

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

June 2-3, 2011

Kennewick, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary 1
Welcome, introductions, and announcements 3
Confirm March meeting summary adoption..... 4
Draft Advice: System Plan, Revision 6 4
Draft Advice: River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment..... 8
Draft Advice: PW-1/3/6 and CW-5 Operable Units 11
Draft Advice: Greater than Class C Waste Environmental Impact Statement 13
Draft Letter: Hanford Site-Wide Permit 16
Program Update – Tri-Party Agreement Agencies 17
Committee Reports 22
Board Business..... 25
Public Comment..... 29

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 four pieces of advice and one letter concerning:

- System Plan, Revision 6
- River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment
- PW-1/3/6 and CW-5 Operable Units
- Greater than Class C Waste Environmental Impact Statement
- Hanford Site-Wide Permit (letter)

Board business

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

- September Board meeting topics
- Advice for the September Board meeting

Presentations and updates

The Board heard and discussed presentations on the following topics:

- Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Program Update
- Board budget (FY 2011 and FY 2012)
- Board self-evaluation and agency evaluation
- Proposed revisions to the HAB Process Manual

Public comment

No comments were provided.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
June 2-3, 2011 Kennewick, WA

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

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

Four seats were not represented: Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), and Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Ex-Officio).

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

Welcome, introductions, and announcements

Susan Leckband welcomed Board members and introduced the items to be discussed during the meeting. Susan said a get-well card is available at the back table for Tony James, who continues to experience poor health. She said the Board hopes Tony will be able to rejoin them soon, and she will provide updates on his health when they are available. Mecal Samkow, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), reported that fellow Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board member Maxine Hines is recovering from an illness due to the success of alternative treatments, and she is happy to discuss her recovery process with Board members.

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, reviewed Board ground rules and noted the change in the Board agenda. She said many Board members have said it is hard to participate in rigorous advice discussions later in the afternoon, so advice has been moved to the morning, with updates and reports in the afternoon.

Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), introduced the nominees for the Non-Union/Non-Management Hanford Employees seat on the Board; Rampur S. Viswanath (Washington River Protection Solutions), will occupy the primary seat, and Lynn R. Davison (CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company), will be the alternate. She said they were chosen from 14 applicants. The nominees' paperwork being processed by the Department of Energy (DOE), but they will begin to actively participate in the Board very soon. Susan Leckband welcomed the nominees and said the Board looks forward to their participation. She said a HAB orientation will be held next Thursday, June 9 at the Richland Federal Building; all Board members are welcome.

Nick Ceto, DOE-Richland Field Office (DOE-RL), announced that June 2 will mark his last day with the Board, as he will soon be retiring. Nick said he has served the federal government for 34 years. Susan Leckband thanked Nick for his service to the Board.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large and Board vice-chair, shared a video that he believes depicts the Board's consensus process. The video shows a family of ducks who begin a walk together, get blown about by the wind, but end their walk together again. Bob says it can be hard to get all of the interests to agree on what the Board does, but that in the end, the Board members work very well together and produce great work.

Susan Leckband thanked Board members for their commitment to Hanford issues, noting that it consumes many volunteer hours, and that local members are not reimbursed for gas or meals. She said it is obvious the members are very passionate about Hanford cleanup and citizens of the Northwest.

Confirm March meeting summary adoption

DOE-RL submitted changes to the March meeting summary. It was finalized and adopted over email within the operating ground rules requirement of 45-days following the meeting.

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

Draft Advice: System Plan, Revision 6

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), introduced the advice and said it is a product of many meetings between issue managers and System Plan managers from the DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) and Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). Dick thanked the system plan managers for meeting with the Tank Waste Committee issue managers over the past six months to explain and discuss the complex document. He said the advice is a record of all the issues the TWC have expressed to the system plan managers about what should be incorporated into the document.

Agency Perspective

Tom Fletcher, DOE-ORP, said he agrees that the advice is a product of a collaborative effort. He clarified a few of the advice points that address modeling contamination rather than modeling waste; the System Plan addresses modeling waste, not contamination. Tom said radionuclides as addressed in the last bullet on the first page of the advice are also not addressed in the System Plan. He said he will continue to work openly and honestly with the TWC and the Board as the agencies get ready to frame System Plan, Revision 7.

Dan McDonald, Ecology, said System Plan, Revision 6 scenarios are mostly put into place; it may be past the point to effect much change with adopting the current advice. He said the Board can continue to provide comments for this revision and for the framing of Revision 7 beginning in July. He said he agrees with Tom that some of the advice is below the process throughput, but that those can be addressed after the meeting. Dan said the advice is generally appropriate, and the agencies will continue to keep the Board in the loop.

Dennis Faulk, EPA, complimented the authors of the advice, noting the style and clarity. Dennis clarified that EPA is not involved in the System Plan, so it may not be appropriate to refer to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies in the advice as appropriate. He said they would still like to receive a copy of the advice, but that the Board should not plan on receiving a formal response from EPA.

Discussion

Susan Leckband asked the agencies for a high-level explanation of the purpose of the System Plan. She asked them to clarify if it is a living document that is updated every year. Tom said it is a high-level process flow document that allows the agencies to track how they get to various completion stages of the tank retrieval and processing activities. He said it is a computer model that tracks what is going on in the

tanks, for example, and follows the process from retrieval to glass production. He said the plan is updated annually based on new assumptions. Tom said the baseline case is the focus for this year, with an addition of nine cases to help understand the impacts to the rest of the system, for example, should the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) be delayed for two years. Tom said they run three scenarios per year for Ecology.

Bob asked if the advice should be sent to DOE in order to impact Revision 7, rather than Revision 6, given what Dan said about there being little room for impact on Revision 6 at this point. Tom said the advice will be taken into consideration for Revision 7, as draft results and scenarios are already being reviewed for Revision 6. He said most of the information provided in the advice can be used for system plans as a whole, while some will relate specifically to Revision 7. Nick said Ecology and DOE agreed to use Board Advice #238 as they go forward with any new system plan. He said they have changed the way Ecology and DOE work together in order to gain cohesion, integrity of purpose, consistency, and flow for all plans going forward.

Dick commented on a few of the operational issues included in the advice, noting that some of the operational and system approaches for issues like technetium-99 are not included in the System Plan, which he believes should be. He said success criteria are currently measured by completion date, but that alternative treatments within the system are not addressed, particularly in terms of contaminants with long-lives. Dick said the Board would like those items out of the local disposal sites, and be processed into a high-level immobilization stream. Dick said these items are not considered by the TWC to be operational concerns, but system concerns. He said that to be a true system study, project costs and operational considerations need to be incorporated in order to look at the system as a whole. Dick said the agencies are moving in that direction, but the Board wishes they would move sooner.

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government), said the System Plan is a cradle to grave plan. He noted that Revision 6 still refers to the high-level waste repository as a destination. Jerry asked if the agencies consider alternatives for destinations now that the repository in question no longer exists. Tom said that sometime in the future, the high-level waste in interim storage on site will have to go to a national repository, even though one currently is not identified. He said a national repository will exist in the future. Jerry said he has not heard any discussions about identifying a new repository site since Yucca Mountain was eliminated. He said he believes the agencies and the Board cannot assume there will be a national repository. Pam Larson, City of Richland (Local Government), said that because a national repository has not been identified yet, DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) will be speaking with communities about possibilities of interim storage this year.

Jean Vanni, Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), asked if the intent of the advice is to ask DOE and Ecology to include an operations plan for the WTP in the system plan. Dick said that is how the system is currently configured, it does not include considerations for long-life isotopes. He said the proposed managing system identifies that Lockheed Martin Energy Technology Services will deal with the isotopes but they still do not know if or how it will work. He said there are operations in place to recover the isotopes in varying quantities yet the Board does not know of its disposition. Dick said he would like to see the isotopes go to the WTP rather than a hole in the ground. Dick said the advice asks DOE and Ecology to deal with these issues properly. Tom said they do not anticipate a significant volume of long-life isotopes going to the Effluent Treatment Facility. He said that those issues will be addressed, but in a different process. He said he understands what the advice is asking for, and he will respond appropriately.

Jean asked why new assumptions are made every year and if there will ever be a point for a final set of assumptions that will allow DOE and Ecology to put a System Plan package together so they know how to operate year after year. Tom said the System Plan is not the correct tool for guiding operations, but that the guides will come from procedures and the commissioning phases. He said the System Plan is purely a model to help them meet the end of retrieval and processing waste by 2047; it shows throughput of the

end of that timeframe based on the availability of the WTP, but does not address the actual throughput of the WTP. Tom said the assumption changes are minor, for example, the removal of aluminum from the baseline case. He said some assumptions may be eliminated, but that there is not a completely new set of assumptions every year. He said the System Plan is truly a living document that assists the agencies in addressing complex issues as they arise and if they will meet the end of the mission.

Jean asked how many System Plans there will end up being. Tom said the plans will go on forever, even through operations of WTP. He said the Savannah River Site is working through their System Plan, Revision 17, and they have been running their waste treatment facility for 15 years.

Dan said one of the scenarios in the System Plan addresses increasing or decreasing throughput as it relates to the baseline, for example, what does a 10 percent increase or decrease do to the end date and what systems would be needed to accommodate that. He said there is a need to reduce the mission life but they need to identify what that does to the other systems. Dan said he would like to address the treatment of isotopes, noting that anything that comes out of the burial grounds or groundwater is considered 100 percent treated once the first protocols are completed and taking the waste to the WTP after that would be redundant.

Dick asked what form the waste is in after it is properly treated. Nick said anything that comes out of the facility has to meet waste acceptance criteria. He said the form depends on waste streams from the plants.

Dick said he sees a problem with loading technetium into the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) in the future as they may not be able to accept it. He said waste is currently being immobilized so it cannot be released into the environment, but that is only compounding the problem. He said the agencies should consider mobilizing the waste into glass so that it will be completely removed from f Hanford. Dennis said the agencies will come to the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) meeting to discuss actual resins. He said there needs to be a more accurate assessment, and he is glad to share it.

Mecal said careful modeling is needed to track and predict how small changes can impact the end goal and other relationships. She said modeling is valuable and objective. Mecal said she did not see in the System Plan that modeling addresses waste streams and not contaminants. She said the advice should include that the System Plan needs to include tracking of specific contaminants.

Pam asked the agencies where they are in regards to the Lifecycle Cost and Schedule Report analysis. Tom said System Plan, Revision 4 is included in the Lifecycle Cost and Schedule Report because are no significant changes between Revisions 4 and 5. He said the next Life Cycle Cost model will include Revision 6 and the baseline assumptions that accompany it. He said a handout is on the back table that provides a high-level look at how the system plans work with the baseline, which is an output to the Lifecycle Cost model that is being developed for the entire Hanford Site.

Doug Mercer, University of Washington (University), asked if the advice should distinguish between a site system plan and a national system plan since the Board does not know what will happen with the national repository in the long term. He asked if there are implications to this advice if there is no national repository for ultimate disposal. Doug said they might want to include a caveat should Hanford have to consider retaining high-level waste for the long term. Pam said she does not think the Board should go that route, as it is her understanding that high-level glass will eventually be made at Hanford, as the Savannah River Site has been producing it for years under the current criteria. She said national efforts do not affect the Hanford System Plan but that the Board and agencies need to be aware of national efforts that are going on.

Mecal said the advice is asking the agencies to simulate operations for all kinds of waste; it is not asking them to commit to any action. She said they would like to see the whole range of possibilities and the most refined way to treat the waste. She said the most refined waste will go to the national repository.

Dan said he believes the biggest issue is where the high-level waste will be stored in the end. He said the Board needs to recognize that the national repository is not a question of if, but of where, when, and how deep. He said high-level waste has to be accommodated no matter where it is, and that Hanford is accommodating it on an interim basis one way or another.

Doug said the high-level glass is designed to go into a national repository and asked if DOE would treat the waste differently if it were not going to a repository. Tom said the baseline is how the agencies will move forward, and the Board needs to focus on the baseline case because if anything is changed, it will be in the baseline case. He said other scenarios are put through a sensitivity analysis should one of the cases become true.

Dick said that alternative analyses, from a total system point of view, should include cost analysis, almost to the degree of a lifecycle cost. He said the agencies will not know which scenario costs more, making it a big consideration when planning the whole system. He said a system plan is poorly done if it does not make specifications or identify uncertainties. He said the agencies need to know more about scenarios or changes to make it feasible. Tom said he understands Dick's concerns about cost, and that they will be addressed in the magnitude cost that is already included in the document. He said the Lifecycle Cost Model is not included in Revision 6, but will be included in the Revision 7 that comes out in October.

Mecal asked if the agencies have schedules for future system plans and if they will be able to include costs in Revision 8. Tom said cost is already included through the baseline, which adds magnitude costs as new activities are included in the scenarios. He said the Life Cycle Cost Model is bigger than the System Plan, and that there will always be disconnect between the two.

Dirk Dunning, Oregon DOE (State of Oregon), said he is pleased with the discussion but believes there is a confusion of issues and non-issues as they relate to running the WTP. He said the advice is to address concerns with waste put into waste streams that will be buried locally; he said this drives the long-term risk. He said long-activity waste should be retrieved and put into the waste stream to go to the national repository, and the advice is encouraging the agencies to do so. Dirk addressed the contaminant carbon-14, noting that presently it looks like it is being routed into the atmosphere, which is a bad idea.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco (Local Government), said there is not a proven technology able to remove carbon-14. He said carbon is released from the equipment used in the WTP to make glass, and that it goes through a number of systems before it is converted in carbon dioxide. He said it is a process of putting an organic molecule into its basic form, noting that he is unaware of a technology that can separate carbon-14 from other carbons. He said he thinks the advice should not be too contaminant specific. Dirk said he wanted carbon-14 identified because it has not been identified in any other system plan. The Board agreed to change the reference of carbon-14 as reflected in the final incorporated of the final advice.

Rob said the idea behind the System Plan is to provide ideas and placeholders for certain scenarios in order to provide comparison for other ideas. He said it is important for the agencies to include unrealistic and 'do-nothing' options in order to have something to compare with the realistic options. Rob asked for the advice bullet asking for only realistic alternatives to be removed. Dick said the bullet addressed the tendency of DOE to include alternatives that are developed from un-proven technologies; the Board is asking them not to do so. The Board discussed changes to the advice language addressing what kind of alternatives to include in the System Plan; proven technologies should not be on a level field with unproven technologies, but unproven technologies are needed to find new alternatives for treatment of

waste. The Board does not want to eliminate new research, but does not want unidentified cure-alls to be included as realistic treatments or alternatives.

The Board made minor language changes to the advice. The advice was adopted.

Draft Advice: River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment

Dale Engstrom, Oregon DOE/Department of Water Resources (State of Oregon), introduced the advice as having originated quite a while ago. He said it has come before the Board before, as well as RAP many times. He said the advice addresses the risk assessment underway for the River Corridor, which will affect the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) of the River Corridor for years to come. Dale said the advice is coming forward because RAP believes some areas of the risk assessment are not being addressed as they should, which is a problem because the risk assessment informs work plans that go toward the final record of decision (ROD) for River Corridor cleanup. Dale said this advice has the potential to change how future risk assessments are done, and that even if it doesn't affect the outcome of the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA), it is still important for the Board's comments and concerns to be heard.

Agency Perspective

Nick said that after reading the advice carefully, it is obvious that the agencies have a hard time communicating with the Board on this issue. He said the agencies need to work on risk communication with the Board. He said there are those that would like to see the agencies take a more pragmatic approach to risk, while others would like to see them be more conservative. Nick said DOE will respond to the advice appropriately and will try to address the Board's concerns with RCBRA. He said the advice will be helpful moving forward.

Dennis noted what a long journey it has been to complete this advice, and said that it is much clearer and sharper than it has been in other drafts. Dennis made suggestions for clarifying language, noting that the advice will have an impact on river cleanup, if not the actual risk assessment document. Dennis said he doesn't understand the attachment of appendixes to pieces of advice. Susan Leckband said the appendix is included in this case because of the good fundamental work that identified the genesis of the advice, noting this work was too much to include in the advice background information but too important to leave out. Dennis suggested a transition paragraph explaining why the appendix is needed.

Discussion

Jerry said the Board made some comments on a previous draft of the RCBRA that have not been incorporated as they should have been. Jerry asked what the intent of the advice is, whether DOE will go back to the risk assessment and include the comments, add them as a supplement, or add them to a new document. He said the advice is very good but he doesn't know where it fits in the process. Dennis said some of his suggestions addresses that the Board would like to affect the RI/FS process, which the risk assessment is a part of. He said he reads the advice as being at a policy level. He said the agencies will look at their upcoming deliverables and see how they can incorporate the advice. Dennis said these documents are hard to understand and reiterated that the agencies have not done a good job communicating risk. Dale said the intent of the advice is to inform the next risk assessment process and comment that the RCBRA could have been done better. Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), said he disagrees and that the risk assessment should be reopened. He suggested the advice ask the agencies to revise the risk assessment without slowing down the first RI/FS.

Nick said DOE will make some revisions to RCBRA, which will be finalized through the RI/FS deliverable to the regulators. He said they will make changes to the risk characterization in order to clarify communication problems. He said it is important that the risk assessment inform cleanup goals, and it is his understanding that Washington State Model Toxic Control Act (MCTA) unrestricted cleanup goals and cancer risk calculations will be used for the River Corridor, noting that groundwater will be restored to drinking water standards, and river water will be restored to ambient water quality. Nick said he believes the agencies and the Board are on the same page concerning groundwater and river water. He said he appreciates what the Board is saying about better risk communication.

Jean said the advice is very good and has gone through considerable committee discussion. She said all concerns are valuable, but that the advice needs to go forward in order to inform future risk assessments. She said she thinks everyone knows the agencies can't go back in the process, and she doesn't want them to leave with the wrong impression of what the Board is asking for. She said the timing and difficulty of the assessment is what led to the advice being after the fact. She said the Board wants to make sure the next risk assessment is complete, and the advice informs future decision making.

Doug asked if the Board has the same expectations for an integrated risk assessment as it does for a risk assessment of a smaller area. He said he thinks the expectations should be different. He said an integrated risk assessment may not be as useful as a predictive tool. Doug asked if there is a more coherent way to help improve the communication between the agencies and the Board. Dale said the advice point concerning risk communication addresses the fact that the Board has members who are good at understanding and communicating risk and can help the agencies communicate with the public. He said they are also asking for an integrated package of how risk is being put together. Susan Leckband suggested Doug take his questions to the next RAP meeting.

Dennis clarified that the RCBRA will contain three components: groundwater, ecological, and human health. He said the Board is trying to articulate that those components should come together at one time into an integrated risk assessment.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), suggested that the advice should say the Board suggests policy level changes, rather than changes to RCBRA. Gerry said DOE has said they will already be making changes so there is no reason not to ask for changes the Board would like to see. He said there needs to be a compromise, as the Board's concerns address fundamental policy issues for cleanup of the River Corridor. He said the Board has concerns about the groundwater screening level in the risk assessment, and they don't know what level the groundwater will be cleaned up to. Nick said there are factual inaccuracies in the risk assessment that they will address, and they only used screening levels for groundwater in the first assessment because they knew more data was on the way that would be changed in the RI/FS. Gerry said he didn't understand why policy level changes could not be made in addition to the inaccuracy revisions. Nick said he thinks Maynard's language suggestions are correct, and that while DOE will not reissue the assessment for public comment, they will make changes based on suggestions from the Board, regulators, and tribes before the RI/FS.

Gerry said he thinks DOE never had the intention of allowing public dialogue on the risk assessment, as it was put out for public comment at a time where DOE believed any changes would slow down the TPA milestones. He said the advice is for making changes without affecting the release of the RI/FS. Gerry said DOE has been saying what an important document this is for public dialogue but isn't allowing it. He said the Board is putting that frustration aside in its advice in order to make sure the process isn't slowed.

Jerry said RCBRA is a required document and the Board needs to tell DOE to revise it. He said there is no reason to believe that any document written will be perfect and shouldn't be revised, even if the

authors are qualified engineers. He said the Board's changes should be incorporated with a public hearing on what changes were made; no additional public comment is needed as the Board represents the public. He said it is a simpler process than what Nick is implying. He said it is impractical to put out a document and believe it will be perfect for eternity.

The Board agreed to change their advice to say the Board advises DOE to include their comments while revising the document, apply changes to the RI/FS process, and include the policy suggestions to future risk assessments.

Dick said the fundamental problem was in the omission of information in the first RCBRA and that he hopes DOE would address that with or without the Board's advice. He asked why a document should be revised if it is not going to be reissued. Nick said the risk assessment will be reissued as an appendix to the RI/FS report, but not necessarily as a standalone document. He said it is a supporting document for the RI/FS. Nick said DOE is willing to send the Board a copy of the updated RCBRA to demonstrate how their concerns have been incorporated once it is complete. Nick noted that DOE received good comments from the public when they issued the RCBRA.

Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, spoke to advice point three and the separation of groundwater from river water. Mike believes they are the same thing when it comes to the River Corridor, and the advice point is over simplified. Mike said the boundary of the Columbia River should be defined, whether it's the river bank or where the water reaches underground soil. Mike said the river water reaches a deep, sandy soil and has a big impact. He said the definition may need to come in another piece of advice that defines the underground boundary of the Columbia River and investigates the effect. Mike said that comparatively, groundwater has a much slower flow than river water. Dennis said he doesn't disagree with Mike, and that DOE is cleaning the River Corridor for contaminants from Hanford that aren't very present in the river system. He said whether or not someone can drink the river water in the future has yet to be determined, but it's not potable because it's river water. Dennis said river water has a huge influence on groundwater and drinking standards. Nick said there is a conceptual model in the RI/FS process that describes the interaction between river and groundwater. He said DOE needs to make sure groundwater meets drinking standards and meets aquatic standards as it hits the river. Mike said there are many complications for measuring water standards, and he would like to see it brought up in the future.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), said asking DOE to cleanup to pre-existing conditions is a larger issue than asking them to cleanup for things resulting from Hanford. Harold said Hanford dollars should not be used to clean up other issues, like arsenic in the soil that is unrelated to Hanford. Harold said other regulatory processes are available if the agencies think the pre-existing material needs to be cleaned up. Dale said arsenic is a delicate issue for Hanford, as it was present in the soil when they acquired the land, and they are therefore liable for it. He said Hanford processed the arsenic and used it in a number of different places. Dale thinks the Hanford Arsenic Operations should at least determine how much arsenic is present and what will be done with it. Dennis said he is okay with addressing the arsenic issue because they will have to do it anyway, just as they have to cleanup some waste sites in the old Hanford orchards. He said in waste sites where there's wide spread contamination, there may be different cleanup levels. He said they will evaluate and address the arsenic, but that doesn't mean they will clean it up.

The Board discussed the inclusion of other contaminants from pre-Hanford activities in the advice, but decided to only address Hanford materials and contaminants as they are addressed in the RCBRA.

Mecal voiced her support for advice point eight, noting that if risk is calculated based on cancer statistics and calculations, what natives consider a real risk won't be captured. She said involving more of the public throughout the risk assessment and RI/FS process will help the agencies to understand the real

value and humanize the issue. Mecal said risk is elusive because it is relative and relevant. She said she supports what Dale said about the Board members who can help in risk communication with the public, and she hopes the agencies will use those resources as much as possible.

The Board discussed whether or not the agencies should re-calculate their risk data before producing the RI/FS and work plans. They said they thought the data was collected inappropriately, the agencies should have used different calculations in the first place, and the Board hopes they will do better in the future. Nick said there is an uncertainty associated with how samples are collected and RCBRA talks about the implications it has with calculating cleanup. He said they will not be doing a lot of re-calculating of risk and will not do more work. The Board decided the advice should ask the agencies to move forward appropriately without re-calculating data in RCBRA.

Pam complimented Dale for leading the effort in getting this advice through committee and to the Board. She said the analyses are what make the decisions for the future, and it is very complicated. She said that when these documents go to the public, the Board and the agencies will have a huge challenge to accurately present the documents and tell the public why they should care. Pam said the fundamental question is whether or not cleanup is being done accurately.

The Board made minor language changes to the advice. The advice was adopted.

Draft Advice: PW-1/3/6 and CW-5 Operable Units

Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, introduced the advice and provided background information on the issues associated with these Operable Units. She said the 200-Process Waste (PW) units 1, 3, and 6 Plutonium/Organic-Rich Process Condensate/Process Operable Units (OU) were consolidated into one soils OU focusing on an accelerated cleanup effort by the TPA agencies in 2002 based upon similarities in contaminant sources (PW-1/3/6); there are 17 past practice liquid disposal sites under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) within these three units. 200-Cooling Water Operable Unit has a total of five past practice liquid disposal sites (CW-5). Shelley spoke to the major contaminants of concern in the units and provided a timeline of the proposed plan for the units.

Shelley said remedial action for the units was determined by an evaluation of an unrestricted land use scenario. She said the RI/FS evaluations show that the majority of the waste sites pose a current or potential risk to human health and the environment via direct contact or in groundwater.

Shelley spoke to the alternatives provided in the draft proposed work plan. She said the background information she has provided is available should anyone want a copy; the information has been consolidated from the larger document. Susan Leckband clarified that the waste sites are not waste in containers but releases into the soil.

Agency Perspective

Dennis said he appreciates RAP taking this issue on, but noted that from a process standpoint, it is a little out of sync. He said they asked RAP to look at the draft proposed plan because Emy is still working on the plan that will go out for public comment, and the comment period will be over before the next Board meeting in September. Dennis suggested some language clarifications.

Nick said the advice is clear, and DOE will respond appropriately. Nick said he wanted to remind everyone that back in time there were thoughts that the waste sites would be capped, and there were even public workshops on the issue. He said they found a different avenue with EPA, which was to remove the structure where plutonium bearing waste was disposed of and remove the material below it. Nick said cesium will remain where it is. He said they are actively remediating the deep vadose zone with a protraction system, and the proposal reflects that the pump and treat system will address some of those concerns. Nick said remediating groundwater is separate.

Discussion

Laura Hanses, Non-Union/Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked how the proposed plan factors into final cleanup decisions. Dennis said it is the final decision for these particular waste sites.

Bob said the advice is consistent with previously expressed Board concerns, in that they would rather see waste sites cleaned up than covered up. Bob and Maynard said the advice authors did an excellent job.

The Board discussed the policy level advice bullets and the plutonium and cesium specific advice. Nick said he appreciates that the Board is focusing on policy level advice because it tells the agencies where the Board's values lie.

Pam said she doesn't know what "near surface" means as referenced in the advice. She said the original advice mentioned specific trench depths that identified how far down the agencies would have to go to remove the waste. She said some trenches were already 15 feet deep before liquid waste was poured in them, so the contamination would need to be removed from further beneath the surface. She said the advice needs to ask the agencies to remove waste to the extent practicable and get as much out as possible. Dennis said that to him, "near surface" means to the length of practicability. He said high volumetric is different from a concentrated layer of waste, and the agencies are proposing to take out the first concentrated layer. He said liquid waste was disposed of between 11 and 19 feet subsurface. Dennis said he thinks Pam articulated their values well. The Board agreed to remove the word "near" for clarity.

Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), asked if the advice is asking DOE to coordinate sampling with remediation efforts so as not to slow the process. Shelley said DOE's original intention was to complete characterization for nitrates after remediation occurs. She said the Board would like them to take the opportunity to sample while they are already down in the trenches.

Jerry said the trenches around the Plutonium Uranium Extraction plant (PUREX) and the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) are extremely radioactive. He said DOE is proposing to put in a 15-foot soil barrier without remediation, which will do nothing to halt the migration of plutonium and cesium into the soil. He said that even with a 15-foot barrier, moisture will still leak from the soil into the groundwater. Jerry said DOE needs to remediate the trenches. Shelley said the Board is compelled by Vince Panesko's, City of Richland (Local Government), comment that "plutonium is forever." Dennis said that in his professional opinion, cesium and plutonium move very little in the soil. He said he doesn't have any concerns that they will be in the groundwater pathway in the future. He said plutonium binds the soil, which is the problem as it makes it highly concentrated.

Dan Serres, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Citizen/Environmental & Public Interest), said 51 percent of the contamination will remain in the soil under DOE's plan. He said the Board is not asking DOE to get 99 percent, but that leaving close to half of the contamination in the ground will be a problem. The Board discussed whether to include the cleanup percentages in the advice, and decided that it is not

relevant to what the Board is trying to advise. Nick and Dennis spoke to the complications with the percentages and how much they believe needs to be removed from the waste sites based on gradation and percentage of plutonium. Dennis said that if there are areas of contamination that need to be removed above the 51 percent or through a surgical process, they will do so, but they believe the amount that needs to be taken out is near 51 percent.

Dick said the problem for many years has been how the agencies decide what's deep enough on each site. He said it is determined by an observational approach, and the agencies may not have conducted deep penetration in their profiling. He said he hopes the agencies use deep penetration to see where they are going, and that they can't do a cost analysis for the project without deep penetration. Dick noted the importance of the difference between 2 feet and 10 feet from a cost perspective. He said he doesn't have a good feeling for how deep or how mobile the material is. He said there are issues that need to be addressed for the whole general process. Nick said that neither EPA nor DOE is suggesting the contamination is only two feet deep, but that's how much they are selecting to remove. He said plutonium contaminated soil doesn't necessarily mean it is Transuranic (TRU) waste. Nick said the difference between what the agencies are recommending and going just a little deeper is one half of a billion dollars; they need to make a cost effective decision. Nick said that the agencies believe taking out the highest concentration of the contamination meets all of their requirements. Mike said he is concerned with the cleanup being driven by cost, noting that cleanup should be driven by the waste site's future impacts. He said the end state of the site needs to be defined in order to cleanup appropriately. Dennis said the agencies understand these waste sites better than any other site in the Hanford complex, and they believe they are cleaning them up appropriately. Dennis noted that the future impact analysis is included in the feasibility study.

Pam said originally the agencies said they would only remove two feet of contamination, but now they are saying they will remove what is reasonable. She said she wants to make sure they will remove what they find and not just stop at two feet. Nick said they anticipate they will go two feet below the bottom of the waste site which will remove about half of the plutonium concentrate in the three high-salt areas. Dennis noted that other areas may have more removed, but that the sites are well characterized, and two feet is where the high concentration of contamination is. He said they may go six inches deeper if they need to.

The Board discussed language for how to advise DOE to remove as much waste as they can, noting that "possible" means something different from the cost perspective. The Board decided to keep the advice as "remove as much as possible" with the knowledge that the agencies understand where the Board's values lie.

The Board discussed which plutonium contaminants will be able to be processed in the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) after its removal from the trenches. Nick said not all of the waste will go to WIPP, as it may not be necessary or qualified, noting that not all plutonium is TRU waste. He said they will analyze where the waste needs to go once it is removed and generated.

Dick said there is an incongruity with how the agencies and the Board are dealing with some issues, as some contaminants are removed from great depths while the plutonium trenches are not. Susan Leckband suggested Dick provide his comments to RAP.

The Board made minor language changes to the advice. The advice was adopted.

Draft Advice: Greater than Class C Waste Environmental Impact Statement

Gerry introduced the advice and asked how many Board members had read the Greater than Class C Environmental Impact Statement (GTCC EIS). A number of Board members confirmed that they have

read it. Gerry said DOE is planning to dispose of extremely radioactive waste that is hotter than the hottest level of low-activity waste. He said that in order for the waste to qualify as GTCC, the waste must be hotter than spent fuel at the surface. Gerry said that remotely handled TRU waste is being included in the GTCC that DOE is trying to dispose of. Gerry said that to the public, remotely handled TRU waste means really radioactive plutonium waste. Gerry said remotely handled refers to the waste being so hot at the surface that it cannot be touched by humans.

Gerry said that in 2002-2003, DOE began shipping remotely handled TRU waste to Hanford, without completing an EIS. He said the State of Washington and citizen groups obtained an injunction in court that said the actual transportation routes in Oregon and Washington needed to be analyzed in an EIS before the waste could be shipped to Hanford. DOE had completed a transportation analysis in the Hanford Solid Waste EIS (HSW EIS), but it was inadequate. Gerry said that after the injunction, DOE removed its request to ship the waste to Hanford.

Gerry said the Board recently received notice of the GTCC EIS, which names Hanford as one of the six sites that may be selected for disposal of the same type of remotely handled TRU waste and other high-level waste. Gerry asked why Hanford is even being considered as an option, as that type of waste, by law, has to be sent to a deep geological repository. He said DOE must go through a process with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission if a surface location is chosen for GTCC waste storage instead of a deep repository. He said that DOE had previously looked at expanding Yucca Mountain into a repository, but it has since been removed from consideration, and the GTCC EIS does not replace Yucca Mountain with any other deep repository option. He said the only deep underground option provided in the GTCC EIS is WIPP at Hanford, yet the background section notes that the WIPP site is legally barred from accepting the waste; this leaves six surface sites for disposal, and the EIS says most of them are unreasonable with Hanford and the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) as the only remaining viable candidates.

Gerry said that if Hanford is chosen to receive the waste, it will go to the landfill immediately East of the landfill analyzed in the Tank Closure and Waste Management EIS (TC&WM EIS) for disposal of three million cubic feet of offsite waste; these two potential waste sites have not been compared for cumulative impacts. Gerry said the impact from GTCC waste alone could add a radioactive dose to drinking water 12 times more than the standards allow. Gerry said DOE should reissue with GTCC EIS with the cumulative impacts of both GTCC waste and waste identified in the TC&WM EIS, and noted that the TC&WM EIS provides more sophisticated groundwater modeling showing how waste moves thousands of years faster than the model provided in the GTCC EIS. Gerry said DOE said the TC&WM EIS groundwater model was expensive to produce and will be used in all future EIS processes, yet it was not used for the GTCC EIS. He said the model used in the GTCC EIS was used in the HSW EIS and it was inadequate even then; it downplays the movement of waste by thousands of years.

Gerry said the advice is based on the Board's long standing value that it is no longer appropriate to bring offsite waste to Hanford. The advice also says that it is only appropriate to dispose of extremely hot and long-lived waste in a deep repository. Gerry said the advice is suggesting protecting the nation, not just Hanford's backyard.

Gerry reiterated that the advice asks DOE to use the TC&WM EIS groundwater modeling unit and revise the transportation study of the GTCC EIS to include actual routes. Gerry said DOE has said the waste won't be shipped to Hanford until after WTP is completed, but he doesn't believe that will do anything to minimize future impacts to Hanford.

Agency Perspective

Ron Skinnerland, Ecology, said the GTCC EIS will go to Congress where they will make a decision on the EIS, the report, and DOE's recommendation. He said Ecology went to the GTCC EIS hearings during the scoping period and said that the consideration of Hanford and offsite waste is a distraction to the cleanup goals of Hanford. He said Oregon and Washington states also wrote letters and presented them at the hearing. Ron said Ecology's letter is available on the back table to demonstrate that they have some of the same concerns as the Board. He said Ecology asked for Hanford to be removed from consideration, as the TC&WM EIS demonstrates consistent long term effects from constituents that are mobile and will contribute to problems that will not help in Hanford cleanup.

Discussion

Larry Lockrem, Benton County (Local Government), said the Blue Ribbon Commission, the committee charged with identifying a site for deep repository, has sent their report to Congress, and Larry does not believe that WIPP was ruled out as a potential site for a deep repository.

Pam said she finds it confusing that Hanford is being considered, as she spoke with a GTCC EIS document manager who said there is a letter in their reports that says no offsite waste will come to Hanford until after 2022. She said she is not worried that the waste will come to Hanford, but she thinks the advice is important.

Mecal said that in an informal meeting between the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board and the GTCC EIS authors, the authors relayed that Hanford had to be included in considerations due to protocol, but they would prefer the waste go to WIPP or the NNSS; they were just laying all of their options on the table before they began excluding specific sites. Mecal said Hanford isn't the best option because it is so far from the eastern United States waste sites. Mecal suggested including in the advice a way to better categorize and classify the waste, in addition to not bringing it to Hanford. Susan Leckband said that it is an issue to take to the RAP for the creation of new advice.

Dan Serres said this advice will find extremely wide support in the Northwest, and he noted the Portland GTCC EIS hearing where there were 200 people, including many elected officials.

Rob asked why the advice includes additional work for the EIS, when it really should just advise against bringing the waste to Hanford. He said the Board's advice is much more impactful when it is clear and concise. Dan Serres said there is a catalog of glaring errors in the EIS, and Hanford was chosen for consideration without a thorough analysis; the advice is asking DOE to correct that. Harold said he agrees that the advice could be concise about the waste not coming to Hanford, but the EIS rules Hanford as potentially viable under an incomplete analysis which needs to be corrected for the process to be complete. He said no one will want the waste, not just Hanford. Lyle Smith, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), said the Board should consider splitting the advice into two points; one will say don't bring the waste to Hanford, with another point that advises the site be removed from consideration for deep disposal.

The Board discussed the advice as being both advice and comments on the GTCC EIS document. They decided to provide copies of the advice both to DOE-HQ and the GTCC EIS document manager, and a paragraph was added to the advice to explain that the advice should be considered advice as well as comments on the GTCC EIS.

The Board discussed changing the format of the advice to fewer advice points with supporting concerns; the supporting concerns would be reasons why the GTCC waste should not come to Hanford. Mecal said DOE specifically asked for advice that will help them in the final EIS process, and the advice should be presented as such, not as concerns. She said the Board's advice will be included in the package presented

to Congress before the final EIS is released so the advice needs to be strong. She said the Board should expect a formal response. The Board agreed to leave all advice points in their original format.

The Board discussed the inclusion of data and numbers from the GTCC EIS in the advice as documentation of an inadequate analysis in the GTCC EIS.

Harold complimented Gerry on his testimony during the GTCC EIS hearing in Pasco. He said a chart about radioactive sources of contamination and effects on the public has been very helpful in discussing the issue with the public.

Doug said the advice should be constructed to demonstrate how Hanford is an unreasonable option for the disposal of the GTCC waste, noting that the EIS itself says a deep repository is the safest way to dispose of it. He asked how the transportation analysis was done. Gerry said there is a chapter on transportation in the EIS but it doesn't consider actual, physical routes; it is only an abstract concept. He said the use of the actual routes will change the impacts, and that is what the advice is asking them to do.

Betty suggested the Board advise that the GTCC EIS should go through a full NEPA public involvement process once comments and changes are incorporated. The Board agreed and added the language to the advice.

Dick asked for a clarification of advice point four that addresses the different wastes and disposal methods. Gerry said DOE, for the purposes of this EIS, are renaming a significant amount of remotely handled TRU waste as GTCC waste, which includes what is legally unacceptable to go to WIPP. He said whatever doesn't go to WIPP under this EIS will be shallow land buried. Mecal said the EIS also addresses non-DOE waste, which includes remotely handled commercial TRU waste. She said the advice is advising DOE that all inventory addressed in the GTCC EIS should go to a deep repository.

The Board discussed the absence of GTCC waste treatment alternatives in the EIS. The advice suggests DOE should treat and immobilize all high-level waste before it is disposed of.

The Board made minor language changes to the advice. The advice was adopted.

Draft Letter: Hanford Site-Wide Permit

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), introduced the letter and said it is a product of three issue manager meetings to be prepared for when the 8,000 page document is released in October. Liz said that part of the permit involves a lot of State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) documents, and the issue managers have asked for meetings on SEPA and how it relates to the permit. She said this letter is requesting a SEPA checklist, including conditions. Liz noted that a letter better fits the format for requesting documents than advice does.

Agency Perspective

Ron said Ecology has been briefing the issue managers on this issue and are interested in responding to the letter. He said they are interested in making sure the Board understands the permitting decisions, and they are willing to meet with the issue managers in July near the timing of the PW-1/3/6 public workshops. Dan said only some of the documents on the checklist are currently available, but that the agencies will make sure to address the Board's concerns as information becomes available.

Rob said accountability has to be maintained if the Board receives drafts or outdated versions of the documents they are asking for. He said they need to ensure the documents are up to date before commenting on them. He said document control issues aren't simply solved just by asking for a draft that could be updated soon.

Gerry commended Ron for his willingness to work with the issue managers and committees on this issue; it is greatly appreciated. Gerry said Ecology will be able to clearly tell the issue managers and Board members which draft is which, noting that Board members are also good about noting the difference between a draft and a final document.

Harold said he doesn't have a problem with making the document request, but he doesn't see why the Board needs to see the documents out of the normal sequence of events. Harold said he thinks the letter should give reason for why the Board needs the documents early. Jean said she didn't see cause for justification; it was her impression that the Board is privy to viewing documents early, and this is their request to do so on the site-wide permit. Maynard said the purpose is to better understand the SEPA process and that is stated in the last paragraph of the letter. Jean said the issue managers want a better understanding of the SEPA process so they can adequately present to the Board about how the process will go forward once the draft permit is released. Jean noted that the Board will not comment on any draft documents received. Liz added that they would like to see the documents ahead of time in order to get a leg up on the 8,000 page permit. She said the documents will help to provide context before they review the permit. Liz said the agencies have committed to posting sections of the permit online as they become available.

Emmett Moore, Washington State University (University), asked why the letter does not ask to see permit mitigation conditions under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Jean said the request is only for SEPA documents because any mitigation efforts have to be captured in both the SEPA documents and the draft permit. Ron said the agencies are already in the permitting stages for some proposed actions. He said they will have to decide how to mitigate where there is an impact. He said the draft permit will identify all of their requirements.

The Board agreed to send the letter forward. Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues, noted that the agencies are not required to formally respond to letters from the Board.

Program Update – Tri-Party Agreement Agencies

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Dennis Faulk provided an update for EPA and shared some recent images of new-born wildlife in the K Area of the site. He said it is good to see that animals and the Hanford Site can co-exist.

Dennis said he feels better about the direction the site is taking than he did during the April Board meeting, noting that the agencies are working together to close the gap for finishing cleanup in 2020. He said EPA asked DOE to work on issues in parallel rather than in sequential order. Dennis reiterated his support of cleaning up the K Area before 2020.

Dennis said the agencies are working on releasing the Proposed Plans for PW-1/3/6 and CW-5 in the Central Plateau by the end of the month, noting the absence of additional agency personnel at the meeting as they are currently working very hard on the plan. He said they are also working to complete the Unit Process-1 (UP1) Groundwater Proposed Plan for a summer release. Dennis said there is a lot of interest in the PW-1/3/6 and CW-5 Proposed Plan, so he believes the agencies will be holding public meetings in the summer.

Dennis said the TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP) is scheduled to be released in late summer. Public meetings on the CRP will be held, but specific dates have yet to be identified. He said the agencies briefed the Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC) during their pre-Board meeting on the updates to the TPA Agreement under Revision 8. He said the update will include the addition of the groundwater package and the reordering of the Central Plateau waste sites. Dennis said the TPA Agreement, Revision 8 will be available to the Board for review in September if it remains on schedule.

Dennis said Hanford Challenge is sponsoring a conversation about the future cleanup efforts of the Central Plateau; Jane Hedges, Ecology, will lead the effort. He said the agencies are also preparing for larger conversations on the River Corridor, TC&WM EIS, and the Hanford Site-wide Permit.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Ron Skinnerland provided an update for Ecology and said the Hanford Site-wide Permit is projected to be ready in October, followed by a 120-day comment period. He said the letters Ecology and the State of Oregon provided during the GTCC EIS hearings are available on the back table. He said letters from the Western Governors' Association and U.S. Representative Doc Hastings asking for the continued funding of the DOE-EM complex are also available.

Ron spoke to the impacts of the recent budget cuts to cleanup efforts, noting that the Washington State budget was just passed, and it includes a three percent pay cut for all employees and five hours of furlough each month, which is equal to eight days per year.

Ron recognized the tremendous efforts of Ecology staff and the number of public functions they have attended to provide information on Hanford. He said they will plan to continue attending fairs and camps this summer to further spread the word on Hanford cleanup.

DOE Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)

Tom Fletcher provided an update for DOE-ORP, beginning with an introduction of the new DOE-ORP Manager, Scott Samuelson, who has over 26 years of federal experience in DOE's nuclear energy, science, and defense programs.

Tom reviewed recent accomplishments in the tank farms, specifically noting that the DOE-EM Advisory Board recently completed a review of Hanford and will produce a report by June 20; a meeting will be held to discuss the report on June 23. Tom said the review was to examine Hanford and the 2020 Vision.

Tom reviewed the current activities at Waste Management Area-C, noting that C Farm is 52 percent complete for retrieval and closure. He said DOE-ORP used the mobile arm retrieval system for waste retrieval first at the C-107 tank with much success. They will continue using this technology for further tank waste retrieval and will successfully retrieve nine tanks this fiscal year.

Tom said that worker safety is DOE's number one concern in the tank farms and reported that there has been a large reduction in chemical exposure hazards for tank farm workers due to new improvements on site, including an increase of the size of exhaust stacks (an additional 30 feet) and new monitoring equipment. Tom said DOE will continue to work on methods that will reduce chemical exposures even further, including implementing the as low as reasonably achievable principles.

Tom reported that DOE-ORP has spent \$249 million of their dedicated \$326 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding and that they are under budget and on schedule. He

said they have completed 79 projects, met 42 contract milestones, and were successfully reviewed by the Office of the Inspector General. Tom also noted that DOE-HQ awarded DOE-ORP with the Energy Star Award.

Tom spoke to the significant construction progress of the WTP, noting that the overall project is 59 percent complete. He said other accomplishments include the completion of the civil design for the High-Level Waste Facility, completion of Water Treatment Facility, and installation of the cooling panels.

Tom reviewed some of the items discussed during the DOE-ORP and DOE-RL Management Retreat that took place in April. He said they discussed cleanup goals, near and long term cleanup priorities, and alignment of cleanup visions. Tom said that each manager was asked to draw a picture of how they see the site in 50 years, and each manager included some form of recreation use in their depictions. He said both DOE-ORP and DOE-RL look forward to better communication, interface, and the integration of activities between all DOE, regulatory, and external entities in the future.

Tom spoke to the official appropriations of the Fiscal Year 2011 funding for DOE-ORP. He said DOE-ORP received just under \$1.14 billion for WTP construction (\$690 million) and radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition (\$320 million).

Tom spoke next of the near term focus of DOE-ORP, noting that it is the focus of the new manager to integrate tank farms and WTP to prepare for WTP operations as well as continue with tank waste retrievals and closure of C Farm. In addition, DOE-ORP will focus on the completing the draft TC&WM EIS.

Tom informed Board members of how to stay involved in DOE-ORP activities and said they always welcome the Board's input.

DOE Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)

Nick Ceto provided an update for DOE-RL and said they are still on track to issue Board membership packets for primary and alternate members in the near future. He said travel is permitted in the interim and that Board members should carry on as usual. Nick reflected on his time with the Board and praised the commitment and passion of Board members. He thanked Board members for their work over the course of his involvement.

Nick said DOE-RL is still focused on their 2015 Vision even with the current budget cuts. He said they are continuing in a forward motion with their critical goals, which include footprint reduction, Columbia River protection, complete cleanout and demolition of the PFP complex, key contamination containment on the Central Plateau, the disposition of 90 percent of TRU waste, and a 10 percent reduction of the Hanford Site infrastructure costs. Nick provided an example of what the Hanford footprint reduction will look like focused on the inner area of the Central Plateau.

Nick reviewed the DOE-RL Fiscal Year 2011 funding allocations and the operating plan. He said DOE-RL did well under budget cuts compared to other nuclear waste sites. The total funding for DOE-RL for 2011 was just under \$1.04 billion.

Nick said DOE-RL is still making progress on the Beryllium Corrective Action Program, noting that they are taking their time to make sure the program is designed and implemented with worker input and support. He reviewed the flow diagram which illustrates the process for how product development (e.g. facility assessment and work permit) are prepared and reviewed to reach consensus driven decisions to ensure all stakeholders are involved in the process to ensure successful implementation in the field.

Nick provided a map of work for the Hanford Reach National Monument; most of the site has been started or completed, including removal of debris and re-vegetation of areas. He commented that they are on track for footprint reduction by the end of September. Nick also said a locomotive has been delivered to the B Reactor to be part of the Hanford Reach National Monument; cask cars will eventually be moved as well. Railroad ties will be taken to ERDF.

Nick spoke to the progress of the River Corridor, noting that DOE-RL is:

- Continuing to demolish facilities in the 300 Area; many are complete.
- Investigating contamination under the 324 Building B-Cell; a cleanup plan is still under development for retrieval of the waste.
- Excavating and locating material in the 618-10 Burial Ground, and characterizing the surface of the 618-11 Burial Ground. They have enclosed the working surface so no contamination will leak into the air.
- Finished with cleanup of the last waste site in F Area.
- Using water to minimize the air dust particles released during demolition of the 117 N Building.
- Removing pumps from 183-4 KW.
- Working on sampling and designing for the Sludge Treatment Project.

Nick said the K-West Area will be behind the rest of the K Area, in cleanup terms, but he expects they will have sludge removed by 2014. He said the K Area RI/FS will be the first RI/FS sent to EPA and Ecology; a draft will be provided in September.

Nick said DOE-RL is retrieving chromium from the C-7 Burial Ground, where contamination is 70-80 feet below the surface; DOE intends to retrieve from that depth.

Nick said DOE-RL is making good progress towards groundwater cleanup and will have remediated 29 waste sites with ARRA funding, noting that the 100 HX Treatment Facility is near structure completion and will be running by the end of the year.

Nick spoke to progress at the Pump and Treat Facility, adding that when completed, it will be the largest in the DOE-EM complex. He said the ARRA funding for the project will run out in the fall. The facility will be used once the UPI ROD is finalized. Nick said DOE-RL is looking for funding in order to continue work on the PFP. They continue to remove contaminated glove boxes, a project that will run through December.

Nick said they are removing drums from the Central Plateau Inner Area trenches and moving them to a packaging facility. He said debris from the 183-KW area will be used as filler following building demolition. Nick said covers were placed on Leachate Tanks 3 and 4.

Nick said the Soil Desiccation Test Injection Wells in the deep vadose zone test area have returned contaminations DOE-RL was not expecting, but they will continue to work towards cleanup goals.

Nick thanked the Board for their support of DOE-RL, and he said everyone is working very hard to make sure Hanford cleanup is done right.

Discussion

Rebecca Holland, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), asked about the guidelines for workers who encounter wildlife on site, noting a picture of a subcontractor who recently found a deer fawn and picked it up. Nick said there are biologists on staff who pay close attention to the wildlife on site and ensure that Hanford activities do not disturb them. He said there is a drilling rig on site that has a nest of migratory birds; the rig will not be moved until the fledglings can leave the nest.

Rebecca asked what Tom means by barriers for the SX Farm. Tom said that as part of the consent decree and TPA action, the agencies committed to interim barriers for the tank farms for 2010 to 2013. The latest farm to receive an interim barrier was TX and it was done under ARRA funding. Tom said SX will be the next tank farm to receive an interim barrier. He said an interim barrier is a water infiltration barrier that will collect the water and move it into another barrier. The current work on site for removal of the sludge cooler and delusion tanks is funded under ARRA to help prepare the farm for the interim barrier.

Larry thanked Nick for his years of service with EPA and DOE. He asked if the DOE field offices can tell the Board what the proposed funding levels for Fiscal Year 2012 are. Tom said they don't know the actual values, but the total DOE-EM estimate is \$5.6 billion. He said there continues to be fluctuation in what the individual field offices will receive. He said they are continuing to advocate for the President's Budget for tank farms and WTP. Nick noted an article in the *Tri-City Herald* Thursday morning about Congress's budget proposal. He said the field offices are planning work based on the President's Budget but understand that may not be what they get. Contractors are supposed to be reporting to the field offices on what they can accomplish with the different funding levels. Nick said it is important for everyone at Hanford to speak with one voice on funding issues. He said support from HAB and the surrounding Hanford communities is crucial. Tom said they are also planning for a continuing resolution which would hold the budget at 2011 funding levels; contractors are planning accordingly.

Susan Leckband thanked the agencies for their presentations and said they remind the Board about not only progress on site, but of the difficult, unique, and dangerous work. She said it is important to remember that the Board is here to support that work. Susan asked if there are support staff for integration at WTP and tank farms or if the work falls solely on Ben Harp. Tom said Ben just appointed his startup manager, who is his first employee. He said integration is a joint effort between tank farms and Ben, and that Ben currently operates under WTP, but he will eventually be moved back into the greater DOE-ORP fold. He said that as the WTP comes out of the design phase, a lot of the process engineers will move into the commissioning and operating phases. Tom said Ben will have a small staff in the near term.

Laura asked for clarification on the land transfer request process. She asked what criteria will be used for determining whether it is in the government's best interest, noting Hanford has 90 days to respond to the request. Paula said one criterion she is aware of is for the benefit of the local community. She will look into other specific criteria. Laura asked how the local communities will be involved in assisting with the request. Paula said that if there is a determination of the transfer being in the best interest of the government, there will be a NEPA process that will include an analysis and public involvement process, as well as consultation with tribal governments. She said this will happen before the transfer is finalized.

Laura said she has frustrations with the transportation problems for the Hanford work force. She asked who has the responsibility of deciding how to get workers from the 200 East Area to the WTP. Laura noted that the agencies are saying 1,000 jobs will be lost upon completion of the River Corridor, but they will need an additional 1,000 jobs for the WTP. Paula said transportation is analyzed in the NEPA process and will be continually looked at.

Pam thanked the agencies for the presentations and complimented Tom on the report of no findings by the Inspector General for the use of ARRA funding. She said much of the funding and stimulus money is a result of the hard work U.S. Senator Patty Murray does on behalf of Hanford. She said Senator Murray

was fortunate enough to visit Hanford and see all of the hard work taking place. Pam thanked Nick for his service.

Mike said Hanford has an opportunity to use super stretch milestones on site in order to encourage contractors to reach milestones more quickly, but with safer working conditions and less environmental disruption; the 2020 milestone would be a good opportunity for this. He said there is a strong incentive for the contractors to increase profit by using resources efficiently to reach all of their goals. Tom said that since 2020 is currently outside of the contract period, they have to look for incentives that are effective inside the contract period. Mike suggested reaching outside of the contract period because work is being done now that will influence work in the future. Tom said they do provide incentives in the 2013 timeframe, like at the Plutonium Finishing Plan (PFP). He said contractors can earn extra money for finishing in 2013.

Keith said that when WTP was first conceived, it was going to be a privatized operation. He said part of the contractor responsibility was to get a certain amount of money for each glass log made, and out of that money, there was going to be a sinking fund to pay for demolishing the plant in the future. Keith asked if that is still the plan. Tom said the demolition if the WTP after 2040 is in the DOE-ORP budget. He said the contractor fees are not currently working the way Keith described.

Dick asked for a status update on the development of onsite storage capabilities for glass logs. Tom said they are currently developing data packages for four areas: cask storage, open rack storage, a new facility, and Canister Storage Building modifications. The data packages will be developed through the summer, with down select criteria identified in early fall. Tom said alternative selection will be delivered in early 2012 and DOE-ORP can update the TWC on the status of the data packages.

Committee Reports

Budget and Contracts Committee (BCC)

Gerry said BCC has not yet received responses from the agencies on the advice for the 2012 and out year budgets. He said BCC will hear an update on the impacts of the 2011 budget reductions, which are not very high for DOE-EM at this point in time. Gerry said BCC will continue to track reductions and out year budgets to see where the significant concerns lie. Gerry spoke to the Board's concerns about lower funding levels for DOE-RL and noted that United States Senator Patty Murray shares the Board's concerns. Gerry said the Board explicitly said DOE-RL needs to be fully funded, and regional consensus on funding levels has made impacts at other sites.

Gerry said the agencies will be presenting the Life Cycle Cost and Schedule Report at the September Board meeting, and then BCC will plan an in-depth conversation and briefing about the report. He said it is still up in the air whether the agencies will provide a full-Board debrief or a workshop. He explained that the report is a crosscutting issue for all committees, and Board members need to look at the document and determine what they need in terms of understanding. Gerry said the Board will need to examine the report to determine what's in it, and how it can be used for long term costs, priorities, goals, etc. Dennis said EPA and Ecology have responded to the budget advice; the responses are available in the Board packet. Gerry thanked Dennis for the clarification.

River and Plateau Committee (RAP)

Pam said RAP will have a meeting on June 8. Their draft agenda includes a briefing and conversation with DOE about the Integrated Vegetation Management Environmental Assessment, as well as preparation for the CERCLA Five-Year Review that will be released in late summer. Pam said RAP will provide information on the review at the September Board meeting. RAP will be looking into the process to develop final RODs. She said there are placeholders on the RAP agenda for updates on the contamination of the B-cell under the 324 Building, and the Columbia River Outfalls and Intakes; DOE will determine if updates are available. Pam said she is hoping DOE will be able to provide an update on the 618-10 Burial Ground retrieval and 618-11 characterization analysis. She said that in addition to the agenda, there is continual issue manager work going on.

Pam said RAP is working with PIC on how to involve the public in the Hanford Site-Wide Permit process and what kind of meetings and communication will be appropriate. Pam noted that the Hanford Site-Wide Permit is a big issue for all committees. She said there are questions regarding the timing of the release of the draft permit. She said all RAP members are working very hard, and she is proud to work with them.

Pam said the Hanford Communities is coordinating with the DOE Hanford Speakers' Bureau to arrange presentations and are making a strong effort to get the word out about the program.

Tank Waste Committee (TWC)

Larry said TWC met on May 12 to discuss ongoing activities such as alternative waste forms, the Enhanced Tank Waste Strategy, System Plan-Revision 6, and the 241 C Tank Farm Tank Removal Study. He said TWC is looking for more information on alternative waste forms, and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is supposed to be working on a document called Roadmap for the strategy. Larry said they haven't been able to view the document yet or receive updates. He said DOE-ORP and Ecology came to the May 12 meeting to discuss the enhanced tank waste strategy, which TWC will continue to track and discuss. Larry said TWC talked about the 241 C Tank Farm Tank Removal Study, which was introduced for purpose and relevancy by an issue manager, followed by a presentation from DOE-ORP on the process for closing tank farms, decision-making, and options for closure.

Larry said DOE Executive Order 435 dealing with waste in the soil was scheduled for a discussion in June but will now occur during the half-day August meeting. He said other topics for the half-day meeting at the library on June 9 includes the Waste Management Area C Schedule, a workshop discussion on Waste Management C, and a discussion on Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and CERCLA integration. Larry said he is unsure about the status of the Bill Moss Technology Forum.

Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP)

Keith said HSEP held a meeting in May to discuss tank vapors and the kind of monitoring done in the tank farms to protect workers. He said the topic was identified as a priority from DOE, and it was a good meeting. Keith said HSEP took a tour of the tank farms that explained how they had begun to vent vapors out of the workspace by increasing the length of the active ventilation stacks. He said HSEP will continue to keep an eye on the farms as more work is done and there is more effort to actively ventilate tanks, especially where workers are present. Keith said HSEP also talked about workers who are not involved in tank work, but may be exposed to contamination because they work downwind; HSEP would like to see a better monitoring system in the future for when vapors are emitted that are undetectable by current technology.

Keith said HSEP will hold a conference call on June 14 at 1:30pm PDT. They will discuss future agenda topics, including their continued tracking of the beryllium corrective action plan. Keith said they meet

with Ray Corey, DOE-RL, each month for progress updates. He said the progress is not as fast as they had hoped, but it was an ambitious schedule to be going with, and they are getting close to finishing.

Keith said HSEP will have a presentation on biological controls at Hanford in the fall. Keith spoke to an incident one year ago where a worker was infected with the West Nile Virus, suffered mental illness due to the disease, and eventually committed suicide. He said there is no evidence the worker was bitten on site, but the worker could not remember being bitten anywhere else. Keith said appropriate biological controls are in place to make workers aware of the dangers of West Nile, and DOE is doing a good job making sure employees know how to protect themselves from insect bites. Keith said HSEP hopes DOE will work to eradicate insect larva before they're born, ask spraying for adult insects has more of an effect on the environment. Mike said the timeframe for eradicating larva is soon, so he hopes DOE will address it as soon as possible.

Mike said there will be an Integrated Safety Management (ISM) conference in September. He said DOE has not recognized that ISM is at different levels.

Maynard reminded Board members about the Vadose Zone Technologies Workshop on June 7.

Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB)

Susan Leckband reported that the SSAB biannual meeting has been rescheduled for June 15 and 16, following postponement of the April meeting due to federal travel restrictions.. She said they will be touring the NNSS, hear regular updates, and potentially review three pieces of advice. Susan said she and Shelley will be attending the meeting and will report back to the Board.

Jerry asked if the SSAB will consider advice on the deep repository and Yucca Mountain issue, as all sites should have some concerns about its cancellation. Susan said not all sites have high-level waste, but she will be happy to raise the issue with the SSAB. Jerry said he thinks SSAB should provide advice as representatives of all of the sites.

Public Involvement and Communication Committee (PIC)

Steve Hudson, [name of seat] and PIC Chair reported that PIC has decided to move forward with only pre-Board meetings (Wednesdays) as they used to do, rather than additional Committee Week meetings, due to the number of PIC members that are also involved with the technical committees and cross-cutting topics. Steve said PIC will have a conference call in June to discuss public meetings for cleanup of plutonium sites on the Central Plateau. He said the title was originally PW-1/3/6 and CW-5 but it didn't cover all of the sites included. They will also hold a call in July on the status of the TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP) review process; the CRP is close to being finished and PIC will decide how they want to deal with it as a committee. Steve said PIC is planning to hold a meeting in August in order to review the CRP before it goes out for public comment; they may provide advice on the CRP for the Board to consider in September.

Steve said he regularly reviews the PIC meeting summaries to identify the salient points, given the technical richness of some of the conversations that take place during PIC meetings. He said the summaries frame the discussions that lead members to crafting advice or making decisions, and Board members will be more prepared if they read committee meeting summaries before attending Board meetings. Steve encouraged all Board members to read the agency responses to Board advice, specifically noting responses to Advice 239 and 240 that provide suggestions for issues PIC should address.

Steve said the Wednesday PIC meeting featured a debrief for the State of the Site meetings. He highlighted the public notice for the meetings provided by the agencies and said they were done very well. He said agency representatives have produced a packet of three different documents that summarize questions and responses provided during the meetings. Steve said the packet is an incredible resource for discovering what the public is thinking. Steve said the agencies will begin sending out thank you notes to the public that attended the State of the Site meetings. Steve said it works well to hold the State of the Site meetings concurrently with Board meetings, but Thursday night is difficult for advice authors who are making edits before the Friday meeting, so PIC will revisit how to schedule the meetings. State of the Site recordings will soon be placed on Hanford's YouTube page, and the summaries are available online.

Steve said PIC received an update on the Hanford Speakers' Bureau which is growing enormously. He said PIC will revisit the issue. He said PIC was also provided with a presentation on the TPA Agreement, Revision 8, which DOE will provide a hard copy of to show changes made over the past four years..

National Liaison

Shelley presented a *New York Times* article about deep geologic repositories in Europe. The article is about a laboratory called the AndroLab in France that is run by the French agency charged with the responsibility of safe waste disposal. She said there is a directive being brought forward in Brussels for the rest of the continent to follow in France's footsteps for deep geologic repositories for high-level waste. The directive will come from the European Parliament on June 27, and it will oblige all 27 members of the European Union to submit plans to the European Commission for similar underground waste repositories. Shelley said Europe has tremendous stock piles of spent fuel, and they are looking for ways to deal with it. She said Finland will open their repository in 2015, Sweden will open one in 2020, and France will open a third in 2025. France has 58 nuclear reactors, currently, the world's second largest atomic energy park. Shelley said 75 percent of France's electricity comes from nuclear power. She said the AndroLab in the Lorraine region of France is set underground 1,700 feet and in a layer of clay that runs from Southern England to the French border with Germany. She said France believes that because of the ionization characteristics of the clay, it is a good structure for a repository.

Executive Issues Committee (EIC)

Susan Leckband said the EIC met for a pre-Board meeting on June 1. She said they discussed process manual revisions, a living document that the EIC has proposed be combined with a flow chart in order to demonstrate what the Board does as their processes improve and more details are added. Susan said Bob, Dale, and Liz are developing guidelines for issue managers on how advice is developed; an electronic copy will be distributed for Board members to make comments, and a final copy will be provided at the September Board meeting. Susan said the EIC reflected on the Leadership Retreat and Board priorities. She said the Board budget will decrease for the 2012 Fiscal Year, and the EIC wants to make sure the funds are spread across the full year in order to meet the needs of the Board.

Board Business

Preliminary Board priorities

Susan Leckband provided a handout on Board priorities for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2011 and Fiscal Year 2012. She reviewed adjustments to the 2011 priorities that were made in cooperation with the agencies during the Leadership Retreat; changes included moving items from tracking to priority based on

time and relevance, while some items of were moved from priority to tracking due to changes in timeliness.

Susan said the committees reviewed the 2011 Agency and Board Priorities in February, and the importance for the adjustment is to report in September on what the Board has done in 2011. She said the report will include items that were moved or weren't accomplished due to higher priorities.

Susan said the agencies provided a draft of what they will be asking for advice on at the Leadership Retreat, which helped to facilitate conversation on if the Board understands what the agencies want. Susan said the agencies and the Board are in alignment for priorities in 2012. She said there are many cross-cutting issues outlined in the 2012 Board Priorities, and committee leaders have had the opportunity to review it; the 2012 Board Priorities will come before the full Board in September, with Board members able to provide comments beforehand. She said there won't be any committee meetings in July, but the committees will have time to work on their priorities in August.

Susan Hayman said the committees are working to identify actionable items for the 2012 Board Priorities; the final document may include the name of the issue and what the committees are expecting to do with that issue.

Susan Leckband said that in the context of overarching work plans, there are specific cleanup items for the Central Plateau, but the whole Central Plateau cleanup package will not be a 2012 priority, mostly due to budget constraints.

Dale suggested that groundwater be added to the list of 200 Area priorities; the Board agreed.

Board calendar

Susan Leckband provided a copy of the Board calendar that extends through December 2012. She said the EIC goes through the calendar thoroughly to identify all holidays, furlough days, breaks, and non-work days to make sure the Board schedule doesn't run into any major conflicts.

Cathy reviewed changes to the 2011 calendar, noting that October Committee Week has been moved up one week, and there is a new code in the calendar for suggested/tentative months off in order to help the budget. Cathy said the time off is flexible, and to the discretion of the committees and their workloads; November 2011 and July 2012 have been identified as a tentative month off for committees. The full Board will take December 2011 and 2012 off as usual. Susan Leckband said the months off were identified carefully and are only during months when a full Board meeting does not follow. Susan said the Board will need to decide on the months off as soon as possible in order to provide a set schedule for those who need to make travel arrangements and work around other things.

Doug asked if there are plans for an electronic calendar for the Board schedule and other DOE events, noting the potential ease for those who use online calendars. Cathy said the Board is looking into it. Paula said DOE doesn't have any plans for that kind of calendar. Cathy noted that the schedule is planned in order to provide maximum notice and preparation for travel; the Board and DOE schedules are available on the website and are up to date.

Cathy said the next Leadership Retreat will tentatively be held on May 1 and 2, 2012.

Board budget (Fiscal Year 2011 and 2012)

Bob gave a presentation on the Board budget, including a meeting cost analysis and the estimated budget for Fiscal Year 2012. He reviewed past Board budgets, including the funding the Board requested and

what they received. Bob said he believes the Board will have an allotted budget in 2012 of \$500,000, down from \$637,000 for Fiscal Year 2011. Paula noted that \$137,000 was carried over to 2011 from the request for additional funding in 2010.

Bob reviewed what the budget analysis represents, noting that it is not all-inclusive and does not provide for potential cost increases. He said DOE used to pay for Board meeting audio-visual services, but those costs are now coming out of the EnviroIssues contract.

Bob reviewed the average cost per meeting. He said meetings outside of the Tri-Cities cost an average of \$10,000 more than meetings held in the Tri-Cities.

Bob reviewed the estimated budget for HAB in 2012, concluding that as projected, the Board will spend \$10,224 more than the allotted \$500,000. He said the Board will need to continue to look for cost saving alternatives. Bob and Paula will work together to track the Board's budget throughout 2012. Susan Hayman said that most of the EnviroIssues costs and estimates are based on a general estimate because EnviroIssues does not track costs the same way the Board does; EnviroIssues will work with the Board in the upcoming year to provide the necessary information.

Susan Leckband said the Board still has the ability to request additional funding in 2012 if they feel it is necessary to complete their duties.

Larry thanked Bob for the presentation and suggested eliminating one Committee Week in order to save the estimated \$26,800, if work load allows. He said the Board struggles with member's schedules in July and December anyway. Bob said that when one looks at the work load of the issues the agencies have asked the Board to address, it's a significant amount. He said there is an option to go back to the agencies and to say the Board has too much work for the funding allowed, and the agencies may remove issues from the priorities list. Bob said that if the agencies want it all completed, the Board will need more funding. Paula said the more efficient the Board can be the better. She said the agencies recognize that the Board may not be able to meet all of their requests and will have to drop a few items in order to focus on others.

Pam said the Board will continue to deal with the TC&WM EIS in Fiscal Year 2012, noting that it could require attention in the December timeframe. She said it would be helpful to understand the EnviroIssues contract and asked if EnviroIssues is allowed increases due to inflation. Paula said inflation is added to the EnviroIssues contract every year. Bob said the Board will have to identify ways to cut back on the additional tasks the Board asks EnviroIssues to do. Pam noted that the facilitation team travel costs could be reduced if the facilitation team was located closer to the Tri-Cities.

Keith asked whether meeting room costs are a significant issue for the budget. Susan Leckband said the committee meetings are held at free locations to save on budget.

Mecal asked if the Committee Week facilitation costs include the cost of the room. Bob said that since the rooms are free, the facilitation costs include travel for the facilitator and note taker, preparations calls, etc. Mecal suggested Committee Week be held virtually or through Second Life, a program that allows avatars to represent participants so it is more interactive. Susan Leckband said virtual meetings are held whenever possible, noting that Dirk lead the last TWC meeting via GoToMeeting. Bob said the EIC discussed virtual options at the last meeting and are beginning to look into the wide variety of technologies available, and that each member will need to have access to.

Bob asked if the \$500,000 is a firm budget, given the Board has yet to see the 2012 budget. Paula said the figure is just an internal projection. She said it is not official but the agencies are taking it seriously and will provide it to the Board as soon as possible.

Bob asked if the Board will be able to carry 2011 funds into 2012. Paula said eliminating the July Committee Week will help the Board save on costs between now and September, and she thinks the Board will be happy with their choice to do so. Paula mentioned that some people would like to see Seattle and Portland eliminated as meeting locations in order to save on those significant costs.

Susan Leckband said the Board needs better access to the budget, noting that DOE's accounting system doesn't track well for the Board. Susan thanked Bob and Paula for agreeing to track for the next year.

Paula suggested that Committees of the Whole could be held as public meetings to save on budget, but would not have facilitation or meeting summary support. Susan Leckband said she uses meeting summaries when discussing the HAB in other venues and they are absolutely critical. She said the Board has discussed limiting facilitation in the past but it is something they have agreed to use fully.

Paula asked what the Board will do if the December Committee Week is cancelled and the TC&WM EIS is released in December. Liz said she is concerned that the Hanford Site-Wide Permit and TC&WM EIS will come out simultaneously and will be a lot for the Board to accomplish at once. She said the public is expecting to comment on the permit in January and February.

Dick thanked Bob for his hard work on the budget analysis and presentation and said it is helpful for all Board members to be able to see how the money is spent. Susan Leckband said Board members haven't seen the budget before because it is hard to extrapolate and make useful. She said the EIC did not want to burden Board members with this kind of administration information when they have so much committee work to do. She said the Board has been lucky to receive full funding in the past, and that's why it hasn't come forward until now.

Mecal suggested holding meetings outside of the Tri-Cities every other year to save on out-of-town costs. She said she thinks there is enough email exchange and phone calls in December to allow for no in-person meeting.

The Board agreed to cancel the December Committee Week, with the understanding that it will be added to the schedule again if need be or if future budgets allow.

Board self-evaluation and agency evaluation

Susan Hayman reviewed the results of the Board self-evaluation and agency evaluation. She said the evaluation was for April 2010 to February 2011, and that it was used to review how the Board is working, and support that is being provided for both committee and Board work; the agencies completed a separate evaluation in order to provide an external as well as internal look at Board work. Susan said full copies of the results are available if members are interested.

Susan said 15 agency representatives and 27 Board members responded to the evaluation. She reviewed how Board members responded on committee work, Board work, Board support, and how well they are doing on all topics. Susan reviewed the average attendance for meetings throughout the year. She said that in general, Board members feel they are doing a better job at representing their constituency.

Susan reviewed what Board members believe to be the Board's most important priorities.

Susan reviewed the agency responses to the Board evaluation and how they feel about committee work, Board work, and Board support. She compared the differences between what the agency and Board responses to the evaluations. Susan said the Board and agencies are mostly on the same page.

Emmett asked why the agencies responded negatively to the question “Is the Board’s advice useful?” Susan directed Emmett to the narrative handout of the responses to see some of the comments and suggested he should ask the agencies for clarification.

Dick said the amount of agency representatives who participated in the evaluation does not represent a good enough cross section to base any information on. Susan said she is happy to receive feedback and suggestions for next year’s evaluation.

September Board meeting topics

The Board reviewed issues to be placed on the September meeting agenda.

- Life Cycle Cost and Schedule Report presentation
- Annual year-end review by TPA agencies
- Community Relations Plan advice
- CERCLA Five-Year Review advice
- Waste Management Area C advice
- Final ROD for River Corridor cleanup advice
- Three advice pieces from SSAB (tentative)
- Unit Process 1 Groundwater advice (tentative)
- Process manual revisions
- Board priorities and calendar

Liz suggested adding a social event to the agenda for Board members to be able to mingle outside of the Board meeting. She suggested it be held at the Red Lion Downtown on Thursday of the September Board meeting. Susan Hayman said she will work with Liz on this.

Bob commented on the speed of the advice process during this meeting, noting that the advice was short and well organized. He said they should continue to provide high-level advice.

Mecal suggested that the Board provide advice on how the leased land at Hanford is being used, as it is a concern to the public. Susan Leckband said since the leased land is not under the control of DOE-EM, it is not an issue for the Board to address. Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, said DOE will be looking into leased land activities as part of the re-permitting process.

Liz said the Hanford Site-Wide Permit issue managers will be looking at an emergency plan as part of the permit. She said it is a cross-cutting issue for committees that will be an issue for the Richland public. Maynard said Ken Niles did an excellent job of explaining emergency planning and how the agencies and states are working together during the Portland State of the Site meeting.

Public Comment

No public comments were provided.

Attendees**HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**

Robert Davis, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Eugene Van Liew, Member	Liz Mattson, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member		Emmett Moore, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Al Boldt, Alternate	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	Dave Rowland, Alternate
Doug Mercer, Member	Sam Dechter, Alternate	Mecal Samkow, Alternate
Jerry Peltier, Member	Dirk Dunning, Alternate (phone)	Dick Smith, Alternate
Maynard Plahuta, Member	Dale Engstrom, Alternate	Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Gerald Pollet, Member	Earl Fordham, Alternate	Art Tackett, Alternate
Howard Putter, Member	Laura Hanses, Alternate	Jean Vanni, Alternate
Dan Serres, Member	Floyd Hodges, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
Keith Smith, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate	
Lyle Smith, Member		

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Paula Call, DOE-RL	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Nick Ceto, DOE-RL	Nine Menard, Ecology	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues
Tom Fletcher, DOE-ORP	John Price, Ecology	
Cameron Salony, DOE-RL	Beth Rochette, Ecology	Justin Day, PNNL
DaBrisha Smith, DOE-ORP	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	Vicky Freedman, PNNL
Alex Termorni, DOE-EM		Janice Parthee, PNNL
	Sharon Braswell, MSA	
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Catherine Bryan, MSA	Peter Bengston, Washington Closure Hanford
Emy Laija, EPA	Terry Noland, MSA	Lynn Davison, CHPRC
		Michele Gerber, URS Corp
Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues	Joy Shoemake, CHPRC
Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues	Rampur Viswanath, WRPS

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Kristie Baptiste, Nez Perce Tribe		
Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald		