

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

*September 8-9, 2011*

*Seattle, WA*

**Topics in This Meeting Summary**

Executive Summary ..... 1  
Welcome, introductions, and announcements ..... 2  
Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Annual Updates ..... 3  
FY2011 Board Accomplishments / Committee Reports ..... 14  
Site-specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Action Items ..... 17  
Draft Advice: Draft Third CERCLA Five-Year Review Report.... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**  
Draft Advice: Waste Management Area C Performance Assessment..... 22  
2011 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report..... 23  
Board Business..... 27  
Public Comment..... 31  
Attendees..... 31

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

**Executive Summary**

**Board action**

The Board adopted two pieces of advice concerning:

- Draft Third CERCLA Five-Year Review Report
- Waste Management Area C Performance Assessment

The Board took the following actions on the three proposed action items from the SSAB:

- Asset retention (not approved)
- Removal/transport of items having cultural/historic value (approved)
- Use of rail transport for moving waste (not approved)

**Board business**

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

- 2012 Board Priorities (including TPA agency priorities)
- November Board meeting topics
- Potential Board advice for the November Board meeting

**Presentations and updates**

The Board heard and discussed presentations on the following topics:

- Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Annual Update
- 2011 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report

**Public comment**

Public comment was provided.

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
*September 8-9, 2011 Seattle, 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 periodic 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.

Six seats were not represented: City of Pasco (Local Government), City of West Richland (Local Government), Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Environmental/Citizen), Benton-Franklin Public Health (Local/Regional Public Health). Liaisons not represented include: Washington State Department of Health (Ex-Officio), and Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (Ex-Officio).

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

**Welcome, introductions, and announcements**

Susan Leckband welcomed the Board to Seattle and noted that it is the annual meeting where the Board will receive updates from Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies about progress on site and plans for the future. She reviewed the Board agenda. She welcomed new Board members and asked them to introduce themselves.

Lynn Davison, Non-Union/Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), introduced himself as the alternate for the Non-Union seat and said he is pleased to be representing the work force.

John Howieson, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), introduced himself as an alternate, noting that he is a retired physician and faculty member for a medical school in Oregon.

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, provided instructions for accessing GoToMeeting for those on the phone and reviewed Board ground rules. She reminded the Board of the Mariner's baseball game Thursday evening; a group will be meeting in the lobby at 5:45 pm to walk to the field, while others will be meeting at 6:30 pm to take the Seattle Light Rail. Susan thanked Dennis Faulk, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), for organizing the event.

Susan Hayman also noted that former HAB committee note taker, Blair Scott, is undergoing significant medical challenges. She asked Board members to send positive thoughts to Blair, who is currently living and undergoing treatment in Australia.

The Board adopted the June meeting summary, which was certified within 45 days and posted to the Hanford website.

Dan Opalski, EPA, welcomed the Board to Seattle. He thanked Board members for their many years of service and welcomed new members. Dan said the Board's input and role is a critical part of the process for correcting course and validating what the agencies have been working on. He said he hopes the Board will keep up their good work as budget constraints will force everyone to work together to get good work done. Dan said Hanford is a shining example of using available resources to a substantial benefit for jobs

and cleanup. He said the upcoming year will stress the importance of alignment of agency and Board priorities and an investment in future steps so Hanford is always prepared to vie for resources and to have a pipeline of work ready to begin. Dan asked that the Board continue to educate themselves and educate the agencies through their advice.

In another announcement, Mecal Samkow, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), said she spoke about the Blue Ribbon Commission's (BRC) public comment period on spent fuel, noting that the closest public meeting to Hanford will be in Denver. She said the Hanford region has a minimal amount of spent fuel compared to the rest of the nation, but Hanford is mentioned in the BRC's report at least six times and might have technology and expertise the BRC might be interested in. She said she is concerned meetings are not being provided in the area. Susan Leckband thanked Mecal for making the Board aware of the issue and said she testified for the BRC on behalf of the Board for high level waste (HLW) placement from the Vitrification Plant (VIT). Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), said he was part of the planning group who decided to hold the meeting in Denver, as the meetings were being limited to one in each region. He said he will be at the meeting to provide testimony focusing on radioactive material transport safety, along with other state representatives. Ken said the West has long been the leader in working to address nuclear transport safety issues. Ken said he believes the comment period is in November. Susan Leckband said Board members are free to make comments via the BRC's website.

Susan said she would like to share a quote from John Wagoner, former DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) project manager, who welcomed the Board at its inception. She said it is a good reminder to Board members of why the HAB is important, what DOE expects from the Board, and what the Board can expect from DOE. John said,

“I have some expectations; the Board is not going to be a handy, one-stop shop that simply punches DOE's public involvement tickets. I made it clear to DOE, contractors, and managers, that the Board will augment, not replace other reliable and effective public involvement programs in place now or planned for the future. There are interests not represented on this Board, and we are obligated to solicit their views as well. Secondly, from my point of view, creation of this Board has a simple driver: I need your advice. I need you to understand our vision and goals, how we propose to achieve them, and the limits of our resources. I need your thoughtful judgments about major decisions we must make and how we should go about making them.”

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

#### *Department of Energy Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)*

Matt McCormick, DOE-RL, said a lot of work has been done on site, and a lot of it can be attributed to the workers and projects under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Matt noted that many of those workers will be laid off shortly due to the end of ARRA funding; he thanked them for their hard work that was done safely, and he wished them well in the future.

Matt provided an update on DOE-RL accomplishments in Fiscal Year (FY) 2011.

Hanford Site Cleanup Completion Framework (Framework):

- This living document will be updated this fall; it is the comprehensive information resource on Hanford Site cleanup. Any suggestions for the update may be provided to Paula Call, DOE-RL.

- Matt said the Framework provides an overview of the Hanford cleanup strategy, strives to make the complexities of cleanup more understandable, and provides context for how individual activities support cleanup completion.
- The Framework contains: overarching cleanup goals; relationships between the three main components of site cleanup (River Corridor, Central Plateau, and Tank Waste); stages of cleanup completion building upon the 2015 Vision, Central Plateau Strategy, and new tank waste completion milestones; and cleanup challenges.

#### 2015 Vision

- Matt said the 2015 Vision is the main focus for DOE-RL, and it is consistent with the values of regulatory agencies, tribal nations, and stakeholders.
- Matt said the primary items of focus for the 2015 Vision include completion of River Corridor cleanup, demolition of the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) and excess facilities, and implementation of groundwater cleanup. Groundwater cleanup includes stopping key contaminants from reaching the Columbia River and containing and remediating key groundwater contaminants on the Central Plateau. Matt noted that DOE-RL strives to stop the contaminant chromium by 2012.
- The key benefits to the 2015 Vision are: reducing the active cleanup footprint to less than 75 square miles; reducing costs by “right-sizing” the Hanford infrastructure (fire houses, roads, etc.); and at completion, the cleanup emphasis will shift resources to full-scale cleanup on the Central Plateau.

#### 22 Years of Cleanup Accomplishments:

- Matt reviewed significant cleanup successes from DOE-RL’s 22 years of cleanup, noting specifically for FY2011:
  - 855 million gallons of groundwater treated.
  - 93 waste sites and 57 facilities cleaned up and demolished in the River Corridor.
  - 39 waste sites and 59 facilities cleaned up and demolished in the Central Plateau.
  - Disposed of two million tons of waste in the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF).
- Matt provided cleanup updates and success stories for the River Corridor and the Central Plateau.

#### 2011 HAB Advice Overview

- Matt said DOE received 12 pieces of advice from the Board, with 9 specifically relating to DOE-RL. He thanked the Board for their advice and valuable discussions. He noted that he has briefed DOE leadership on the Board’s advice on FY2012 and FY2013 budget requests.
- Matt highlighted the following pieces of advice as having successfully influenced DOE decisions:
  - HAB advice #239 – Public Involvement Strategic Planning in the TPA Community Relations Plan (CRP):
    - Many advice concepts were incorporated via proposed changes.
    - Strategic approach suggestions influenced public meetings on plutonium.
    - TPA agencies are currently working on a strategic planning tool to complement the CRP.
  - HAB Advice #241 – Medical Support Contractor:
    - Provided early input for developing the draft Request for Proposals (RFPs).
  - HAB Advice #244 – Cleanup Budget Priorities for FY2012, FY 2013, and Ensuing Years:

- HAB workshop participation and identified priorities provided useful feedback for 2012 and 2013 planning.

#### Infrastructure Reduction and Energy Efficiency

- Matt said the Mission Support Alliance (MSA) is Hanford's primary contractor for the integration of infrastructure and service, noting that they have saved the site over \$25 million in cleanup dollars this year due to consolidation of services, including:
  - Integrated site-wide input to determine current and future needs for site-wide services.
  - Consolidated and centralized services for site-wide efficiencies.
  - Partnered with DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) to outline infrastructure future needs for the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP).
- Matt said Hanford is on target to reduce the infrastructure facilities footprint by 50 percent due to MSA upgrades including the expansion of wireless services by 400 percent for cleanup field work automation and the convergence of two communication systems into one Voice Over Internet Protocol (VoIP) modernized network. Matt noted that Hanford is the leading site in the DOE-Environmental Management (DOE-EM) complex for wireless technologies.
- Hanford has reduced energy consumption and greenhouse gases on site by incorporating fuel efficient and alternative fuel vehicles (and right-sizing the existing fleet), consolidating data centers, and beginning the migration to the Thin Client computer system, which will require 90 percent less energy than a traditional desktop computer. Matt noted that MSA is leading energy efforts for Hanford, and Hanford recently received the Best in Class award for DOE-EM complex energy efficiency.

#### Outreach

- DOE continues to spread Hanford's story through *The Hanford Story* video series and the Hanford Speakers' Bureau. Matt said DOE hopes to reach as many people as possible through the two programs.
  - *The Hanford Story* has received nearly 9,000 views on YouTube. DOE released the chapter on groundwater in August 2011 and is currently developing chapters on ARRA, future uses, and tank farms.
  - The Hanford Speakers' Bureau has provided 51 presentations to 1,873 people in FY2011, compared to FY2010's figures of 12 presentations to 325 people.

Matt said DOE continues to focus on employee safety via programs like the Beryllium Corrective Action Plan, Site-wide Safety Standards, FY2012 Survey Assessments that will result in a Safety Action Plan, and the DOE-Health, Safety, and Security (DOE-HSS) Independent Assessment of Employee Concerns. Matt noted that there are currently 12 to 13 initiatives in place for employee safety.

#### Post Cleanup Hanford

- Land transfer considerations:
  - Matt said that while most of the Hanford site will be conserved for natural resources, DOE-RL recently received a request from the Tri-City Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) to transfer 1,341 acres of land for economic reuse. The request meets DOE's policies and land use plans, but they will proceed with environmental reviews before making a decision on the transfer.
  - Matt noted that land on the Hanford Site becoming available for other uses is a testament to the cleanup progress on the Site.

- Matt said DOE has a responsibility to work with local communities to transition away from economic reliance on Hanford, and they have been directed by the current administration to eliminate excess properties to reduce the economic burden on the federal government.
- B Reactor:
  - Matt reviewed the recent accomplishments of the B Reactor site, noting that the site received 7,897 visitors and provided 221 tours in FY2011. Other accomplishments include the Chairman's award for Achievement in Historic Preservation of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and a recommendation from the Department of the Interior to be included in the Manhattan Project National Historic Park.
  - Matt notes that the B Reactor provides the agencies with the opportunity to tell the Hanford story, and they hope to expand public access to the site, especially to include individuals under the age of 18.

#### Hanford Cleanup – FY2012 and Beyond

- Matt said a review has been completed by DOE-RL, with support from DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ) to optimize cleanup dollars. In order to maintain momentum on the River Corridor, groundwater cleanup and PFP, Matt said that the agencies have agreed on a TPA change package that will delay some secondary milestones on the Central Plateau to allow them to maintain focus on these cleanup efforts. Matt invited Board members with questions to speak with him at a later time.
- He said the implementation of the review results and the FY2012 U.S. House of Representatives proposed budget mark of \$1.026 billion support the key components of DOE-RL's 2015 Vision.

#### *Department of Energy Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)*

Scott Samuelson is the new manager at DOE-ORP, and comes to Hanford with 27 years of nuclear experience. He thanked the Board for their participation at Hanford and invited members to ask him any questions throughout the day.

Scott provided the annual update for accomplishments at DOE-ORP for FY2011. He introduced the new DOE-ORP management team, noting that he hopes the positions and key staff will have more permanence than in the past. He is changing the structure of the office to be more efficient, including consolidating two engineering and safety groups. Scott said he sees the DOE-ORP mission as a straight forward strategy to remove waste from the tanks and move the waste into safe storage. He said they are committed to that mission.

Scott spoke to the importance of safety on site, noting his personal commitment to safety from his experience in construction. Scott said there are many safety programs in place on site that are strong and compliant.

Scott thanked the Board for advice provided in FY2011, noting that the budget advice and relevant committee discussion have been particularly helpful in a stressful budget year.

Scott reviewed the various accomplishments for tank farms, 2020 Vision integration, and the WTP, noting:

- Tank Farms:

- DOE-ORP has been retrieving tank waste, monitoring vapors, researching supplemental treatments and immobilization, and increasing tank leak loss and structure integrity in FY2011.
- DOE-ORP has successfully used the Mobile Arm Retrieval System (MARS) on sign-shell tanks in C Farm.
- WTP:
  - WTP is 60 percent complete, which is an increase of 8 percent from this time last year.
  - Civil, structural, and architectural design for the HLW Facility is complete, and construction continues to advance; melters will arrive this fall. Melters for the Low Activity Waste (LAW) Facility are in place.
  - The first large piping module has been installed in the Pretreatment Facility (PT), and large scale integrated testing is underway. The remaining 12 piping modules will be placed in the next few years. Designs for the concrete walls of the PT were recently issued.

Scott reviewed a diagram of tanks in C Farm, noting that six tanks are empty, nine tanks are in a stage of active retrieval, and one tank is being prepped for the next version of MARS, which will implement a vacuum system. Retrieval using MARS will begin in October 2011.

Scott said the 2020 Vision for DOE-ORP is about looking at their work in a whole systems approach, helping contractors to work together, and ensuring the WTP and wastes are ready for processing and treatment at the same time. Integration of tank farms and WTP is the 2020 Vision.

Scott reviewed a diagram of WTP Turnover to Commissioning, noting the timeframes for the listed facilities:

- Turnover in 2013:
  - Fire Water Pump House Facility
  - Non-Radioactive Liquid Waste Disposal Facility
  - Glass Former Storage Facility
  - Fuel Oil Facility
  - Chiller / Compressor Plant
  - Water Treatment Facility
  - BOF Switchgear Building
  - Cooling Tower Facility
  - Anhydrous Ammonia Storage Facility
  - Standby Diesel Generators.
  - Main Switchgear Building
- Turnover in 2014:
  - Steam Plant Facility
  - Laboratory
- Turnover in 2015:
  - LAW Facility
- Turnover in 2016:
  - Wet Chemical Storage Facility
  - Emergency Power Facility
  - PT
- Turnover in 2017:
  - HLW

Scott reviewed work completed successfully on the 222-S Laboratory, 242-A Evaporator, and the S, SY, and SX Tank Farms. The work was completed due to ARRA funding. Necessary updates were made to the facilities and farms to make them safe for workers, modern, efficient, and ready for future work.

Scott said that DOE-ORP is working to understand budget implications for FY2012. DOE-ORP priorities under budget constraints are: to continue good progress in tank retrievals; to prepare waste feed for WTP; and to start turnover of the WTP facilities in 2012.

Scott reviewed DOE-ORP plans for FY2012, including:

- Tank Farms:
  - C Farm.
  - Hanford Storage Facility (new project).
  - TPA Activities:
    - Single-shell tank structural analysis
    - Hose-in-hose transfer lines
    - Barriers
    - Waste feed delivery.
- WTP:
  - Complete LAW design and 90 percent of piping installation.
  - Complete HLW Wet Process Cell installations, oxidizers, and off gas absorbers.
  - Receive PT boiler, heater exchange, and motor control center, and place concrete steel, piping, and HVAC ducting.
  - Complete Lab construction sustainability.
  - Complete Balance of Facilities Title II Civil/Structural design.
  - Complete Chiller Compressor Plant and Anhydrous Ammonia Facility construction.

Scott said challenges for DOE-ORP in FY2012 include the budget, aging equipment and infrastructure, and communications. He said he will work with his staff to be more open and transparent with projects and decisions at DOE-ORP; they will make sure the Board is informed on how decisions are made.

#### *Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)*

Polly Zehm, Washington State Department of Ecology, said she appreciates the work of the Board and congratulated Susan Leckband on her retirement, and recognized her commitment and leadership. Polly said she wasn't aware of most of the work at Hanford prior to her 2003 appointment, and she said she can't emphasize enough how impressive the evolution of the work at Hanford is. She said it was once difficult to talk about building foundations for the future given past constraints, but Hanford is in a different place now.

Polly provided an update on Ecology's nuclear waste program.

#### FY2011 Highlights

- The Consent Decree was signed after many years of legal negotiations. Polly said the agencies, Board, and the public needs to continue to work together to meet goals and make hard decisions.
- The first Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report (Lifecycle Report) was released.
- WTP reached 60 percent completion.
- The state is currently challenging the Yucca Mountain decision.
- ARRA funding implementation brought jobs to the Tri-Cities and completed important work before the current budget crunch.

- Substantial progress was made on preparing the Hanford Site-wide Permit (Permit).
- Ecology increased education and outreach efforts to communicate what Hanford was, what it is, and what it requires so the communities see it as an asset, not a liability.

Polly said local communities need to continue to support and advocate for Hanford funding.

Polly reviewed Ecology responses to HAB advice, noting that the Board and agency dialogue is as important to Ecology as the advice.

Polly said work on the Permit is a key role for Ecology; she noted that the Permit is currently 14,000 pages long, and Ecology is working to make the document easily accessible and understandable through public involvement work.

#### Site-wide Permit Update

- What's the status?
  - Ecology is currently meeting with DOE and EPA to resolve comments made to the document; staff is working on formatting for the web and for print.
  - The Permit is being printed as draft units are completed, and fact sheets, "baseball cards," frequently asked questions, and more are posted on Ecology's website.
- Public Involvement activities:
  - The comment period is set to begin in January 2012 and will run for 120 days.
  - A HAB Committee of the Whole is planned for March 2012.
  - Public workshops/hearings are planned in the Tri-Cities, Seattle, Spokane, and Vancouver.
- HAB involvement in FY2011:
  - The agencies made presentations to committees in October and November 2010 and February, April, and May of 2012. Issue manager meetings were held with the agencies in October, February, and April.
  - The Board provided a letter to the agencies in June regarding the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and access to documents.

Polly spoke to budget constraints for Ecology, noting that employees received a three percent pay cut in July 2011, which will be effective until June 30, 2013. Employees must also now take 5.2 hours per month of Temporary Salary Reduction (TSR) during the biennium, which translates to eight extra days off per year in addition to regular leave. Polly noted that TSR is different from furlough days in that the Ecology office at Hanford will not have to close to accommodate leave. Polly said Ecology works to keep a core of devoted managers on site, but it is increasingly difficult to retain technical staff with the reducing salaries. She said Ecology is preparing for more cuts if needed and will submit a plan to the state for reductions of five to ten percent.

Polly reviewed Ecology cleanup priorities:

- Continue progress on groundwater cleanup and protection of river.
- Continue soil cleanup on the River Corridor.
- Complete PFP demolition work.
- Support tank retrievals, and construction and design of the VIT Plant.

Polly reviewed a timeline of Hanford groundwater remediation, noting that a much better present state of site has been accomplished because Ecology did not accept conditions set by the original TPA.

Polly spoke to education and outreach efforts conducted by Ecology in FY2011, thanking Pam Larson for creating engagement opportunities. She said the purpose of education and outreach is to ensure the next generation of opinion leaders, decision makers, and voters are knowledgeable about Hanford. Polly said that in FY2011, Ecology visited ten public schools, four universities, numerous school functions, and various community events like the Benton-Franklin County Fair and Tri-Cities Sportsmen's Show. She said communication tools include a Facebook page (currently 70 followers), a Hanford Education and Outreach listserv, and 20 plus blog post on the Ecology website in the past year. An email address was also created to complement the cleanup hotline.

Polly reviewed FY2012 goals for Ecology:

- Issue the Permit for public comment.
- Update the CRP.
- Continue discussions on tank retrievals and closure.
- Maintain focus on education and outreach to get the next generation engaged.

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

Dennis Faulk provided an update for the EPA. He said the ultimate goal of EPA is to protect the Columbia River, and he says they have been successful. Dennis said that due to ARRA funding, EPA has put groundwater protection systems in place over the past two years. Dennis reported that ARRA funding allowed EPA to hire three people locally, and all three of them are still working for the federal government.

Dennis said 10 million tons of soil have been removed from the River Corridor; the soil has been moved to ERDF. Complete contaminated soil removal is expected to be complete in the next few years.

Dennis said there was a large chromium spill at the 100 C7 site, noting that the agencies will remove the contaminated soil to 85 feet. He said the removed soil will require treatment before it can be moved to ERDF. The removal will cost \$15 to \$20 million and will be completed within the next couple of years.

Dennis said the 200 Area Groundwater Treatment Facility is the project EPA is most proud of, and it will go online in December 2011 to treat all groundwater in the Central Plateau. Dennis noted it cost \$200 million to build the facility, and it would have taken many more years to complete without ARRA funding.

Dennis said the PFP is a priority for the agencies, as it is the highest risk facility on site. He said sacrifices have been made in order to continue with decontamination and decommissioning (D&D), as the PFP is not well funded in FY2012; work in the Central Plateau has been slowed in order to accommodate this funding need. Dennis said it will cost \$1.4 billion to complete the project.

Dennis spoke to the public meetings on the plutonium waste sites associated with the PFP, noting that they were some of the best meetings he has experienced for the superfund cleanup. He said he was pleased to see many new faces at the meetings. He commended Board members for public meeting turnout.

Dennis said the 100 K Area Proposed Plan is 1,400 pages long and is only for one project. The plan will be available for public comment in late spring or early summer and will be the first of the proposed plans released.

Dennis said he is looking forward to discussions on the Lifecycle Report, the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) Five-Year Review, and CRP, as these documents are important to the agencies and have been in development for a long time. He said the CERCLA Five-Year Review will be important work for EPA in the upcoming months.

#### *Board discussion*

Mecal thanked agency representatives for their presentations. She said she recently went on a tour of the B Reactor with a group of college students, and they were told the tour does not focus on cleanup, even though cleanup is what held most of their interest. She said she would like the agencies to know that the tour bus driver was able to provide better cleanup information than the tour guide, but only after completing the tour. She said she would like to see a more formal approach or response to people's concerns over the potential problems at the WTP. Mecal said she would like to encourage the agencies to choose the most thorough route for removing plutonium from waste sites, noting that she has concerns about the knowledge sets on plutonium behavior. She said she would not like to see plutonium left for the next generation.

Laura Hanses, Non-Union/Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), commended DOE for their efforts in working with the bargaining unions to facilitate one site-wide bump and roll process, and asked each representative to explain their role in the layoff process for non-bargaining unit employees. Matt said DOE's role is confined to the requirements for the work force under human resource management. He said they try to ensure there is no discrimination in the layoffs, requiring contractors to write reports on how they are managing layoffs. Matt said that who is laid off and why is left up to the contractors. Laura spoke to the poor grouping of experienced and new employees, saying that the groupings are wrong and laying off vested employees is bad for the housing market. She said contractors have their own agendas and do not have long-term investments in their employees. Laura said the employees are DOE's best assets. She said baseline employees are being displaced because of ARRA hires. She expressed her concern over the retention of inexperienced employees over long-time tank farm employees. She said she would like the demographics of the layoffs provided to the Budgets & Contracts and Health & Safety committees.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, said he hopes DOE is engaging workers in finding a solution for sludge. He said that because employees were left out early on with the removal of spent fuel, millions of dollars have been wasted on something the employees could have provided insight for. Matt said the mockup of the sludge removal equipment in the maintenance and storage facility is being developed with both workers and managers. He said contractors know workers have the knowledge, especially for long term manipulation of systems.

Keith said the Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) has been studying tank vapors under great scrutiny and they may have some suggestions for how DOE-ORP should proceed. He said the HAB is pleased the stacks have been raised so people do not inhale vapors on a regular basis. He said he still has concerns about the content of the vapors, however, and DOE's ability to detect chemicals of concern in real time in order to alert workers to contaminants in their breathing space. Keith said Hanford has long had the tendency to build something and then allow it to deteriorate, like the transfer piping. He said Hanford doesn't maintain maintenance and surveillance equipment. He said he hopes DOE corrects this tendency. Keith asked what will happen with the pre-treatment facility for WTP if DOE does not proceed with it, given the technical issues. Scott said DOE will continue to work on detecting airborne contaminants quickly. He said there are concerns about whether the tanks that are supposed to go into the pre-treatment facility are designed in a way that will work; concerns like whether particles can be suspended in the fluids, heal accumulation, etc. He said these issues are subjects of large scale integrated testing that is just beginning. Scott said small scale testing indicated problems with

corrosion, but wanted the Board to note that small scale testing is not indicative for materials that will be handled at full scale. He said they are still concerned with what they have seen and will continue to try to make tests more reflective of actual conditions. He said it is important to note that the issue addresses five tanks out of the whole system. He said DOE believes the majority of tank waste can be sent through WTP, and they will work to figure out how to handle the five vessels, whether at WTP or on the feed delivery side.

Pam Larson, City of Richland (Local Government), thanked the agencies for all of the work completed under ARRA funding; the work has been encouraging and the people in the Hanford area are appreciative. She asked Matt how C Area soil will be treated once removed. Matt said they will fill the holes back in and will revegetate, while the soil will be treated at ERDF. Chemicals will be added to the soil to reduce chromium from level six to level three, making the contaminant less toxic and less mobile.

Pam spoke to public outreach opportunities in the region and thanked Ecology for their support. She said the Hanford Communities produces programming about Hanford for television and they receive comments from people who learn about Hanford from their homes, whether in Tri-Cities or in Portland.

Ken said he appreciates Scott addressing the WTP mixing issues. He asked Jane if Ecology is comfortable with DOE's response to the various WTP issues. Jane said they are happy that none of the issues have come as a surprise to them. She said they have been aware of everything before the information is released to the public, and Ecology has engineers overseeing the issues. She said they are in continual talks with DOE and technical staff to try to understand how to resolve the issues. Jane said they will ensure a safe and operational plant, and schedule comes second to safety. She said the expert panelists and independent reviewers are highly regarded. She said she thinks the proposed testing will be helpful and informative, and permits will not be issued until all questions are answered. Ken spoke to Bechtel National Incorporated's (Bechtel) recent announcement of their review panel and asked if there was any consultation with the work force or outside groups when selecting the panelists. Scott said contractors routinely bring in outside experts for reviews, and the timing worked well for this review. He said there are many bureaucratic reasons why it was easier for Bechtel to choose their own panelists. He said the group is composed of former senior members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) who as a group define nuclear safety culture. He said no one could have put together a more independent group, and he believes they will provide their honest findings. Ken asked if the group's work will be open or closed. Scott said DOE is encouraging their workers to work with and be interviewed by the panel, but that public meetings are not a part of their scope. He said their output will be shared openly and broadly.

Maynard Plahuta, Benton County (Local Government), noted Scott acknowledging that infrastructure concerns will be last in priorities under the current budget constraints and asked if he has any other concerns about infrastructure other than the evaporator. Scott said he has concerns but not a detailed list in order to provide an answer. He said he is aware that deferred maintenance causes problems, and they will have to start over if they wait too long.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), asked if Matt plans to revisit the decision on plutonium given the negative feedback he has received on the Process Waste 1, 3 and 6 (PW 1/3/6) and Cooling Water 5 (CW-5) Proposed Plan. Matt noted that public comment on the plan ended earlier in the week, and comments are currently being compiled. He said the agency leads will then determine any needs for modifications based on public comments, but that the technical basis of the decision is sound. He said examination of plutonium in the soil will always benefit from more characterization, but they have enough now to make a decision with public input. Dick said the analysis in the feasibility study is incomplete, flawed, and needs to be expanded to address the question fully. He said some of the conclusions lack support, and he does not see how DOE can proceed without more information.

Dick asked Scott if there is any effort to look at alternative solutions to the problem with the large tanks. He said DOE should know their alternatives before they get to the point of having to use one, and continuing without further examination would be unreasonable. Dick spoke to dealing with high level waste canisters and interim storage, noting that he previously made suggestions about upgrading the High Level Waste Facility to also be a shipping facility. He said it would be a small design change with potential for reduction in developing a new shipping facility. He asked if anyone is thinking about it. Scott said that they currently don't have anywhere to ship the glass logs that will come out of WTP; the logs will be stored onsite until an option becomes available. Scott said they recently concluded looking into an interim storage facility, deciding on an underground, open rack storage that will eventually need shipping capabilities.

Dick asked about the immobilization medium being used in the glass plants, noting that silicate has limitations. Scott said he isn't aware of any ongoing efforts to actively consider forms of output from WTP, but that they will consider other alternatives as they learn more about plant capabilities.

Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), said the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) recently issued a letter to the Secretary of Energy validating workers' concerns about safety and being able to speak up. He asked if Scott is taking any steps to address what the DNFSB and employees have identified as safety culture issues. Scott said they are communicating and opening up to make sure employees know DOE wants to hear their concerns. He said they are appreciative of what the DNFSB has pointed out, and they will look into it. He said DOE falters in not communicating when an issue has been raised and how they have dealt with it. Scott said he will not stand for retaliation on workers who raise safety concerns. Tom asked if DOE plans any kind of public process to address the issues. Scott said they don't have any plans but the subject is actively being discussed with his staff. Tom noted that a public process would be helpful.

Doug Mercer, University of Washington (University), asked about the project baseline summary (PBS) title budget and how much control DOE has over the dispersal of those funds for waste disposition and construction. Scott said they have less than optimal control, but that they work through the budget process with appropriators to make sure they understand the best split of the funds to get the work done. He said as they get closer to understanding the bottom line for system support, they provide recommendations for splitting funding for an optimal path forward. Scott noted that it is crucial to strike the right financial balance year to year. Doug asked Scott to address the uncertainties in construction and design for the dispersing method, asking if the uncertainty is big enough that the issue should be addressed. Scott said the fundamental process does not need to be changed.

Doug spoke to using the 100 K Area Proposed Plan as a template for the other five proposed plans, noting that the completion of the six documents will be a historic moment for Hanford. He said he thinks this is the message to be shared with the public, and he asked if the agencies share the same understanding of the implications of the plans. Dennis said putting the final decisions in place for final cleanup is important to all of the agencies. He said using the 100 K Area Proposed Plan as a template will provide a good public policy discussion, and he hopes the document will be useful for other documents. Doug reiterated that the milestone is very important to communicate to the public; he asked what the communicated message will be. Dennis said the message is that cleanup work has been ongoing at Hanford for over 20 years, and a very significant portion will soon be finished. He said that breaking the site up into manageable chunks and completing one of those chunks is also very important to communicate to Congress.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said the expectations for what constitutes meaningful public involvement are set in the CRP. He asked the agency representatives to communicate their commitment to holding public meetings around the region. He also asked what the representatives heard from the public at the public meetings held on plutonium, specifically relating to

retrieving material under the caps. He said there was not adequate public notice in order for citizens groups to provide turnout for the first of the plutonium meetings, and inadequate public notice demonstrates poor public involvement commitment. He asked the agencies about their commitment to providing public access to documents throughout comment periods. Gerry reiterated Dick's concerns about the plutonium tanks not being fully characterized, and if they were characterized, the characterization is out of date. He said the public deserves to know this information and required public access to documents needs to be included in the CRP.

In response to Gerry, Dennis said the agencies are arranging a stakeholder call to discuss the desire to hold public meetings on the CRP. Dennis said the Oregon meetings on plutonium were very successful, and people said they want more plutonium removed. They also said they don't trust the agencies to keep the institutional controls (ICs) in place, and they have concerns about climate change. Dennis said the public is concerned that the plutonium figure seems to be extremely high, so the agencies are working to make sure the number is solidified for the record of decision (ROD). Dennis noted that the agencies extended the public comment period on PW 1/3/6 and CW-5 due to lack of access to the documents. Jane said she heard the same public input as Dennis and noted that she would like to engage the public using modern technology and other outreach tools, rather than depend on public meetings. She said different outreach methods can be addressed during the stakeholder call. Matt confirmed that DOE will take part in the discussion on CRP outreach, and he shared Jane's thoughts on different engagement techniques. He reiterated Dennis's comments on what was heard at the plutonium meetings, and noted that as a decision maker for the ROD, he will take all public comments into account; the ROD will be issued at the end of September. Matt said there were workshops in 2008 and 2009 to help inform the decision on plutonium. Scott said he is still learning about the CRP process, but he knows the agencies will do what is required and more.

Gerry said there is nothing like face to face meetings when it comes to communicating with the public and understanding what they want in terms of public involvement. Gerry noted that the CRP was due to be revised three years ago, and it is not the public's fault it has taken this long. Therefore, the public involvement portion of the review should not be as constrained as it is. Gerry suggested the agencies provide a public meeting in Spokane, as there are many people there who are invested in Hanford and have been requesting public meetings for a long time.

Larry Lockrem, Benton County (Local Government), said it is unfortunate that laid off workers cannot be moved to WTP in order to help all of the facilities come online, but he noted the work force will need to be different. Larry encouraged the agencies to work with the universities in the area to train the chemists and chemistry technicians that will be needed when the LAB is commissioned in 2014. He said there currently are not enough chemists and chemistry technicians in the area to support operations. He said the agencies have time to make sure the work force is prepared for the future.

### **FY2011 Board Accomplishments / Committee Reports**

EnviroIssues distributed a table showing the Board and committee accomplishments relative to the FY2011 priorities. Susan Leckband noted that the table identifies projects tracked during the past year and where they originated. She said the purpose of the table is show the agencies what specific actions have been taken on the priority work items, and that the Board takes the agency recommendations for priorities seriously. Susan reviewed the high-priority items identified in the table.

Susan Leckband reviewed how Board members and alternates are appointed to the Board, noting that the process occurs every two years. She said the latest group of people to go through the appointment process have received their appointment letters. Pam asked if Board members appointed by city officials are also subject to the two-year appointment process. Susan said yes, and sometimes it takes time to identify the appointing authority.

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

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen) and PIC chair, said PIC is continuing to place emphasis on opportunities for the public to understand cleanup issues and more effectively participate in cleanup decisions. Steve said the reason PIC is successful is due to committed committee members who also attend the technical committee meetings. Steve complimented the core PIC members, specifically vice-chair Liz, who attends every HAB and each committee's meeting. Steve said the real business of the HAB is done in committees, and members are missing out if they do not participate in committees.

Steve said the PIC discussed how to strengthen committee participation and awareness. He said one idea is to have each committee identify hot topics and points of discussion after each committee meeting so the rest of the Board can follow what the committee is doing. Steve noted that the hot topics would not be a replacement for meeting summaries.

Steve said that this year the PIC sponsored HAB Advice 239 and 240 and participated in State of the Site and various public meetings. After each public meeting, the PIC debriefs on what worked, what didn't work, and future applications. He said Ken Niles served as facilitator for the Oregon public meetings on plutonium, noting that the public appreciated Ken and his familiarity with Hanford and the community.

Steve said in the coming year, PIC will be revisiting many topics like strategic planning, reviewing the CRP, and encouraging HAB members to be more active in their public involvement responsibilities.

Susan Leckband noted that the PIC has taken on the task of engaging in the whole Board in discussions about how the HAB is a public involvement mechanism and how each Board member has a responsibility to the public.

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

Keith said HSEP has been very busy this year. They will hold a meeting on October 14 to discuss PFP safety, biological controls specifically related to mosquito issues on site and their success, beryllium, and as a joint topic with the Tank Waste Committee, the DNFSB. Keith noted that a discussion and presentation on integrated safety management (ISM) was slated for October but had to be pushed out because Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large and HSEP vice-chair, will be presenting at the ISM conference the same day as the October meeting. Keith said Mike's approach to ISM and presentation on such is to help the agencies make it less complicated and easier to understand for implementation.

Mike said the presentation does not represent the full Board as he and Keith worked on it as private citizens in response to the Medical Support Contractor RFP. He said he appreciates the RFP process but the comment period was too short. He said issues with ISM may come up as HSEP contemplates advice for the PFP.

#### *National Liaison*

Susan Leckband provided the update for the National Liaison, as Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, is currently attending a radiological waste conference. Susan said Shelley also attended the Site-specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting in Las Vegas. Susan said that this year, as chair of the Board, she has spoken to Tri-City leadership, participated in forums on behalf of the HAB, and has been invited to participate in an EPA dialogue focused on CERCLA reviews and other issues. She will provide further information to the Board as she learns more about the forum.

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

Gerry said BCC's major goal for FY2011 was to review and provide advice on setting budget priorities in the changing financial climate. He said the Board's budget advice had a significant impact and showed regional consensus for preserving and adding funding for work on the PFP and retrieval and treatment activities. Gerry noted the acknowledgement from the agencies on the positive impact of the budget advice. Gerry said the budget cuts to Hanford are very small compared to cuts to the overall DOE-EM cleanup budget. He said Congress has directed DOE and negotiators to shift funding in the direction supported by the Board. Gerry said BCC will continue to monitor priorities and will make sure funding goes to those priorities.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business) and BCC vice-chair, said BCC will begin to work through the Lifecycle Report along with other committees. He noted that the report is 370 pages, but the executive summary is only 5 pages. Harold said the Lifecycle Report will have a large scale impact on what will be done on site and when it will be done.

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

Pam asked RAP members to raise their hands; she thanked them for their hard work. Pam spoke to the pieces of advice that originated in RAP. Advice 237 dealt with the dismantling of the K East Reactor which required a fair amount of technical analysis. Pam said DOE decided not to continue with the project but the analysis will be helpful in the future. Advice 242 addressed preservation of historic facilities; Pam has seen an evolution in how the DOE field office dealt with cask cars and the train. She said they have responded to the advice in action, not in a letter. Advice 243 addressed the Solid Waste Burial Grounds, which is a major undertaking for retrieval of 40 linear miles due to the plutonium and uranium in the burial grounds. Pam said the advice stressed the need for additional characterization of those sites.

Pam said the HAB has not received a response on the advice addressing monitoring in the vadose zone. She said advice 246 on the River Corridor Baseline Risk Assessment (RCBRA) was passed in June after much iteration in the RAP. She said the advice stressed the importance of risk information and the document's use and availability for future documents and decisions. The advice spoke to improvements to the actual document and use of different sampling methods per EPA's guidelines. Pam said the concept of risk should be as understandable as possible, and RAP has requested public involvement materials for when RCBRA becomes publicly available. Advice 247 addressed issues with PW 1/3/6 and CW-5. Pam said the HAB has already heard about the overwhelming consensus on retrieving as much plutonium from the waste sites as possible. Pam said the HAB also passed advice 248 on the Greater than Class C (GTCC) Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). She noted that the HAB has not received agency responses on either advice 247 or 248.

Pam said that for the September RAP meeting, they will be discussing new contaminant information for the 324 Building and receiving an update on what has been found in Burial Ground 618-10. She said they will also discuss plans for the River Corridor and receive a status update on U Canyon. She said they will

be considering draft advice on the K Area River Corridor decision. Pam said RAP is anxiously waiting for the release of the Permit and the second draft of the Site-wide EIS.

Dennis apologized for EPA's late responses to the Board's advice, noting that they will wait to respond to advice on PW 1/3/6 and CW-5 until a response summary is completed at the end of September. Dieter said Ecology strives to provide responses within six weeks as a rule of thumb. He said they will work harder to meet that deadline.

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

Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon) and TWC chair, acknowledged vice-chair Larry Lockrem and asked TWC members to raise their hands. He said TWC members represent many skills and a huge amount of Hanford history. Dirk said TWC works closely with DOE and Ecology, as tank waste isn't a primary issue for EPA. He said TWC works on a wide range of issues relating to removing waste from the HLW tanks. Dirk encouraged participation from new members.

Dirk said TWC has focused on no less than 20 issues in past year, from treatable waste to WTP technology development to regulatory issues. He said they produced three pieces of advice. The first was related to the Environmental Cleanup Board Tank Waste Sub-Committee and transparency for that process. He said the agency response was to say they would try to be more open but were not required to make their meetings public. Dirk said TWC provided advice on systems planning, asking for relevant dates and times for input; DOE-RL and Ecology responded positively. In June, TWC developed the basis for Advice 245 on systems planning with eight advice points. Dirk said DOE-RL and Ecology both responded and agreed on four of the points relating to collaborative work on lifecycle and maximizing technetium and iodine. He said they disagreed on three points relating to assessing contamination for tank farms and related areas, and on uncertainties in general. Dirk said DOE's response was that the work either isn't in DOE-ORP's scope of work or the issue is too complex. Dirk said the agencies side-stepped the issue of not being diverted by new technology.

Dirk said TWC will focus on safely retrieving and closing tank farms in FY2012. Larry thanked everyone on the Board and the agencies for support in 2011, and he reiterated Dirk's encouragement of committee participation.

Susan Leckband encouraged more active participation in the meetings. She thanked the agencies for responding to advice, noting that responses normally take two to three months. She noted that it would seem more relevant and timely to receive the responses sooner.

#### **Site-specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Action Items**

##### *Introduction of action items*

Susan Leckband reviewed three action items proposed by the SSAB for DOE-EM. She said the first piece applauds DOE for cleanup work but asks DOE to make sure future assets are looked at more carefully. The second piece speaks to disposal of historic assets and their potential reuse; the SSAB would like DOE to use disposal funds to transfer the assets to groups who would like to display the assets for educational purposes. The third piece addresses transportation issues for radiological waste. Susan said the Board will need to provide approval for each piece in order for her to support the pieces through the SSAB, and she would prefer to pass or not pass the advice through consensus.

##### *Board discussion*

Jeff Luke, Non-Union-Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), noted that the Board is not allowed to make changes to the SSAB documents as they are not the authors. He said it is unfortunate because Susan's explanations of the pieces were much clearer than the actual advice.

Ken said he agrees the pieces need clarification and said he has concerns about the transportation of assets potentially being more expensive than disposal. Ken said he would rather the Board not put their signature on advice that still needs work. Ken spoke to the advice concerning railroad transport for radiological waste, noting that the example provided is too site specific and is tainted by previous efforts that were poorly planned without input from states. He said DOE is already looking into railroad shipments. Ken said the Board should not sign the that piece of advice.

Pam said the advice on future assets is poorly written. She said the advice on disposition is useful, and she would support it while deferring to Ken's expertise on the rail transport advice. Pam noted that she has spoken with the museum that provides artifact preservation for Hanford about the two pieces of advice concerning assets, and the museum supports passing the advice.

Mike said he is unsupportive of the advice pieces on disposition because disposition procedures are unclear, but can be successful if followed. He said he wouldn't want to send a former Hanford computer to school only to later find out the computer was contaminated. Mike said the advice does not add value to what is already in the disposition procedures, but he would not stand in the way of a consensus decision by the Board.

Maynard said federal law dictates that it is appropriate to charge a project for artifact related activities if the artifacts may potentially be used in museums or other contexts; additional costs can be incurred for items of historical or cultural significance. He said many activities can take place to ensure assets and artifacts are not contaminated. Maynard said he is happy that former site cask cars were preserved early on, as DOE could have made a decision to simply fill them with grout. He said that just because something is contaminated, it doesn't mean it can't be preserved.

Doug asked if it is possible for the advice to be revisited by the SSAB before being passed. Susan said she will tell the SSAB the rationale behind the Board's decision should they choose not to sign; she will take back small and large concerns. Susan noted that there aren't any time constraints on the pieces of advice, and the SSAB might want to revise the pieces that will have a long term effect.

Dick noted that the quality of writing in the pieces is not up to the Board's standards. Susan said she agreed and noted the quick timeframe in which the advice was crafted.

Susan Leckband asked the Board to consider the pieces of advice before making a decision; she asked members to provide any written comments to her.

After consideration, the Board agreed to sign the second letter on disposition and asset preservation. The advice concerning future assets and railroad transportations did not reach Board consensus and will not be supported by the Board.

### **Draft Advice: Draft Third CERCLA Five-Year Review Report**

#### *Introduction of advice*

Vince Panesko, City of Richland (Local Government), provided an overview of the advice, saying that the CERCLA review is done every five years on waste sites completed by DOE to ensure the remedy is still

protective of humans and the environment. Vince noted that DOE no longer has to monitor waste sites once the contamination has been completely removed. For waste sites with remaining contamination, a review every 5 years is required to ensure the remedy is protective of human health and the environment. Vince thanked the agencies for allowing RAP to review the document early, commending them for the document's usability. He said the review focuses on areas that are not protected, pump and treat sites, and more, but that the Board's advice will only focus on policy level issues.

Vince said one issue of concern is that DOE says some remedies are protective but they don't provide supporting material. He said the advice is to provide linkage or an appendix for supporting documents for decisions regarding protectiveness. Vince said another issue for the Board to address is that the author of the report reported to RAP that in some cases, he did not complete measurements for site protectiveness; in some cases, he only drove by the sites to make sure the ICs were still in place. Vince said the ICs may be protective now, but they won't be in 100 years. Vince referenced Board Advice 190 which said the Board doesn't want DOE relying on ICs like fences and signs for protectiveness. He said RAP also heard that the agencies consider a site protective if they think the contamination won't move. Vince noted that this issue will also be addressed at subsequent meetings.

#### *Agency perspective*

Matt thanked RAP for reviewing the document and clarified that an analysis of protectiveness has to include whatever is outline in the ROD for the site, including ICs. He said ICs are part, but not all, of the remedy. Matt said DOE has an extensive groundwater well network that is part of the report, but they need to better demonstrate how it ties to the CERCLA Five-Year Review. He said they are still working on the technology for how to monitor what contamination is left is in place and mitigation for potential migration.

Dennis said many of the issues with the review boil down to the exposure scenarios used by DOE. He said that under the Model Toxic Control Act (MTCA), in-depth contamination is tracked long term no matter who has the rights to the site. He said the agencies have demonstrated that mobile contaminants are retrieved as much as possible. He said the report does not accurately tie together how protectiveness determinations were made; a multitude of information was used, but the casual reader doesn't know how to track it. Dennis noted that EPA recently provided their comments on the CERCLA Review and they are happy to share them with the Board. He said there is a difference in contaminant behavior between the River Corridor and the Central Plateau, and that they don't have a handle on the 200 Area because they are further along with river cleanup. Dennis said Hanford gets a double review process for the CERCLA Five-Year Review because of the interim actions for the waste sites. Dennis said he thinks the Board's advice is clear.

John said there are not many final RODs on site, and that the agencies have been testing the five-year ROD review process and fine tuning it. He said DOE has set the bar high for the review but they are not quite there yet. He said they need to do better, and that while they are following some requirements, they have not yet evaluated new technologies to improve cleanup progress for the final ROD, which is something they said they would do under CERCLA. He said this issue ties into the Board's advice point three. He said DOE needs to consider what they want the Five-Year review to be and how they will get there.

#### *Board discussion*

Betty said Matt and Dennis are contradicting each other when it comes to the Board's comments on ICs, and she would like to see the Board's advice on not relying on ICs reiterated in the CERCLA advice. Matt clarified that ICs will have to be evaluated for protectiveness if they are outlined in a ROD but that the

Board can still ask them to lessen reliance on ICs. Dennis said that for EPA, ICs are only administrative in function. He said he does not consider a fence to be an IC. He said the Board could advise DOE to do whatever they can to limit ICs and fully monitor the sites that have them in place. Vince noted that IC reliance is included in advice point one.

John Stanfill, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), thanked RAP for their work and said the advice covers all of the Nez Perce Tribe's concerns. He said DOE has a hard time answering the question "How do you know?" He said the Nez Perce Tribe supports the advice.

Mecal asked when the sampling and monitoring technology will be ready and available for Board or public involvement. Matt said there will be a discussion as DOE looks at the Inner Area and how to provide confidence that contamination in the soil is physically safe and is being monitored. He said the technology will be available between now and 2016.

Doug said the agencies are unable to provide evidence that ICs work. He said the Board would be more comfortable with ICs if they had proof that they work. Vince said how ICs work depends on how ICs are defined. He said DOE defines them as fences and signs, as does the Board for purposes of the advice. He said DOE only looks for obvious signs that the ICs are effective every five years for the CERCLA review. Vince noted that RAP had this information confirmed verbally. Vince said the review itself is vague on confirmation of the IC's protectiveness. Vince said DOE should define what an IC is if they're going to use one. Doug said he would like the ICs to be proven effective through science and statistics. He said ICs should be evaluated in different locations over different periods of time. He said he would like to see the Board advise DOE to develop a formal research program for ICs. Dennis said DOE is required to conduct annual IC assessments, but that the review process didn't capture that accurately. He noted that how many creatures made it on a waste site is part of the assessment and that DOE needs to take credit for the assessments because that is how they verify ICs. Doug said monitoring should be identified as an IC, and an evaluation of monitoring effectiveness should be built into the RODs. He asked what happens if the person responsible for examining the ICs doesn't do a good job?

Susan Hayman said there is always confusion about whether the advice is about remedies themselves or about the Five-Year Review to determine if remedies are still protective. Ken agreed with Susan, noting that the advice has been muddied by focusing too much on ICs. He said Board comments should say DOE needs to do a better job assessing the effectiveness of remedies, whatever they should be. Ken provided language edits that focus the advice on verification of remedy effectiveness.

Gerry said there is disconnect between the CERCLA Review and RCBRA, and he doesn't know how to reconcile them without changing the exposure scenarios that find all of the sites protective. He asked if DOE asked the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to comment on whether the scenarios are protective of species. Matt said he doesn't believe they asked NOAA to comment but he will verify. Dennis said that with the final RODs, the agencies can select different exposure scenarios that will require less or more cleanup. He said they tried very hard 18 years ago to be relatively restrictive because they didn't want to do a plethora of cleanup when they knew things would change. He said change will come with the final ROD. Dennis said the City of Richland completed a comprehensive land use plan and asked the agencies to revisit the 300 Area to make sure the area is consistent with their future uses. Dennis noted that this is how the processes are meant to work together. Gerry said the interim ROD exposure scenario is that no one is exposed because no one goes on the land, while the RCBRA is based on the scenario of live along and fish. He asked why DOE is allowed to have two different answers. Dennis said groundwater has to be taken out of the equation because groundwater swamps out the risk otherwise. He said the exposure scenario in the 100 Area says that anyone should be able to live on waste site land anywhere outside of the 200 Area, but that it's not possible now because DOE controls the land and groundwater is not at an acceptable use yet.

Dan Serres, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said he thinks advice point two is the heart of the advice. He suggested adding soil monitoring as well as groundwater monitoring. Jeff said he doesn't think the Board should itemize which controls they want looked at. He said there is potential to miss something to monitor if they itemize other things. He said that if the itemization remains, he would like to the language to say "such as" so it's not exclusive. The Board agreed.

Mecal said checking that remedies are working is different from suggesting methods of verification. She said being specific in what the Board wants to see in methods of verification adds to DOE's confirmation or remedies.

Dick said he agrees with Ken's suggestions and noted issues with DOE's idea that sites are deemed protective because of ICs. He said simply having ICs in place does not prove anything. He said to demonstrate the ICs are effective will require a sampling program, and he believes the advice says that without specific reference to ICs. Liz said referencing ICs was originally an important issue for RAP. She said she doesn't want to lose the primary issue that an IC should not be the primary sign of effectiveness.

Jeff asked Dennis to clarify the definition of IC, as Jeff inferred that Dennis's definition is a barrier to prevent intrusion but the Board is talking about monitoring remedies like caps or pump and treats. Dennis said DOE's definition of ICs includes fences and signs, but EPA considers IC's to be administrative in nature. He agreed that specific reference to ICs should be left out, as they are ultimately just one component of the remedies. He said the Board wants to make sure a remedy is protective given any changes. Dennis noted that actual monitoring is a different component for a ROD that is required annually or biannually. He said just because DOE controls access to a site, it does not mean the remedy is protective. Liz said it will be important not to lose that sentiment. Ken said ICs are not even among the top 15 issues with the CERCLA Review. Mecal said ICs demonstrate a lack of a remedy. She said a guard standing in an area will not be there for 200 years so protectiveness cannot be based on it. She said if the reference to ICs is left out, the Board is taking out the important contrast between measuring real remedies versus the remedy for now. She said an original issue with ICs is that they lack permanence. Ken noted that in a Five-Year Review, DOE can validate that a guard will be in place for five years and therefore the IC is protective.

John Stanfill said he supports Ken's suggestions, and that remedies are protective and ICs are only a small part of a remedy. He said DOE will ultimately have to prove how they know a remedy is effective. They will have to list the ways they checked on a contaminant to prove its not moving.

Betty said the advice say the CERCLA Review should assess whether it is appropriate to substitute a more long term remedy for an IC. She said she hopes that at some point the remedy will be looked at to have a better, more permanent solution.

Liz said the point of the advice is DOE's over-reliance on whether an IC like a fence is in place or not, not that the IC is part of a remedy. Jeff said a drive-by for a waste site is not intended to determine whether or not a remedy is working. He said just because a site is still restricted does not mean a remedy is working. Dennis said some people could read the CERCLA Review as saying that because a fence is up, an area is protected; Dennis said that read is not good. Pam noted that it took RAP a long time to realize that actual data is used in protectiveness decisions after the CERCLA author told them he simply drove by. Vince noted that they still haven't seen the actual data, which is the issue.

Gerry said this is the last CERCLA Review that will cover interim RODs, and the advice seems to be written as if it is only about the interim RODs rather than future reviews as well. He suggested re-adding bullet one that was stricken per Ken's suggestions. He said he would like the advice to say that

assumptions regarding maximum reasonable future exposure scenarios should be reviewed in light of public comment. He said once DOE relies on ICs as permanent remedies, it is vital that the assumption about how people will be exposed in the future is reviewed to see if it is still reasonable. Vince said Gerry's points are important to remember as the Board reviews the RODs that will be published in the next few years. He said the discussion is bigger than the advice. Ken suggested bullet one be re-added but as bullet five, and that the main point of the advice is the Board's dissatisfaction with this version of the CERCLA Review; the ICs are not the predominant concern. Jeff said the point is to ensure all controls are properly examined with supporting documentation. The Board agreed to Ken's suggestion of adding bullet five.

The Board discussed how to address the long term protectiveness of ICs in the advice. Ken said the advice is supposed to be a comment on this cycle of the CERCLA Five-Year Review. He said long term protectiveness and ICs are not relevant to this specific five-year review period and document. Gerry said he agrees with Ken but that he hopes this advice will influence future review periods. He noted that the CERCLA Review is not subject to normal public involvement.

The Board reorganized and clarified the advice points. The advice was adopted.

### **Draft Advice: Waste Management Area C Performance Assessment**

#### *Introduction of advice*

Vince Panesko, City of Richland (Local Government), provided an overview of the advice and said DOE-ORP mirrored processes done at the Savannah River Site regarding tank farm assessments and provided workshops to help people understand tank modeling. He said these activities came to a stop under DOE-HQ direction because of the importance of supporting the publication of the Tank Closure and Waste Management Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS). Vince said it was the Board's understanding that there was supposed to be a chronological order to the completion of tank farm documents, noting the order of the TC&WM EIS, performance assessment, and closure documents, all to be completed in sequence. DOE was supposed to complete the documents by the end of 2014 to meet the TPA milestone for C Farm closure. Vince said the Waste Incidental to Reprocessing (WIR) Process is uncharted waters with a high potential for delay. Vince spoke to issues concerning the delay of one document affecting the schedule and completion date for other documents. He said the Board would like to hear more about programmatic inputs when schedule delays are announced. He said there is need for an updated schedule for the performance assessment and tank closure documents. Vince noted the schedule updates could be accomplished on the Hanford website with periodic updates in the future.

#### *Agency Perspective*

Scott said he has no objections to the advice; he provided one wording change to be more specific for closure activities at C Farm.

John Price, Ecology, said he thinks the advice is good. He said there are five major sets of regulations in control when it comes to the TC&WM EIS, and they will continue to have problems with what to complete first and what to wait on. He said the advice addressing the potential for tank closure delays and the need for the public to understand the schedule is very good. John noted that retrieval and closure are both challenging aspects, and DOE will continue to be challenged to stay in control of the schedule. He said their schedules already have float time built in.

### *Board discussion*

Dick said the DOE representative who presented to the TWC on this issue pointed out that there is currently no float in the tank farm schedule, which is why it is addressed in the advice. The Board agreed to leave the float time point in the advice.

Jeff suggested deleting the last paragraph in the background section of the advice because it reads more like advice, while its information is still provided in the advice points. The Board agreed to remove the paragraph.

Ken suggested that the advice omit the reference to the tank closure end date of 2019, as it is possible 2019 may not be met given financial concerns and potential schedule delays. Maynard asked if omitting the date would set a precedent for not acknowledging milestones because they may not be fulfilled. Vince said he supports the omission because the background mentions the milestone. Susan Leckband said the point of the advice is to receive information on activities until they are complete, no matter what the end date is.

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

## **2011 Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule and Cost Report**

### *Issue manager framing*

Harold said he has reviewed the whole report and is impressed by it. He said providing advice will be a cross-cutting issue for many committees and may require a Committee of the Whole in order to provide advice to DOE-RL on the report. He said the report estimates the total cleanup cost of \$115 billion. Harold said the Board needs to address how to review the document and put comments together for advice, which may not apply until the next revision of the report. Harold noted that Board members with varying expertise may differ in opinion about some of the results in the report, including assumptions and end states.

### *DOE presentation*

Shannon Ortiz, DOE-RL Lifecycle Report Project Manager, provided an overview of the Lifecycle Report, noting that she will prepare the document annually with support from MSA Portfolio Management. The Lifecycle Report will be submitted to EPA and Ecology every year under TPA Milestone 36-01.

### Overview

- DOE submitted the Lifecycle Report to the regulators on July 25 and to the public on August 4, 2011. The Lifecycle Report complies with TPA milestone direction and is centrally organized by the PBS (Project Baseline Summary), which coincides with how DOE submits budgets.
- The Lifecycle Report reflects all cleanup work to be completed by DOE-RL and DOE-ORP through 2060, as well as 30 years of long-term stewardship through 2090.
- The Lifecycle Report supports continued discussions with EPA and Ecology on how and when DOE will complete cleanup, and how milestone changes might affect lifecycle scope, schedule, and cost.
- The Lifecycle Report is for planning purposes only; it is not a decision document. Costs are provided in estimates, and estimates are shown in 2010 dollars.

## Hanford Scope

- The Lifecycle Report is formatted by the three major components of site cleanup: River Corridor, Central Plateau, and Tank Waste. One chapter is provided for each component. The scope of Hanford cleanup work is broken down into a series of PBSs: ten for DOE-RL and two for DOE-ORP.
- The Lifecycle Report does:
  - Provide project scope, schedule, and cost from FY2011-FY2090 for both field offices.
  - Show the remaining estimated cleanup costs for projects.
  - Include post-closure long-term stewardship and ICs, safeguards and security, pension costs, and community and regulatory agency support for the full site, not just environmental cleanup.
  - Include regulatory documentation of site cleanup decisions.
  - Reflect tribal and stakeholder values.
  - Include actual budget appropriated in FY2011, the President's requested budget in FY2012, and future cost estimates that support full compliance.
- The Lifecycle Report does not:
  - Include DOE operating budgets of tribal grants.
  - Identify prime contracts as they are for a short period of time.
  - Identify ARRA funding separately (but is included in FY2011 costs).
  - Show work force or full time equivalent (FTE) estimates.

Shannon reviewed the remaining cleanup schedule for waste cleanup and management, noting that chapters four through seven and Appendix E of the report detail schedules for the three site components and mission support services.

Shannon spoke to the \$115 billion cost for total site cleanup, saying that DOE-RL accounts for 45 percent of the cost at \$52 billion, while DOE-ORP takes 55 percent of the budget at \$63 billion. The \$115 billion figure does not include the range of costs for alternatives, but the report will be updated with remedy costs as cleanup decisions are made. She said that for the 2011 Lifecycle Report, the TPA agencies identified 39 cleanup actions for which final decisions are needed, going into in-depth analysis for disposition of the 100 Area Surplus Reactors and the 200 SW-2 Operable Unit Burial Ground. Shannon noted that the upper bound costs for the two actions are not included in the report but will be incorporated when decisions are made.

Shannon concluded by noting that the 2011 Lifecycle Report is currently available on the Hanford website, and the TPA agencies will be accepting feedback through November 10, 2011. She said feedback on the 2011 Report will influence the 2013 edition of the report.

### *Regulator perspective*

John Price spoke to the frustration of Board advice not being able to affect the report until the 2013 edition, noting the timeframe of the tank waste lawsuit settlement that required the first Lifecycle Report to be completed within nine months of the settlement, with each new addition required in January for subsequent years. John said it is a positive that the Board will have a longer period of time than normal to impact the next edition. John said he thinks some Board members will not agree that the Lifecycle Report reflects tribal and stakeholder values. He said Ecology is pleased to have the first edition available, and they look forward to making the report even better.

Scott echoed John's comments, noting that the report is not where DOE-ORP would like it to be either. He said the Board's input will be valuable for identifying areas that need more work.

Dennis said he too had a bit of sticker shock when it came to the \$115 billion cleanup cost. He spoke to cleanup decisions that will affect the total cleanup cost, like long-term reactors that are currently represented as a zero cost element. Dennis said he would appreciate the Board's advice on areas to cover with full analysis for the 2013 report, as well as advice on uses for the report. He said he does not quite know what to do with the report, currently, but he hopes it will be valuable and meet Board expectations in the future.

### *Board discussion*

Susan Leckband said copies of the report are available in CD format for Board members. She asked Shannon about timing for advice. Shannon said it is too late to impact the 2012 version of the report but noted there is very little difference between the 2011 and 2012 versions. She said she would need advice from the Board in April 2012 to affect the 2013 report.

Keith asked Shannon how costs were calculated accurately if FTEs and work force costs were not included in the report. Shannon said the costs were based on crew sizes, but that FTEs have been calculated, they are just not included in the report. He asked if the \$115 billion figure is based on whether DOE caps or retrieves waste. Shannon said the cost will adjust as decisions are made on the 39 remaining cleanup actions. Keith noted that the total cleanup cost has changed significantly from the 1980's, when the cost was projected at \$56 billion.

Rick Jansons, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), asked if the scope for tank waste not accepted at WTP is included in the 39 remaining cleanup decisions. Shannon said she was not sure about that particular issue but she knows there are tank farm elements within the decisions.

Gerry said a few of the timelines in the report seem suspicious, and he asked about the SST milestone set for 2040, noting that supplemental treatment does not seem to be included. He said he is unsure why cleanup of the Central Plateau would extend far beyond tank waste cleanup, when he thinks it should be in reverse. He asked if the Lifecycle Report managers integrated the Board's advice on end state assumptions and key concerns. Shannon said the Central Plateau timeline is longer because there are some facilities in the area that cannot go through D&D until WTP is completed. She said the Lifecycle Report uses current baseline assumptions as developed in the Consent Decree. She said comments on the TC&WM EIS will not be incorporated into the Lifecycle Report until the EIS is complete. Gerry said examining the assumptions used will be a task of the committees.

Gerry said he thinks the Board is waiting to see if the Lifecycle Report is a useful tool for identifying activities that can be accelerated, things to shift around, and activities constrained by funding. Dennis said he hopes the report addresses solid waste burial ground issues captured during Board and public workshops. He asked that the Board look at the two in-depth analysis issues to see if DOE hit the mark or if there is anything else to be included.

Ken said the document provides good reference for unrelated topics, noting Appendix D which has a list of cleanup decisions including RODs, interim actions, etc. Ken said the list excludes a few national EIS's that could inform cleanup. He said he has concerns about the Board postponing comments on the report, as even though the Board is busy now, they might also not have time in FY2012 to devote to the Lifecycle Report. Ken said the in-depth analyses are not very deep and only take up about six pages of the report. He said the information does not seem new and is information that has been unsatisfactory to the Board before. He said the analysis for the SW-2 Burial Grounds should be an evaluation of partial excavation and a mix of remedies; it is not just all removal or nothing. Ken said it is not sufficient to attach a cost to a project if the document is supposed to be a tool to help decide project acceleration, impacts, and delays, noting that delays could cause additional costs. He said the report should address

delays and projects to move forward if extra funding becomes available. Ken said he has only seen minimum safe costs on a project basis for the PFP and K Area; he suggested a breakout for all projects be included in the report.

Maynard suggested including FTEs as that is information the surrounding communities rely on for planning for the Hanford work force. He said that if DOE has data, it should be included in the report.

Doug said from his understanding of the Lifecycle Report, it does not lend to communicating impacts of underfunding and other expected delays. He said he thought a central utility of the report was to communicate impacts and unexpected challenges. He asked if the report includes a graph of cost over time. Shannon said there are graphs throughout the document that show annual costs year by year, and by each DOE office. Doug suggested the graphs be shared in future presentations and asked why the timeline for the River Corridor is as it is. Shannon said the River Corridor, with the exception of the K Area, will be cleaned up by 2015 under the DOE 2015 Vision. Doug asked if DOE has made an assumption of capping for the K Area and if that assumption will carry to other units. Shannon said the assumptions will depend on alternatives for the other areas and CERCLA decisions. She said decisions will be made on a case by case basis.

Doug asked which PBS's have the largest upper and lower bounds, cost wise. Shannon responded that DOE-ORP 14, and DOE-RL 13, 30, and 40 have the largest ranges because those actions are the ones that run the longest.

Pam asked if cost for DOE-ORP includes operating costs for WTP. Shannon said it does. Pam said she would like to see aggregate numbers for why DOE-RL costs are similar to DOE-ORP even though DOE-ORP will be removing tank waste and operating WTP. Shannon said site services for both agencies are included in safeguards and securities. She noted that D&D of the canyons is a large cost for DOE-RL and is included in the report. Pam asked if DOE has briefed Congress on the cleanup figures. She said she is concerned about the sticker shock to Congress and Hanford's ability to sustain funding in light of the magnitude of the long-term costs. Shannon said lifecycle costs are communicated to Congress every year as costs are updated. She noted that the \$115 billion will be shocking, but that Congress has seen the cleanup costs for each office separately.

Liz clarified for the Board that comments for the Lifecycle Report can be accepted through both November 10, 2011 and through April 2012. She said one suggestion in PIC was to capture 2011 comments now and add 2012 comments later so advice is not being crafted at the last minute in April. Liz said she thinks the report will be useful for explaining big picture cleanup to the public since the report goes so far into the future.

Dick commended DOE for estimating costs in real dollars. He asked if the Lifecycle Report meets TPA Milestone 62-08. Shannon clarified that it meets Milestone 36-01. Dick said Milestone 62-08 was supposed to examine tank system costs over time and a variety of alternative solutions. He said the milestone was promised in 2006 and then never seen again. He appreciates that the Lifecycle Report analyzes a few alternatives but he would like to see one level down from the PBS level. Shannon said one level of information for overall Hanford is provided in the Executive Summary, the report introduction is broken into segments for DOE-RL and DOE-ORP, and that the appendixes go one level further. Dick asked about the decisions yet to be made that could have been explored in Milestone 62-08. Scott said that in terms of supplemental LAW treatment, he is trying to make a decision as soon as possible about what is and what is not effective. He said he would like to spend more time at WTP to see what it can and cannot do in order to make more informed decisions about what additional capacity will be needed. He said moving the decision out from the immediate future will serve well. John said that a series of milestones was redone out of the tank waste settlement agreement. He said the 2012 Lifecycle Report will

have System Plan 6 built in so that report will demonstrate improvements based on new logic from tank waste.

Harold spoke to the amount of work it will take the committees to review the report, and he asked if the Board will have access to the information used for making assumptions in order to develop advice. Susan Leckband said there is a tension between understanding the document and crafting advice. She said advice for the November Board meeting may only be at a high level, while the committees could continue to work on more detailed advice to bring to the February or April Board meeting. She said if the Board would like a Committee of the Whole for the topic, Board budget will have to be re-arranged. Betty Tabbutt, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen), asked how much progress committees can make without background information on the assumptions made in the report. She suggested the advice timeframe not be confirmed until that information is provided.

Betty asked if the report assumes flat funding. Shannon said the report is TPA compliant and utilizes profiles that will get the work done by the milestones. She said that as milestones are changed or added, the report will change too.

Gerry encouraged Board members to review the parts of the report that interest them and to attend the BCC meeting the following week to participate in the discussion and development of potential advice. He said Ken's comments are the beginning to thoughts for the advice. Susan Leckband said the Board can weigh in and determine the directions for the BCC. She said it is a good opportunity for participation.

Mike said it is important to consider how the Lifecycle Report can be used to communicate milestones to Congress and to the public, in addition to Board advice.

## **Board Business**

### *Finalize Board/TPA Agencies FY2012 priorities*

Susan Leckband said the most recent letter on agency priorities for the Board had been distributed to Board members. Susan Hayman reviewed the Board priorities as they were distributed to Board members and noted that the priorities have been through much iteration with leadership, committees, the Board, and the EIC. Susan Hayman said the Board priorities take TPA priorities into consideration.

### *Agency perspective*

Scott said he is new to the priority process, but that DOE did their best to capture areas of concern and issues for Board advice. He said he hopes the agency priority letter is clear to the Board.

Dennis said he believes the priorities to be consistent between the agencies and the Board and noted the work planning between the agencies and HAB leadership.

Dieter said none of the Board priorities are surprises to the agencies as they are mostly in agreement. He said Ecology will be interested in the Board's input in the coming year.

### *Board discussion*

Ken asked for a clarification of why the Central Plateau is listed as a non-priority for 2012. Dennis said the agencies and the Board still haven't reached a common understanding of where they are going with

the Central Plateau. He said a number of things have been issued in the past year that will need to be converged, the sooner the better. He said the agencies will want to spend some time on that this year. He said the River Corridor is top priority but they don't want to lose sight of convergence on the Central Plateau. The Board agreed to make the Central Plateau a priority.

Mecal said there is need for formal communication or resolution about the PT facility issues and the DNFSB investigation, noting that they don't appear on the priority list. She said something that has the potential to delay cleanup and cost more money should be tracked by the Board. She asked which committee tracks contracts and incentives. Susan Leckband said BCC looks at contracts on a yearly basis based on the appropriations schedule. Mecal asked about incentives, noting that they can be divergent from actual issues getting solved at Hanford. Susan said BCC has incentives in their work plan, but the Board priority list does not show so much detail. She suggested Mecal check with the committee on their work load. Gerry encouraged Mecal to participate in BCC because they have many concerns about incentives in contracts and allowing the contractor to choose what gets done, and when. Gerry said the Board has issued f advice on incentives in the past. Liz noted that HSEP also looks at incentives and how they might affect worker health and safety. Susan Leckband noted that issues with the WTP are listed on the first page of the priority list. She said the DNFSB investigation will be followed by TWC relating to safe design and operation, noting that the priority list may be added to later in the year if issues arise.

Mike compared the format of the two documents (Board and agency lists), noting the differences. He said he would like to see safety as an overarching priority on DOE's priority list.

Pam noted that the agency priority list does not represent many of the issues developed by HAB leadership at the leadership retreat. She asked if the agencies disagree with the Board's issues or if they flow together somewhere else. Susan Leckband said the priority table for FY2012 Board accomplishments will show both agency and Board priorities. Dennis said the agencies are willing to discuss everything on the Board's list. Pam said she wanted to bring it up because in the past, the agencies have said the Board is focusing on too many issues and spending too much funding. She said she doesn't want that issue to arise later in the year.

The Board formally accepted the list of Board priorities for FY2012. Susan Hayman said the committees will start to work on the priorities and incorporate them into their six month work plans. Susan Leckband noted the importance of work plans for demonstrating what work is being done for DOE and what funding is needed. She said the more the committees can refine and utilize their work plans, the better. Steve reiterated the importance of reading meeting summaries in order to understand the intensity and the density of the meetings surrounding the priority topics.

#### *Finalize FY2012 Board calendar*

Susan Hayman made some announcements on behalf of EnviroIssues, noting the staff changes while Cathy McCague and Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues, will be out for maternity leave. Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues and Board note taker, will be taking over for Nicole, while a new facilitator in the EnviroIssues Boise office will be taking over for Cathy, pending agency approval. Chelsey Funis, EnviroIssues, will be returning in November as Board note taker to fill behind Melissa while she covers the committee notetaking workload. Susan said EnviroIssues will ensure a smooth transition and will continue to provide excellent facilitation and support services. Susan reminded the Board and agencies that EnviroIssues staff members are not full-time HAB employees, with the exception of Tammie Gilley. While they cannot be available full-time, they will work hard to ensure timely communications with the Board. Susan said if anyone experiences problems with EnviroIssues' level or service they should let her know.

Susan Leckband reviewed the FY2012 Board calendar, noting that funding for the HAB will be less this fiscal year, and the Board needs to ensure the meetings being held are meeting priorities. Susan suggested the Board choose to hold committee meetings in either November or December 2011 (but not both), and to not hold committee meetings in July 2012. She said the cancellation of physical meetings does not mean the committees can't hold calls. Susan Hayman noted that committee week in October will be held one week before what is normal (i.e. the week of October 3) given the federal holiday and DOE alternative work schedule Friday off during the week of October 10. She said decisions about the November and December meetings can be made in October.

Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP, noted that the Deputy Director of Site Operations, Stacey Charbonneau, needs to approve the Board calendar and agendas. Susan Hayman said she provides Paula Call with the meeting topics for the next Board meeting 30 days in advance in order to put it into the Federal Register. Pamela asked about approval of the full year calendar. Susan said agendas for the full year cannot be projected that far in advance but EnviroIssues will cooperate with whatever is required.

Gerry asked about the Washington universities spring breaks scheduled for April 2012. Susan Hayman said marking the spring dates on the calendar is just a planning tool to make sure they don't place a Board meeting during a known spring break week. Gerry noted that if meetings are planned around universities with locations in the Tri-Cities, spring breaks from all areas should be considered.

The Board confirmed the Board calendar for FY2012.

#### *Identify FY2012 Board meeting locations*

Susan Leckband noted that three Board meetings for FY2012 will be held in the Tri-Cities and two outside of the area. She said the Board had hoped to host a meeting in Hood River, but meeting locations are not available on the dates selected.

Keith asked if traveling to Hood River makes the location more expensive. Susan Leckband said the cost to host a meeting outside of the Tri-Cities is double that of the cost inside the Tri-Cities no matter what the location. She said Hood River and Portland are about equal cost wise.

Susan Hayman asked if the Board would like to proceed with meetings in Portland and Seattle, or if they would like to do something different in light of budget concerns. Mecal said the public turnout in Seattle seems to be sparse, while many people in Portland, including university students, will miss an involvement opportunity if a meeting is not held there. Pam agreed with Mecal, noting that only one person provided public comment in Seattle. She said it doesn't seem worth it to hold a meeting in Seattle only to have EPA and Ecology leadership attend for five minutes. She said she would like the Board to consider continuing with the Portland meeting and finding a different location for the Seattle meeting.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large and Board vice-chair, noted that the real budget issue is hosting meetings at all, not the location of the meeting. He said facilitation support is main cost. He said the Board needs to better track costs and adjust schedules in the coming year. Gerry said the Board needs to ask DOE why the Board is receiving a budget cut that is more than expected compared to the rest of the Site. He said the EIC should demonstrate to the agencies that they have laid out a case for why the Board work needs to be done and a large financial cut is not acceptable. Susan Leckband said the budget issue will be dealt with when DOE receives final budget numbers.

Gerry said the Board is a regional group that needs to meet around the region. He said there has been a large turnout in Seattle in past years, noting that the turnout in the Tri-Cities is also minimal. Gerry suggested the Board meet in Seattle but somewhere other than the downtown area in order to cut down on

costs. Ken says he agrees with Gerry about regional meetings but said it is hard to justify given public turnout. He suggested the PIC work to publicize the meetings rather than just depend on the citizen groups. He said he can help advertise for the Portland meeting.

Ken said it is often difficult for Oregon members of the Board to make it home safely if a meeting ends late during the winter months. He said the out of town Board meetings end early to accommodate people from the Tri-Cities and their travel schedules; he would like meetings in the Tri-Cities to give the same consideration to out of town members. He said travel needs to be looked at from a safety standpoint in addition to timing standpoint. Susan Leckband said she agrees with Ken and that if meetings do end up going later, there should be authorization for another night's stay because no one should be in danger due to travel for the Board.

Larry asked if the Board has ever held a meeting in Spokane. Susan Leckband said a Board meeting was held in Spokane five or six years ago, and that there was no public turnout.

Bob suggested that in order to save money, the Board and the committees could spend the last ten minutes of every meeting summarizing their conversations rather than having EnviroIssues produce full summaries. He asked if the cost is worth it if the summaries are not legally required. Susan Leckband said the Board summaries are legal requirements, but not the committee summaries. She said committee summaries have been done in order to help members remember what was said for historical purposes as well as for planning. She said the issue can be discussed at a later date. Susan Hayman said the EIC can discuss it in October.

Larry asked if the Board meeting meets legal requirements by being audio-recorded, suggesting the recording could substitute for the summary. Susan Leckband said she will look into it but she is cautious of eliminating the meeting summaries because she refers to them on a regular basis and directs the public to the summaries when they seek Board information. Dick agreed with Susan, noting that he reads the committee summaries often, finding them useful as reference material. He said an executive summary would be a welcome addition but not a substitute for the summaries.

Liz said she thinks the turnout in Seattle is low because it always coincides with the beginning of the school year. She suggested swapping the Seattle meeting date with another location. Mecal said she thinks the Board should try harder for turnout rather than disregard a location due to low turnout and agreed with Liz's suggestion for adjusting the Seattle meeting time. She suggested cost savings in terms of car rental sharing for out of town meetings. Susan Leckband said the Seattle date is important because it is the end of the fiscal year and time for annual updates.

The EIC will discuss meeting locations and costs at their next in-person meeting.

#### *Review September committee meeting and call schedule*

Susan Hayman reviewed the needs identified for September committee week:

- HSEP committee meeting (1/2 to 2/3 day).
- BCC committee meeting (2 hours).
- TWC committee meeting (full day).

Susan noted that due to agency representatives being unavailable for the September RAP meeting, this meeting has been cancelled; RAP will hold a committee call the week of September 19 with the date and time to be decided. HSEP, EIC, and PIC will also hold calls during the week of September 19.

*Identify preliminary November meeting topics*

The Board reviewed topics for the November Board meeting, including:

- CRP draft advice
- Lifecycle Report draft advice
- Tutorial on the Tank Removal Feasibility Study (tentative)
- Tutorial on tank vapor monitoring (tentative)
- Presentation on groundwater (tentative)
- Weldon Spring Site capping field tour presentation (tentative)

**Public Comment**

David Dubroot, LaRouche Political Action Committee, said he was speaking in the context of the nation facing the worst breakdown crisis it has ever faced, putting the nation at risk. He said the nation does need to follow the current trend of budget and job cuts in the science community. He said the nation needs investments in massive developments of infrastructure, nuclear technology for fusion power, and beyond. David said Hanford represents a great treasure of the nation and should be expanded in capabilities, not cut back. David spoke to a project called the Sawtooth Lift System that could be powered by nuclear energy, but the United States is moving into the stone age of nuclear development while the rest of the world moves forward with nuclear reactors. He said he wants to encourage Hanford leaders to stop negotiating with the environmental movement and let the nation prosper. He said progress is important for the world population to increase and live at a higher standard of living.

Shannon Cram, student and professor at University of California-Berkley, said she was struck by the DOE-ORP presentation on WTP and said she is concerned she didn't hear an acknowledgement of the controversies currently surrounding WTP that have recently been published. She said she would appreciate an acknowledgement that even if a plant is 60 percent complete, it doesn't mean much if the plant eventually does not work.

**Attendees**

**HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**

Tom Carpenter, Member	Dan Serres, Member	John Howieson, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Lyle Smith, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate
Rebecca Holland, Member	John Stanfill, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate
Rick Jansons, Member	Bob Suyama, Member	Liz Mattson, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Eugene Van Liew, Member	Emmett Moore, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member		Vince Panesko, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Lynn Davison, Alternate	Mecal Samkow, Alternate
Doug Mercer, Member	Sam Dechter, Alternate	Dick Smith, Alternate
Ken Niles, Member	Dirk Dunning, Alternate (phone)	Betty Tabbutt, Alternate
Maynard Plahuta, Member	Dale Engstrom, Alternate (phone)	Steve White, Alternate
Gerald Pollet, Member	Earl Fordham, Alternate	
Howard Putter, Member	Laura Hanses, Alternate	

**AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF**

Paula Call, DOE-RL (phone)	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	K Tebrugge, CH2M Hill
Matt McCormick, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	John Lehew, CH2M Hill
Shannon Ortiz, DOE-RL	Dan McDonald, Ecology	Sandy Rock, CSC
Cameron Salony, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
Pamela McCann, DOE-ORP	Polly Zehm, Ecology	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
Scott Samuelson, DOE-ORP	Dru Butler, MSA	Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Sharon Braswell, MSA (phone)	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Emy Laija, EPA	Joy Shoemake, CH2M Hill	Melissa Thom, EnviroIssues
Dan Opalski, EPA	M Jaraysi, CH2M Hill	

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Shannon Cram, UC Berkley	David Dubroot, LaRouche PAC	Mark Loper, Heart of America NW
Angela Day, University of Washington		