, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility	David Rosafeld, Free Speech Radio News