

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

September 3-4, 2009

Seattle, WA

Topics in This Meeting Summary

Executive Summary..... 1
Welcome, introductions and announcements 2
Confirm June meeting summary adoption..... 2
TPA agencies update 3
Proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA 8
Advice regarding the FY 2011 Hanford cleanup budgets and priorities13
Advice regarding State of the Site meetings.....15
Base assumptions workshop.....19
Committee reports20
Public comment23
Board business.....23

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 1) Tri-Party Agreement State of the Site meetings and 2) fiscal year 2011 Hanford cleanup budgets and priorities.

Draft advice regarding a request to hold a base assumptions workshop was discarded after Dave Brockman, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office committed to hosting a workshop on base assumptions this calendar year.

Board Business

The Board will have committee calls and meetings in September. The Board also reviewed changes to Public Involvement and Communications Committee processes and adopted changes to the process manual. The Board adopted its 2009-2010 priorities and changes to its Board and committee meeting schedule. The Board also welcomed new committee leadership.

Presentations and updates

The Board received updates from the Department of Energy, the Washington State Department of Ecology, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency about the proposed consent decree and amendments to the Tri-Party Agreement; public involvement efforts; and commitments to a base assumption workshop.

Public comment

No public comment was provided.

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
September 3-4, 2009 Seattle, WA

Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force) and Board Chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) to order. The meeting was open to the public and offered ongoing opportunities for public comment.

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

Four seats were not represented: Franklin and Grant Counties (Local Government), Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), City of Pasco (Local Government), and the Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen).

Welcome, introductions and announcements

Susan Leckband welcomed the Board to Seattle and reminded the group to follow the posted ground rules and mute their cell phones. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, asked Board members to limit themselves to one initial comment or question with one follow-up, and then allow other members a turn to speak.

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), introduced Linda Anderson-Carnahan, EPA's division director. EPA is looking for a new regional administrator and hopes to settle staffing issues by the fall. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) provided EPA with funding for staffing dedicated to work funded by American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) at Hanford and the Idaho National Laboratory (INL).

Charlie Weems, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local/Regional Public Health), announced that Dr. Howard Putter is the new member for Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Art Tackett now represents the Benton Franklin Regional Council (Local Government). Susan Kreid is resigning from the Board, formerly serving as alternate for the Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Environmental/Citizen). Robin Holcomb is her likely replacement.

Mecal Samkow is the new alternate for the Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon).

Board meeting goals included:

- Receive updates from the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies and an update regarding the proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA.
- Discuss draft advice (Board action items) for:
 - Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Hanford cleanup budgets and priorities
 - State of the Site Meetings
 - Base assumptions workshop
- Conduct routine Board business, including
 - Committee reports
 - National liaison – DOE Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board (EM-SSAB) updates
 - Announcement of new committee leadership
 - Adoption of Board priorities
 - Confirmation of 2010 Board calendar

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

Confirm June meeting summary adoption

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

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

TPA agencies update

DOE-Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL)

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL, provided an update for DOE-RL. The Mission Support Contract (MSC) was awarded to Mission Support Alliance. Dave introduced Frank Figuera from Mission Support Alliance. Frank expected to share more information about his company with the Board at its November meeting. Dave said the contract transition was a success and all major contracts for Hanford are now complete.

Dave reviewed key updates and used photographs to describe some of the work:

- 2015 Vision and reducing the active cleanup footprint from 586 square miles to 75 square miles or less by 2015 (and then reducing further to 10 square miles). The site is divided into geographical areas: The River Corridor (app. 210 square miles), the Central Plateau Outer Zone (app. 65 square miles), the Central Plateau Inner Zone (app. 10 square miles) and the Hanford Reach National Monument (app. 300 square miles, including the Arid Lands Ecology Reserve [ALE]).
- Strategy for cleanup – priorities
 - Protect the Columbia River
 - Contain/treat contaminated groundwater
 - Clean out and demolish the high-hazard Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)
 - Remediate waste sites in the Outer Zone
 - Retrieve buried, solid radioactive waste (transuranic [TRU] waste)

2015 Vision FY 2009 Progress

- 300 Area
 - All 300 Area groundwater remedies are implemented
 - Natural attenuation and monitoring determined not adequate
 - Remedial technologies to sequester technologies are being tested
 - Uranium geochemistry and transport research underway – funded by the DOE Office of Science
 - 16 facilities demolished
 - 3 waste sites remediated
 - 134,549 tons of soil removed
 - Non-intrusive characterization underway at 618-10 burial ground; plans underway for 618-11 burial ground
- IU2 and IU6 Area
 - 1 facility demolished
 - 3 waste sites remediated
 - 49 tons of soil/debris removed
 - Orphan site evaluation field inventory continued; a total of 9,595 acres has yielded 58 new waste sites (identified aerially)
- D and H Area
 - All D and H Area groundwater remedies implemented
 - Completed expansion of HR-3 pump and treat system
 - Design for expanding 100-D pump and treat system in progress
 - 4 facilities demolished
 - 2 waste sites remediated
 - 426,729 tons of soil removed – Dave showed photos of a ground vault and outfall (major excavation)
- N Area
 - All N Area groundwater remedies implemented
 - Experimenting with apatite barrier (going well)
 - 4 facilities demolished
 - Dave said N Reactor looks very different now; the superstructure is gone and they removed a tank from the 107-N ion exchange building; they are making good progress

- 1 waste site remediated
 - 37,215 tons of soil removed
- B and C Area
 - B Reactor designated as a museum or interim safe storage
 - Designated a National Historic Landmark (many public tours); National Park Service preservation study in progress
 - 1 waste site remediated – chased one chromium stain to groundwater about 60 feet deep and removed all contaminated soil
 - 33,287 tons of soil removed
- K Area
 - Demolished K East Basin in FY 2009 (99% complete as of September 1)
 - Filled more than 1,000 Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility (ERDF) containers with debris
 - Will initiate remediation of soil under K East Basin this month; still do not know how much contaminated soil is under the basin
 - Expanded 100 K Area groundwater treatment system
 - New facility began operating
 - Treatment capacity at 100 K tripled to 35 million gallons per month
 - Installed 24 new wells for injection and extraction to support expansion of treatment capability
 - 1 waste site remediated
 - 11 facilities demolished
 - 35,000 tons of soil/debris removed
- 400 Area
 - Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) is in long-term surveillance and maintenance
- Central Plateau
 - All 200 West carbon tetrachloride, uranium and technetium-99 groundwater remedies implemented
 - Design 60% complete for new 200 West (ZP-1) pump and treat system; 6 new wells drilled to support the new system. This system will begin treating carbon tetrachloride, carbon tetrachloride-99 nitrate, trichloroethylene and chromium by 12/31/2011
 - Dave thought the Board may be interested in a briefing on this facility; it is one of the largest in the DOE complex
- PFP de-inventory
 - Continued offsite shipments, on schedule for completion by 9/30/09
 - Remaining material will be stored in the Canister Storage Building (CSB)
 - On schedule to move material onsite and remove Protected Area designation by 12/31/09
 - PFP complex is slab on grade
 - 37 glove boxes or laboratory hoods removed
 - 24 ERDF roll-off boxes of combustible materials removed
 - On schedule to complete by 9/30/16 (goal is to complete early, by 2013)

Dave reviewed ARRA funding goals: To save and create jobs, reduce the active cleanup footprint and reduce lifecycle costs.

ARRA update:

- DOE-RL apportionment totals \$1.635 billion
 - To date, 100% of funding has been provided and is being applied to contracts with CH2M Hill Plateau Remediation Company (CHPRC) and Washington Closure Hanford (WCH)
- DOE authorized work to begin in April 2009
- For FY 2009, only 30% of the total funding can be costed until contractors complete work planning and work scope is finalized (on track)
- Approximately 2,700 people are working on Hanford ARRA projects
- Work on several major projects is underway; some activities are already complete
- Contractors are hiring, training and issuing procurements

Dave said DOE-RL is on track with implementing its ARRA work plan. ARRA highlights include:

- D&D work at PFP – 14 glove boxes or laboratory hoods removed from main building (234-5Z)
- Demolished superstructures of two of three spent fuel facilities in the 200 North Area, demolishing fuel basins; without ARRA, there was no funding for this work
- D&D of ancillary facilities near K Reactors, removing equipment/debris from K West Reactor Basin
- Installing wells for the new 200 West Area groundwater treatment system (drilling wells as deep as 500 feet)
- Expanding ERDF for cleanup debris
 - This project was shovel-ready; Dave said the day DOE-RL received funding, the contractor started removing overburden materials. They are digging cell 9 now (excavating 1.5 million cubic yards of soil) and will then move on to cell 10. This work will nearly double ERDF's capacity.
- Characterizing one of Hanford's most challenging waste sites in the River Corridor (618-10 burial ground); started non-intrusive characterization
- Demolished 15 large chemical tanks near U Canyon

Dave showed a CHPRC video that he hoped was a useful way to share information about the contractor and their work at Hanford. He asked for the Board's feedback on the video.

Dave said DOE-RL has their challenges. Their safety record is excellent, but there was a recent severe injury incident.

DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP)

Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP, provided an update for DOE-ORP. Shirley thanked the Board for its advice over the past year; of the 12 pieces of Board advice, five were specifically directed to DOE-ORP. Advice helps DOE-ORP prioritize its work when they submit budgets to DOE-Headquarters (DOE-HQ).

Shirley reviewed big cleanup issues and accomplishments in FY 2009:

- Tank Operation Contract (TOC) transition: Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) was selected and contractor transition was a major focus during the first part of the year. Shirley said they wanted to ensure the contractor understood corrective actions and management. She appreciates WRPS's long-term perspective and how they focused on fixing many legacy issues before jumping into evaporator work, for example. She thought their corporate culture encourages preventative maintenance rather than "band-aid solutions." ARRA funding has also helped accelerate needed infrastructure work.
 - Shirley said out of 64 performance-based incentives, WRPS has currently completed 40 and expects to complete 20 more by the end of the year (one is an Integrated Safety Management Systems [ISMS] validation review).
- DOE-ORP will issue System Plan Revision 4 this month and open public comment in mid-September. They complete the DOE self-assessment for the baseline in early October and will share the baseline with regulators and the public in late November.
- Tank retrievals and technologies – retrieved 1.65 million gallons to date.
 - 7 tanks retrieved to date
 - 4 tanks retrieved to the limits of technology (hard heel)
 - Tank C-104 retrieval will begin in September 2009 – Shirley said this tank is a challenge and they have had to change out some equipment. It contains the highest level of plutonium.
 - Tank C-111 is in line for retrieval
 - Mobile Arm Retrieval System (MARS) – currently being deployed in the cold test facility. Shirley hopes to use MARS to deal with hard heel and in tanks where vacuum technologies were previously used; if MARS is successful, it will round out DOE-ORP's technology toolbox.
- 242-A Evaporator – completed three campaigns this year that freed up 900,000 gallons of tank space; upgrades were also made in preparation for the work.
- TY Farm – the barrier is complete and the contractor is currently performing characterization work for the SX Farm barrier.

- Single-shell tank integrity – workshops were held this year; Shirley said they heard the Board wants to increase leak detection monitoring and dome deflections. In FY 2010, DOE-ORP will start many initiatives based on recommendations.
- Completed 11 hose-in-hose transfer lines

Shirley said DOE-ORP has received 80% of the \$326 million from ARRA funding. \$42 million has been issued to the contractor and DOE-ORP has spent \$16 million to date. Shirley showed photos of ARRA accomplishments, including waste feed infrastructure, evaporator valve upgrades and exhauster D&D. ARRA work is under scrutiny and DOE-ORP has received positive feedback from DOE-HQ.

Shirley said Hanford has rebuilt confidence in the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP). Shirley said Steven Chu, U.S. Secretary of Energy, Inés Triay, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM), and others recently visited Hanford and were amazed at the progress at WTP. She encouraged the Board to take a tour if they have not done so recently.

WTP progress:

- Overall design: 79% complete
- Overall construction: 45% complete
- 2,100 professional staff
- 825 craft workers
- 250 subcontractors
- 3,150 total staff

Shirley said they completed one milestone five months ahead of schedule (which the Board will see in the TPA amendment going out for public review soon). She noted that vendor quality assurance has declined in the U.S.; Hanford is helping the rest of nation by having such strict quality assurance rules, but it takes time and work to ensure materials meet site standards.

DOE-ORP spent \$500 million in research and development for the Pretreatment Engineering Platform (PEP). The total PEP cost was about \$90 million. Shirley said testing correlated to bench scale testing and was well worth the cost. DOE-ORP will continue to use PEP as they go into commissioning and procedure writing for WTP operations. The TOC contractor will take over PEP in October. The last outstanding issue is mixing; DOE-ORP has built another platform and is currently testing. Shirley hopes to resolve this last issue by the end of September 2009.

Shirley reviewed progress at different facilities in the WTP complex:

- Pretreatment Facility (PT): Total budget is \$4.1 billion; spent to date is \$1.2 billion. Shirley said they are making good progress and expect to meet the structural steel milestone by the end of 2009. Design is 66% complete and construction is 27.5% complete.
- High-level Waste Facility (HLW): Shirley said this is the best-meshed integrated project team at WTP. Engineering is 75% complete and construction is 24% complete.
- Low-Activity Waste Facility: Total budget is \$1.6 billion; spent to date is \$0.77 billion. Work is progressing slower on this facility because PT and HLW are the priority facilities. Engineering is 87% complete and construction is 42% complete. DOE-ORP is looking at mitigating risk before and during commissioning of the facility. Shirley said they are looking at accelerating some cold simulation commissioning early; if it is technically viable, they could start hiring people in 2012.
- Analytical Laboratory (LAB): Total budget is \$0.6 billion; spent to date is \$0.16 billion. Engineering is 81% complete and construction is 35% complete.
- Balance of Facilities (BOF): Overall budget is about \$1 billion; spent to date is \$0.36 billion. Eight facilities out of 20 are complete. Shirley said they are looking at turning some of these facilities over to the TOC contractor. Engineering is 80% complete and construction is 47% complete.

Shirley reviewed the DOE-ORP management team. DOE-ORP has 148 federal oversight staff and created a new engineering and nuclear safety organization. John Eschenburg is leaving Hanford and Guy Girard is the acting assistant manager for WTP now. Shirley will introduce him at the next Board meeting and DOE-ORP will be recruiting to permanently fill the position.

WRPS achieved Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) status at WTP and will work to achieve VPP Star Status next year.

Shirley reviewed some of the areas on which the River Protection Project will focus:

- Proposed settlement agreement between DOE and the State of Washington
- Tank Closure and Waste Management Draft Environmental Impact Statement (TC&WM EIS) – will be released in late October and will have a 140-day public comment period; Shirley hopes to issue the document next summer or fall
- Tank waste management, treatment, vitrification and closure
- MARS testing
- Protect workers from radiological and chemical hazards
 - Shirley noted more attention should be paid to chemical hazards. There are not enough as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) regulations in place, and no programs that Hanford can “take off the shelf” and implement. Shirley said Hanford has to create safety programs. Chemical hazards are just as or more dangerous than radiological hazards.
- Additional double-shell tank retrieval space
- Design and construction
- WTP startup and turnover strategy
- Achieve WTP VPP Star Status
- Commissioning of LAB, BOF, and LAW

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)

Polly Zehm, Ecology, thanked the Board for its commitment to Hanford cleanup. She said she was happy to be at the Board meeting no longer “on the verge” of completing a TPA settlement. The change package and agreement in principle that were completed are very important to the State of Washington and Hanford cleanup. Polly said a year ago no one had a sense of what the state and nation’s economies were facing. The Tri-Cities economy seems to be more robust than other parts of the state; ARRA investment in Hanford cleanup brought or retained many jobs in the Tri-Cities.

Polly said it feels good to be at the Board meeting knowing there is better thinking, commitment and priorities to Hanford cleanup. While opinions may vary about if the right milestone dates were selected, Polly said action was the important thing. She thanked the Board for its advice, and reiterated that Ecology takes it seriously and continues to value and support the Board in its work.

Polly said Governor Chris Gregoire and Ecology Director Jay Manning were involved in the creation of the TPA and the State of Washington could not have two leaders that understand the site better than they do, and who are as invested and understand the challenges and importance of Hanford. Polly is excited for the coming years of cleanup, and thanked and acknowledged Dave and Shirley. She said they have a healthy and trustworthy relationship, with an appropriate level of tension that helps keeps things in balance. She appreciated their commitment to cleanup and working with Ecology and EPA.

EPA

Dennis Faulk said this was a big year for the TPA and Hanford cleanup, especially reaching a proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA. Dennis encouraged the Board to read the Oregon Department of Energy recent publication called “Hanford Cleanup: The First 20 Years” (available on the Oregon DOE website: <http://www.oregon.gov/ENERGY/NUCSAF/docs/HanfordFirst20years.pdf>). He thought the CHPRC video was great and highlighted progress at Hanford. He suggested including some information about regulatory roles at Hanford.

Dennis described how five years ago at State of the Site meetings the public demanded cleanup agreements for groundwater. Those milestones are now in the TPA and DOE is implementing aggressive systems to prevent contamination from reaching the Columbia River. Dennis commended the Board and public for pushing that work forward. He noted that starting work on 618-10 and 618-11 burial grounds was a big accomplishment for Hanford.

Dennis said it is phenomenal that over eight million tons of material have gone into ERDF since the start of cleanup. The TPA agencies have struggled with Central Plateau cleanup strategy, but now have a plan for groundwater and waste sites in the Outer Zone. Dennis said they continue to struggle with the Inner Zone but he expects they will have a better idea by the end of the year.

Dennis thought the modifications to the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) role and purpose will be helpful to the Board.

Discussion

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon), asked when the TC&WM EIS will be released. Shirley said it will be released on October 23, 2009.

Pam Larsen, City of Richland (Local Government), thanked the TPA agencies for the presentations and DOE-RL for sharing the CHPRC video. She asked if DOE-RL reactivated the rail line onsite and if TRU waste can be shipped to the Waste Isolation and Pilot Plant (WIPP) by rail. Dave said they are using the rail line onsite, but he did not think WIPP has the ability to receive waste by rail. DOE-RL has been directed to prepare for five truck shipments a week to WIPP with a ramp up in early 2010 to 15 shipments a week.

Mike Korenko, Public-at-Large, said WTP and tank farm integration is key, especially with the secondary waste stream. He asked Shirley if she had any comments on using systems engineering to develop an alternative for treating the secondary waste stream. Shirley said DOE-ORP directed the TOC contractor to take the lead on the secondary waste stream. She is meeting with Inés Triay and URS Corporate to hear their ideas about how to accelerate the schedule and alternatives such as in-tank preconditioning.

Doug Mercer, University of Washington (University), asked what kind of relationship DOE has with the Department of the Interior and how the River Corridor will be managed after 2015. Dave said the land will continue to stay under DOE ownership and management.

Dick Smith, City of Kennewick (Local Government), asked how DOE-ORP will transition to a WTP operations contractor. When would an operations contractor start work after WTP is proved to be operational? Shirley said this is often done at Savannah River. DOE-ORP is looking at contract models. Once Bechtel completes the BOF, it will focus on the rest of WTP. Bechtel is not in the business of long-term maintenance. Shirley said they want a company with a vested interest in the long-term workings of WTP.

Keith Smith, Public-at-Large, commented that the emphasis on groundwater is good. He thought hiring operators early for WTP was a smart move; it will make a big difference for operators to see how WTP is built rather than bringing them in at the end. He encouraged DOE-ORP to focus on minimizing chemical exposures.

Mike Korenko said John Eschenburg has done great work at Hanford and he wished him well.

Proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA

Shirley led the discussion about the proposed consent decree and amendments to the TPA. The TPA agencies initiated negotiations to revise the TPA in 2007. Proposals were developed for the construction and commissioning of WTP, retrieval of waste from single-shell tanks, groundwater cleanup and the development of a lifecycle scope, schedule and cost report. They consulted with tribal nations, the State of Oregon and stakeholders in 2007. Shirley said proposals were modified based on the input they received. Negotiations continued but the agencies were unable to reach agreement. The State of Washington filed a lawsuit in November 2008 (which was later joined by the State of Oregon) and the TPA agencies returned to negotiations, resolved remaining issues and reached agreement on the terms of a proposed consent decree and modifications to the TPA. Shirley noted that groundwater milestones were added to the TPA in August 2009.

The public comment period on the proposed consent decree and TPA modifications is September 24, 2009 through November 9, 2009.

Components of the proposed settlement agreement

- The proposed settlement would impose a new, enforceable and achievable schedule for tank waste cleanup.
- The proposed consent decree contains milestones and dates for construction and initial plant operations of WTP and waste retrieval from 19 single-shell tanks through 2022.
- TPA changes will go into effect once the consent decree is entered into court. Changes include:
 - Resolution of WTP technical issues and waste treatment
 - Decisions for supplemental low-activity waste treatment
 - Single-shell tank retrievals and closure; double-shell tank closure
 - Development of a comprehensive lifecycle scope, schedule and cost report
- A separate consent decree is proposed between DOE and the State of Oregon, which is focused on being more participative in TPA reviews.
- The TC&WM EIS will include a preferred alternative of not importing certain off-site radioactive, mixed radioactive and hazardous waste to Hanford at least until WTP is operational.

Key TPA and consent decree milestones

<i>Consent decree</i>	<i>Current milestone date</i>	<i>New proposed milestone date</i>
Retrieve C Farm single-shell tanks	9/30/2006	2014
Complete WTP construction, startup and hot start	1/31/2011	2019
Achieve initial plant operations	New milestone	2022
Complete retrieval of waste from an additional 9 single-shell tanks	New milestone	2022
<i>TPA</i>		
Retrieve all single-shell tanks	9/30/2018	2040
Treat all tank waste	12/31/2028	2047
Complete closure of all double-shell tank farms	New milestone	2052

Proposed consent decree

- 19 milestones for WTP include:
 - Construction “pacing” milestones for WTP facilities
 - Hot start WTP by 2019
 - Achieve initial plant operations by 2022
- 4 milestones for tank waste retrieval include:
 - Complete retrieval of waste from 10 remaining single-shell tanks in C Farm by 2014
 - Identify 9 additional single-shell tanks for waste retrieval by 2014
 - Of those 9 additional single-shell tanks, initiate retrievals in at least 5 by 2017 and complete retrieval of waste from these tanks by 2022
- Provisions cover reporting requirements for single-shell tank retrievals, regulatory coordination and process for dispute resolution

Proposed TPA changes

WTP

- Resolution of WTP technical issues and waste treatment
 - Close all 28 Expert Flowsheet Review Team technical issues by end of 2009 (currently down to one issue: mixing in tanks)
- Complete treatment of all Hanford tank waste in WTP by 2047 or earlier
 - Establishes a process for DOE and Ecology to review and potentially improve final completion dates every six years beginning in 2015
- Decisions for supplemental low-activity waste vitrification treatment by 2015 and subsequent construction and operation milestones for supplemental vitrification treatment facility

- On an annual basis starting in 2023, issue a report certifying the rate of treatment being achieved is sufficient to treat all waste by 2047 or describe plans to increase processing rate

Tank farms

- Single-shell tank milestones
 - Complete closure of C Farm by 2019
 - Complete negotiation of interim milestones for the closure of remaining tank farms by 2022
 - Complete retrieval of waste from all single-shell tanks by 2040 or earlier
 - Close all single-shell tank farms by 2043
 - Establishes a process for DOE to work with Ecology to review and potentially improve the 2040 and 2047 completion dates
- Single-shell tank milestones also address the placement of additional interim barriers over single-shell tank farms, activities to assess integrity of single-shell tanks and removal of pumpable liquids from miscellaneous catch tanks
- Review sequencing of tank retrievals every six years, commencing as target milestones in 2015 and enforceable milestones in 2021
- Contingency actions and milestones if and as necessary for new compliant tanks to support retrievals

Annual report

- DOE prepares an annual report setting out the lifecycle scope, schedule and cost for completing the Hanford Site cleanup mission
 - Reflects all actions necessary for DOE to fully meet all applicable environmental obligations, including those under the TPA

Public involvement planning

- 45-day public comment period: September 24 – November 9, 2009
- Meetings with tribal nations
- Workshop for the HAB and public (September 30)
- Regional public meetings
 - Possible locations include:
 - Tri-Cities, WA
 - Seattle, WA
 - Spokane, WA
 - Portland, OR
 - Hood River, OR
 - Potential timeframe: Mid-October
- Fact sheets, presentations, advertisements, listserv notices
- Proposed amendments will be available at www.hanford.gov
- Proposed consent decree is available at www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/nwp/pdf/2008lawsuit/081109_terms.pdf

Shirley said DOE wants to beat the 2047 milestone for treating all tank waste and the 2052 milestone for completing closure of all double-shell tank farms. In addition to three and six year reviews of the TPA milestones, Shirley noted that the System Plan will be reviewed annually. These reviews are planned to help DOE stay on track and accelerate work whenever possible.

Dave noted that DOE is moving forward with the lifecycle scope, schedule and cost report now in good faith before the settlement is finalized. He hoped to have a sample product to share with the Board in December.

Discussion

Susan Leckband asked the agencies to extend the public comment period to December 4, 2009. At the PIC meeting yesterday, the committee discussed the need for Board members' organizations to have time to prepare materials to distribute to their groups and the larger public. PIC did not have time to develop advice, but Susan and the Board recommended extending the public comment period if the agencies want the public to understand and comment on the proposed consent decree and TPA changes.

Gerry Pollet, Heart of America NW (Regional Environmental/Citizen), said the agencies heard this request at PIC yesterday – did they have an answer? Nolan Curtis, Ecology, said it was discussed yesterday and the agencies need to hear why an extension is necessary; they are not prepared to respond today. Gerry said PIC identified a number of reasons to extend the comment period and the agencies should accommodate the request.

Gerry asked why the new TPA milestones only plan for retrieving one to two single-shell tanks per year. He thought the State of Washington said that was unacceptable a few years ago. Gerry said the number one public comment on the last round of TPA changes was to not add new waste to Hanford when existing waste has not been cleaned up. He thought there was some recognition of this in the proposal, but only in the TC&WM EIS, not the TPA or consent decree. He commented that an EIS can be changed with an amendment. Gerry said no one has ever suggested any connection between the WTP startup date and importing new waste. He asked why it was not part of the consent decree. He also noted that comments about this issue were called “out of scope,” and he did not think they were out of scope.

John Price, Ecology, said the state was not comfortable with leaving waste in tanks, which is why they want to establish new milestones for tank farm closure (close C Farm in 2019). He said new milestones will increase the rate of retrieval and closing tank farms; they will retrieve much more than one tank a year. John said it is evident the state is putting cleanup first by implementing groundwater milestones, proposing new tank waste milestones, and developing a Central Plateau cleanup package for TRU waste retrieval and treatment. Gerry disagreed about the rate of retrieval and thinks retrieving 19 tanks in 13 years is not very much.

Shirley said DOE compromised on the WTP startup date – committing to WTP startup in 2019 takes away a great amount of flexibility for DOE around the nation.

Jeff Luke, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), agreed that the conversation was a good indicator that more time for public comment is required. The TPA agencies have worked on this agreement for years and the public deserves adequate time to comment. Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch of Oregon (Regional Environmental/Citizen), stated that PIC needs more time for public comment. Organizations need time to plan and mobilize the public to attend public meetings and provide comment.

Susan Leckband said she was happy to present formal arguments to the agencies for extending the public comment period to December 4, 2009.

Doug Mercer asked if there would be any consequences to extending the comment period. Are there any compelling reasons not to extend the comment period? Shirley said they need to go to the governor and the Department of Justice to see if extending the comment period is possible. She said work on site would not physically change or be delayed if the comment period is extended, but she noted that DOE is “not on the hook” until the consent decree and TPA amendments are registered and the State of Washington may want to register them as soon as possible. Some milestones are tied to the date when the consent decree is officially registered.

Jeff read an excerpt from the Department of Justice letter that introduced the proposed consent decree. The letter says that prior to TPA modifications taking effect, the parties will conduct their affairs consistent with the requirements of the change packages until they either take effect or the proposed consent decree is withdrawn from consideration of the court. Jeff thought that bound DOE to the consent decree and the TPA changes even before it is officially entered into court.

Mary Sue Wilson, Office of the Attorney General, State of Washington, described the purpose of the letter and some implications of the date on which the consent decree is entered into court. The purpose of the provision in the letter that Jeff read from was for the state to get confirmation that DOE would act and come to the state if public comment took longer and they required more time. The lifecycle scope, schedule and cost report is due nine months after the TPA is formally amended and entered into court. The lifecycle report is due every January, and the state hopes the court will approve the agreement in December, which would trigger milestones bound to the approval date. The statement in the letter is very important to the

state to know DOE is working according to the new milestones and cannot come back later and say public comment took longer than expected and they need more time.

Dick asked that if DOE is already committed to following the new milestones, what will happen if public comment differs from that direction? What is the point of public input – will it make any difference? Andy Fitz, Office of the Attorney General, State of Washington, said that is why the language in the letter was deliberately chosen. The state purposefully did not say follow the schedule to the letter, which is why they said “in a manner consistent with...” The state did not want to act in a way that pre-judged public comment.

Doug asked again if there were any other specific consequences to extending the comment period. Shirley said in her experience with the TC&WM EIS, it is good to finalize agreements before something changes that can cause delays. There is a risk to waiting to finalize the consent decree and TPA changes; one cannot know what may happen that could cause delays.

Ken Niles said the State of Oregon already weighed in on the proposed consent decree and TPA changes by having a supplemental consent decree with DOE. It seems that DOE has already moved away from Hanford as being a disposal site, so committing to not importing waste to Hanford until at least when WTP is operational does not seem as big a “give” as it used to be. Dave said it basically takes away an option that DOE may have wanted to keep.

Mary Sue said she and Andy do not speak for the decision-makers, but will take it back for their consideration. The state wants the agreement in place as soon as possible. Even though the official comment period is currently 45-days, pieces of the documents started being released in August and the educational process is essentially already started. The TPA agencies are happy to answer questions before the official start of the comment period. Mary Sue said they deliberately scheduled the comment period around the November Board meeting so the Board could develop advice as needed.

Greg thanked Mary Sue for the clarification. He said the HAB is having a workshop about the proposed consent decree and TPA amendments at the end of September. At that point they will have enough information to take out to the public, so the public education piece did not fully start in August. He added that he was happy that at least a temporary moratorium on importing offsite waste to Hanford would be implemented until WTP is operational.

Regarding Mary Sue’s comment about the public being able to start learning about the proposed consent decree and TPA amendments in August, Jeff noted that not all information is available and not all the change packages were available in August. He said the public should have more time to review all the changes packages.

Shirley agreed to take the Board’s comments and request for an extended comment period back to the decision-makers. Dennis added that the TPA agencies were thoughtful when putting together the comment period, but will discuss it again. John agreed.

Mecal Samkow, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board (State of Oregon), thought the complexities and technical difficulties at Hanford are at times beyond public understanding. She said it would be interesting to analyze the cost and gains of extending the comment period. She thought the Board should be realistic about what the public can comprehend and make informed comments.

Gerry thanked the agencies for the commitment to consider extending the comment period. He said organizations cannot start preparing a citizen’s guide until a variety of questions are answered at the HAB workshop about the proposed consent decree and TPA amendments.

Lifecycle scope, schedule and cost report

Gerry said the Board previously advised no more TPA negotiations until the lifecycle scope, schedule and cost report is prepared, which is expected to take no more than one year. He said if that had been done in 2007, the report would have helped the agencies see what work could be done, how quickly waste could be removed from tanks, how to accelerate projects and more. Gerry said there is nothing in the proposed

consent decree that accelerates dates from the current DOE baseline. He thought the lifecycle report should be complete before changes the TPA are finalized.

Andy said the lifecycle report is intended to project cost estimates to meet current, enforceable TPA deadlines. The state was concerned about the credibility of the report since there were not credible, enforceable deadlines in place in the TPA. He said the state was nervous about DOE developing a report built solely around its own internal deadlines. The lifecycle report does not look at the question of how to accelerate work, but it does look at the entire suite of legal and environmental regulations at Hanford in one place so the entire scope of the project is clear. Andy said the place to see if work can be accelerated is in the system plans. Without TPA changes, the state had no legal handle on the system plan effort. Andy described it as a chicken and the egg effect. Mary Sue added that the TPA amendments include requirements for system plans that review the ability to accelerate work. System plans will be updated every three years. The opportunity to move dates up in the TPA will occur every six years.

Mike Korenko thought many of the big decisions are in essence already decided. He said the agencies need a mechanism to carry public comments forward and incorporate them into the system plan improvement processes.

Ken Niles said his understanding of the lifecycle report is different from Andy's interpretation. He thought the report would take an objective look at how long it would take to complete work without any budget or schedule constraints. He thought it was not as valuable if its purpose is what Andy described. What does the report do?

Dennis commented this is a good example of why public dialogue is necessary. He views the report as Andy does, because the report is intended to provide a full and complete picture of what it will take to complete work at Hanford. He thought it will accomplish Ken's goal as well. Dave added that he wants the report to also include what work could be accelerated with additional funding.

Andy said the report will contain an element of what Ken described. He reiterated that it requires a starting point – the mission is built around the TPA and the consent decree. The state was concerned with DOE developing a tool related to tank waste retrieval and treatment when current milestones are not credible. Andy said they did not want DOE to develop a schedule that was not based on milestones, which could take on a life of its own. He did not think the report will look at how to accelerate work. Andy also thought the report will be an excellent tool for Congress to see the big picture and the consequences of appropriations or lack of appropriations.

Dick said the lifecycle report is important because there needs to be a clear picture of everything needed to accomplish cleanup at Hanford. The system plan then puts the pieces together into a schedule of what can truly be accomplished. Dick thought both pieces come together to provide a comprehensive look.

Advice regarding the FY 2011 Hanford cleanup budgets and priorities

Gerry introduced the draft advice regarding the FY 2011 Hanford cleanup budgets and priorities. He thanked the agencies for the FY 2011 budget priorities workshop that was held in July. This workshop was later than usual because the budgets were created late this year; normally HAB budget workshops are held in February or March. Congress is reviewing the FY 2010 budget and the FY 2011 proposals were sent to DOE-HQ on July 30. Gerry said the DOE field offices and DOE-HQ have already seen the advice in draft form as it was evolving. The purpose of adopting the advice today is to go on the record.

Gerry said the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) was happy that DOE committed to developing a lifecycle scope, schedule and cost report. The draft advice provided recommendations pertinent to both DOE-RL and DOE-ORP, and advice specific to each office. It urged DOE-RL and DOE-ORP to submit fully compliant Integrated Priority Lists (IPLs) that identify and request funds necessary to meet existing TPA milestones. The draft advice also stressed the importance of characterizing waste sites and identifying funding for characterization activities on pace to support remediation of all non-tank farm units by 2024 and to meet other milestones. Gerry said the advice also calls for multiple Records of Decision (RODs) to

ensure proper characterization and work plans to take into account major differences between Central Plateau units.

The advice recommended that DOE-RL:

- Request an increased target budget to include all funds needed to meet all current TPA milestone and other compliance requirements, including contact-handled TRU retrieval and mixed waste treatment.
- Apply lessons learned from K Basins to PFP cleanout and demolition.
- Request funding to complete K Basin work and meet milestones (and commended the progress at K Basins).

The advice recommended that DOE-ORP:

- Create a more detailed breakout of its IPL and develop technologies to make additional space available in double-shell tanks and request additional funding to deploy multiple units.
- Invest in projects that accelerate the retrieval, processing and disposal of wastes from existing single-shell tanks.
- Begin funding in FY 2010 the work required to define the path forward and a decision on a supplemental treatment facility by 2012.
- Include Ecology in setting priorities for the development and deployment fund for technology development, and asked DOE-ORP to include funds for planning and designing a waste blending facility for WTP.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business), also thanked the agencies for the workshop. He said he was disappointed at the HAB turnout; there were more agency representatives than public or HAB members.

Agency perspective

DOE-RL

Dave thought the advice was good. He asked if the Board was getting at something specific when it says apply lessons learned from K Basins and other D&D projects to PFP cleanup. Gerry said it was just a general discussion of taking lessons learned from one complex project and applying them to another.

DOE-ORP

Ben Harp, DOE-ORP, noted that the IPL includes “minimum-base operations,” not “minimum-safe,” and said DOE could clear up definitions in the IPL if necessary. He also noted that DOE-ORP does develop technologies to help free up space in double-shell tanks, but not through ARRA.

EPA

Dennis did not attend the workshop but thought the advice was consistent with past budget advice. He thought for 2009 through 2011, DOE is doing pretty well with ARRA funding. He thought Hanford needs to focus on 2012 and how to capitalize on the momentum from ARRA funding in 2009-2011. He suggested the Board weave that concept into the advice.

Ecology

John thought the discussion about the high cost of minimum safe or base operations in the background of the advice is important and the Board could further develop that concept. He said everyone has been concerned about security costs at PFP, and it is good news it will be cleaned out and demolished. He thought Hanford should continue to look for opportunities to reduce minimum base costs.

Discussion

Susan Leckband noted that the Board knew there was not enough time to submit adopted advice to the local DOE offices before they submitted their draft budgets to DOE-HQ on July 30. That is why she emailed everyone on the Board to tell them as individuals they could send comments to the local offices before the budget submittal. She reiterated that the purpose of adopting this advice is to go on record. Next year the budget cycle should go back to its normal schedule and the Board will be able to send advice to the local DOE offices prior to the submittal.

In response to Dennis' comment, Gerry said there is some information in the advice about how the ARRA funds will run out and how additional funds will be needed in FY 2012 to carry on the momentum. He thought they could flesh out that statement. Gerry also added that this is the first Hanford budget prepared by the Obama administration and it is important to get this advice on record.

Ken Niles said the advice recommends that DOE-ORP begin to deploy wiped film evaporators. Are wiped film evaporators a proven technology that is ready to deploy? Ben said DOE-ORP is testing wiped film evaporators on a small scale, but they are not ready to deploy. Gerry said there is time for the technology to prove itself. Susan Leckband added that wiped film evaporators are only identified as an example of one of the technologies that could help make additional space available in double-shell tanks.

Ken Niles asked if DOE-ORP already decided to proceed with planning for and designing a waste blending facility for WTP. Ben said they need to make a decision in 2012, which will be based on mixing studies funded by ARRA. Ken said he was okay with the statement as a placeholder. Pam added that blending waste is a big challenge and many people have advocated pursuing a waste blending facility. Larry Lockrem, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), said most studies have been done with simulants and moving forward with blending is important because it goes beyond simulants.

Keith was supportive of funding for characterization. He was concerned that some people think characterization is unnecessary because they prefer capping. Keith said they should be sure capping is the best and only solution before doing it.

Doug thought the Board should ensure advice is tightly written, background sections provide succinct and necessary information, and advice points are clearly tied to the background.

Art Tackett, Benton-Franklin Regional Council (Local Government), referred to the statement that without ARRA funding, inadequate funding would have reduced the annual TRU retrieval rate by as much as tenfold. He asked if there was a more precise number or percentage the Board could use instead of "tenfold." Dave said more accurate numbers were not on hand.

The advice was adopted. It will be sent to DOE-RL and DOE-ORP with the customary CCs, including DOE-HQ. It will be addressed to Inés Treay particularly because she is mentioned in the advice.

Advice regarding State of the Site meetings

Ken Niles introduced the draft advice regarding the State of the Site meetings. The agencies asked for advice about the value of the meetings and how they should be conducted. The advice:

- States the Board's support for State of the Site meetings, especially when the senior TPA agency managers meet with the public.
- Recommends objectives for the meetings and ways to support the objectives.
- Advises ways to work cooperatively with the Board and its member organizations to promote the meetings and provide information to those who would not or cannot attend the meetings.

Agency perspective

DOE-RL

Dave said every year there are arguments about where to hold State of the Site meetings. Does the Board have specific recommendations? Ken said the default locations are the Tri-Cities, Seattle, Portland and Hood River. The Board discussed adding Spokane, but did not reach a decision. Steve Hudson added that some communities like to focus on one or two main issues and some like the meetings to be more open-ended.

EPA

Dennis said the agencies always struggle with how much time to spend providing information and how much to allot for dialogue with the public. Ken said there were major differences of opinion about presentations, their length and purpose. The advice addressed this by stating that presentations should be

concise with the goal of getting to public questions and comments no later than 45 minutes after the start of the meeting.

Discussion

Dave said the name “State of the Site” is not very accurate if each agency only has ten minutes to share information about cleanup. He values open dialogue with the public, but sees the value in providing enough information, too.

Susan Leckband said the Board decided that public meetings about the proposed consent decree and TPA amendments should be held separately from the State of the Site meetings because it is such a big issue. She said the Board advised that TPA meetings be held in Seattle, Tri-Cities, Hood River, Portland and Spokane, and thought that State of the Site meetings should be held in the same locations. Nolan said the agencies were not planning to hold State of the Site meetings in all those cities this year.

Dick said the State of the Site meeting in the Tri-Cities always focuses on DOE’s failure to address personal injury. He thought DOE should hold a separate meeting to address that issue. Dave said DOE is actually hosting a meeting in September to do just that – it is a town hall meeting for employees, former employees and spouses. It is not a public meeting. Dick thought personal injury and claims are important issues but should not dominate an entire State of the Site meeting.

Laura Mueller, Non-Union, Non-Management Employees (Hanford Work Force), asked for more information about the town hall meeting. Dave said it will be held in the Tri-Cities on September 16 or 17 and employees will be notified in an “all-hands message.” They are working to get the information to employees, former employees and spouses. He said the Department of Labor will participate.

Nolan said State of the Site meetings are valuable because they are the only Hanford meeting without a specific agenda topic. It is a time for the public to bring up whatever they want to discuss. He thought the Board should be cautious about putting a limit on what people can discuss at the meetings.

Pam thought State of the Site meetings are a time for the public to learn about Hanford cleanup and for DOE to answer questions. She did not think it is valuable for people to use them as a tool to beat up DOE. Pam said the CHPRC video was great and thought videos could help people better understand the site and cleanup work. She added that it is nice to have a meeting in Spokane, but no one usually shows up.

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, commented that changing the style of State of the Site meetings is something the Board has always discussed. She said it is difficult to cover everything the agencies and public want in one evening.

Harold said State of the Site meetings used to be heavily attended and now they have poor turnout. He asked if meetings were the best use of resources – are there other public involvement tools that would be more effective? However, Harold did not object to the advice going forward. Ken said PIC has had much discussion about just that, but feels the State of the Site meetings are still valuable. He said they agree that more tools are needed to communicate with the public.

Dave commented that at every meeting, the agencies learn something new and gain a different perspective. Gerry said the establishment of groundwater milestones are a great example of how public input at State of the Site meetings influenced decision-making. He thought State of the Site meetings provide a forum for accountability.

Mecal encouraged the agencies and Board to use universities as outlets to provide information about Hanford and reach new audiences. Existing newsletters could also help educate the public so when they attend a State of the Site meeting, they know enough about Hanford to make informed comments and really influence cleanup decisions. Mecal thought State of the Site meetings could be very influential if elected officials attend. She also thought it would be powerful to see images showing changes at Hanford from the 1940s until now. Susan asked Mecal to provide those ideas and advertising outlets to PIC.

Tom Carpenter, Hanford Challenge (Hanford Work Force), said the advice already encourages the agencies to make use of educational networks. Keith thought Twitter should be added to the social networking list in the advice; the Board added it.

Susan Hayman thought it was great to collect ideas about different public involvement tools, but recommended that the Board focus on the advice at hand and provide specific ideas to PIC. She also noted that all Board members are able to join PIC.

Doug asked what Dave wanted to get out of State of the Site meetings. Dave said he enjoys interacting with people and hearing their perspectives, especially those not normally heard in the Tri-Cities. He sees the meetings as an opportunity to communicate what is really going on at Hanford and correct misinformation. Dave said he would like specific information from the Board about how many meetings they should have and where. The Board added a sentence saying that State of the Site meetings should be held annually at four or five cities around the region.

Doug said he has been involved with Hanford for years and gets frustrated with negative reactions and misconceptions about DOE and cleanup. However, he did not see that as necessarily bad since negative attention is still attention and often brings in more funding. He thought the State of the Site meetings are a tool for maintaining interest. He thought the advice could be more explicit about accountability and commented that the objectives seem more like methods. Doug also encouraged active engagement during the meetings – slides with percentages and numerical figures do not encourage audience participation and engagement. Susan Leckband thought those were good comments and Doug should work through PIC to take action on some of those ideas.

Steve noted that the advice imposes certain obligations on the Board. Board members should make sure their constituents are properly prepared before State of the Site meetings so they can ask informed questions. He said public involvement should not be defined by meetings, and meetings should not be the default tool.

Larry asked if the agencies notify the Washington and Oregon delegations when advice is issued. Susan Leckband said the congressional delegations are copied on all advice. Dave added that the delegations are notified about public meetings.

Mecal asked if the advice could recommend inviting political figures to State of the Site meetings. Susan Leckband said the Board is not allowed to lobby or get involved politically, but individual Board members and their organizations can do so. Dave added that the chances of getting political figures to attend are greater if organizations call them directly.

John Stanfill, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Government), asked why the Board recommends having public comment start no later than 45 minutes after the start of the meeting. Susan Leckband said they wanted to ensure the public had enough time to ask questions and make comments, and to prevent agency presentations from going on too long.

Alternative perspective

Nancy Murray, Public-at-Large, asked who provides the alternative perspective at State of the Site meetings. Ken said it can vary – it could be a citizen group, the HAB chair or vice-chair, the State of Oregon, etc. He said PIC decided to leave it open by having the advice say “after the agencies make their presentations, an alternative perspective should be provided.” Nancy suggested saying a different or other perspective should be provided rather than alternative because “alternative” suggests a disagreement. She did not think disagreement should be presumed.

Ken Niles clarified that the intent of the advice was to have one alternative perspective speaker included in the presentation portion of the agenda. He said everyone at the meeting has a chance to speak during the public discussion and comment portion of the meeting.

Tom Carpenter said it is important to have the alternative perspective as part of the formal presentation portion of the State of the Site meetings. He said Hanford cleanup has challenges and the alternative perspective helps flesh those out.

Jeff asked about the original function and purpose of the State of the Site meetings – were they simply a description of the past year’s activities? He said the alternative viewpoint was a somewhat different purpose. Dennis said they can have a slightly different function every year. Originally, the meetings were issue-specific with a large amount of time devoted to public dialogue. Now they are used to update the public about physical progress on the site.

Jeff asked if the Board really wanted to institutionalize the alternative perspective presentation. Dennis said the Community Relations Plan (CRP) actually memorialized the alternative perspective, and it is not limited to the State of the Site meetings. The advice pulls language from the CRP.

Jeff asked if the original State of the Site meetings had the formal alternative perspective presentation. He said the Board should decide if it wants to formally request that an alternative perspective be presented rather than come forth from the public naturally. Ken said at the first year of State of the Site meetings, the HAB chair presented the alternative perspective.

Gerry said the State of the Site meetings are about whatever the public views as key issues. They are the only time the public gets to raise whatever issues they want, and the public expects an alternative viewpoint. He thought the name “State of the Site” is not very accurate since the meetings have been about accountability. He said the formal alternative perspective presentation needs to be maintained and the advice should recommend it.

Greg agreed and said the alternative perspective presentation needs to be maintained, and wondered why the Board was considering not having it. He said the agencies sometimes are not very good at couching the issues that are important to the public. The alternative perspective presenter spends time researching the public’s main issues and brings them forward.

Susan Leckband asked if anyone objected to leaving the language about having an alternative perspective in the advice. Emmett said it is vague and he would abstain from the advice if it were left in. He would not block the advice, but he would stand aside.

Susan Hayman said the Board always strives for consensus and asked the Board to think about specific language to get consensus. She suggested it may need to go back to committee for further development.

To try to address Emmett’s concern about the ambiguity surrounding the selection of the alternative viewpoint to be presented, Ken Niles suggested language that says that, after the agencies make their presentations, the alternative viewpoint should be provided by a citizen group, the HAB chair or State of Oregon, to be decided among themselves. The Board did not agree to that suggestion.

Greg thought the HAB perspective is not necessarily an alternative perspective. However, he did not want to deny the HAB the opportunity to provide its perspective. Ken said the intent is just one formal presentation of an alternative perspective. Ken asked the agencies if they understood what the Board means by alternative perspective. They said yes.

Doug thought the alternative perspective should be maintained; he thought it was against the interest of the agencies to not offer the opportunity for an alternative perspective presentation. Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health (Ex-Officio), commented that the public comment portion opens the meeting up to all kinds of alternative perspectives.

Pam thought everyone at the State of the Site meeting should have an equal opportunity to share their viewpoint; if one has the chance to give a formal presentation, then all should be given that opportunity. She liked the idea of the HAB chair saying a few words at State of the Site meetings.

Dick said the problem with the alternative perspective presentation is there is no clear process for selecting who gets the presentation slot. He thought the Board should advise that citizen groups and individuals should be offered the opportunity to comment on and ask questions about cleanup.

Susan Hayman asked the agencies how they determined who offered the alternative perspective presentation in the past. Dennis said the agencies have been hosting State of the Site meetings for so long, it is clear who the established groups are and who wants to give the presentation. He said the groups in different regions get together and self-select. Dennis thought this will come up in the CRP revisions and will be an important issue to deal with then.

Floyd Hodges, Citizens for a Clean Eastern Washington (Regional Environmental/Citizen), suggested saying “non-agency point of view.” Emmett reiterated that the problem is with who selects that viewpoint and how it is selected. Susan Leckband said the advice is not intended to dictate that process. Gerry added that the State of the Site meeting agenda is ultimately set by the agencies.

Bob Suyama, Public-at-Large, thought it would be easiest to delete the sentence given the disagreement about it. Tom Carpenter said it is important to keep the alternative perspective part of the formal presentation time because public comment is typically limited to a couple minutes. Public comment also does not allow for an organized presentation. He said it does not have the same impact as an organized presentation. Tom said this system has worked well for years and the process of selecting the presenting group has worked well. He said he would object to the concept being struck from the advice. Shelley Cimon, Public-at-Large, agreed that the alternative perspective was valuable and should be maintained.

Dave noted that the CRP requires the alternative perspective presentation, so the agencies will still do it, whether or not it is in the advice. He said it is a valuable perspective.

The Board debated whether or not to advise that the alternative perspective be a local perspective as well. It decided to not say it should be a local perspective because, for example, it would eliminate the possibility of the HAB chair providing the perspective in Portland or the Nez Perce Tribe presenting in Seattle.

The Board decided to say “After the agencies have made their presentations, a non-agency perspective should continue to be provided.”

Emmett still thought the recommendation was vague and ambiguous and thus open to argumentation and manipulation. He said if the Board chooses to include the statement, he would abstain and not block consensus. Emmett said he was not averse to the concept of a non-agency perspective, but the statement is vague.

Jeff said the Board always strives for total consensus and he was trying to figure out the language and concept so Emmett does not have to abstain. If the problem with the statement is wording, the Board should try to fix it.

Emmett said he does not feel the formal presentation opportunity is necessary because everyone has the chance to provide comments during the public dialogue and comment portion of the meeting. Dick agreed that all organizations have the opportunity to provide comments after the presentations and the formal alternative presentation was unnecessary.

Emmett decided to abstain from the advice and not block consensus. The advice was adopted without full consensus, and this will be noted in the advice. It will be sent to the TPA agencies and typical CCs.

Base assumptions workshop

Greg introduced draft advice requesting the TPA agencies conduct a Board workshop before the end of the year (open to the public) about base assumptions in several documents regarding cleanup along the River Corridor and the Central Plateau. Examples of these base assumptions of concern include:

- The use of DOE’s ecological protection standard has not been agreed to be EPA, Ecology or the public
- The use of a 150-year cleanup period assumption
- DOE’s assumption to cleanup the River Corridor for unrestricted surface use rather than unrestricted use

- The lack of integration of the trust responsibility in a decision-making matrix that could be used to minimize any potential damage claims under the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process
- The deferral of cleanup and the over-reliance on institutional controls
- The reliance on modeling and simulations rather than sampling and further investigation

Agency perspective

DOE-RL

Nick Ceto, DOE-RL, thought the problem was more with reaching understanding. Nick said for example, DOE does not use a 150-year cleanup assumption – they are cleaning up the River Corridor by 2015. He said DOE does not select or rely on institutional controls until cleanup is complete. He said he understands the concern, but if the Board is interested in fundamental issues, the agencies are happy to meet with the issue managers and committees to talk through the issues and figure out the best format in which to address them. Nick did not think the items on the list were DOE assumptions and he asked the Board to think about what it means by reaching resolution before it adopts the advice.

EPA

Dennis added that the Board might want to say the list of concerns in the advice is not all-inclusive, so it does not preclude any other issues that may pop up. He thought the way it is written now makes it seem like those are the only issues.

Discussion

Greg said the six assumptions of concern are examples and the Board would discuss others as they come up. Nick thought that reinforced the need to do some work up front with issue managers and committees in order to have a good discussion. He thought having a workshop without accomplishing some work up front would not be successful. Greg agreed that the Board would have to do some work ahead of time.

Harold did not want the advice to discuss NRDA or tribal processes; he said the Board is not party to the NRDA process. He said he would object to the advice unless it is removed. Greg commented that it would have to be discussed at the workshop because the workshop should be comprehensive and discuss all aspects of Hanford cleanup, including protectiveness and liability.

Bob Suyama said the advice came to be because the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) received several large documents at once, including Remedial Investigations/Feasibility Studies (RI/FS) work plans. The committee thought it was a good time to establish a set of criteria so when DOE does the RI/FS analysis and then the RODS, everyone will be in agreement. Bob added that the Board previously issued advice on using systems engineering to make decisions; gaining understanding about the base set of assumptions should be done first.

Dave said the advice is not necessary to have a workshop. He said DOE will host the requested workshop. He said the workshop could help the committee identify the need for advice.

The advice was discarded and DOE-RL committed to hosting a workshop on base assumptions. The issue managers will start working with the agencies to frame the issues and topics. PIC will also be involved.

Committee reports

Committees recently selected their committee leadership. The new chairs and vice-chairs for 2009-2010 are:

Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC): Gerry Pollet, chair; Harold Heacock, vice-chair
 River and Plateau Committee (RAP): Pam Larsen, chair; Maynard Plahuta, vice-chair
 Tank Waste Committee (TWC): Larry Lockrem, chair; Rob Davis, vice-chair
 Health, Safety and Environmental Protection (HSEP): Keith Smith, chair; Mike Korenko, vice-chair
 Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC): Steve Hudson, chair; Ken Niles, vice-chair

National liaison: Shelley Cimon

BCC

Harold said the committee has been active with developing budget advice and had a FY 2011 budget workshop. He was disappointed at HAB attendance. Gerry said the BCC was briefed on the ARRA work scope. The MSC contractor was selected and the committee will be discussing employee pension and benefit issues with workers who have been in enterprise companies. BCC will meet on September 10.

RAP

Pam said the RAP is very busy and needs more issues managers. They are working on a number of issues, including:

- 618-10 burial ground characterization plans, which will lead to 618-11 burial ground characterization
- 100 Area RI/FS work plan that will identify data gaps and the need for final decisions (Dale Engstrom, Oregon Department of Energy (State of Oregon) is the issue manager)
- Hanford Site Completion Framework: Identifies how individual cleanup decisions affect overall cleanup. This was released in August and has a 90-day public comment period
- K Basin updates

RAP will hear or work on the following at their September 9 committee meeting:

- A tutorial on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and how they interact
- A presentation on the Natural Resource Trustee Council (NRTC) to gain a better understanding NRDA and its processes
- An update on PW 1,3 and 6 and CW-5 (Shelley is the issue manager)
- A proposal to construct a new limited purpose landfill (limited to clean construction debris)
- Update on PFP D&D

TWC

Larry thanked Pam for her work last year as vice-chair. TWC has and will work on the following issues:

- Secondary waste roadmaps
- Pacific Northwest National Laboratory workshop about technology and programmatic steps to accept secondary waste
- Presentation about technetium waste and supplemental risk assessments (RAs) and potential risk drivers; will have a follow-up session on technetium
- C Farm tank performance assessment (PA); two workshops held so far, will have a total of ten. Larry said the committee is asking why a PA is required for C Farm when nearby burial grounds do not require PAs
- Combined discussion on budgets and cleanup with BCC
- Discussed research and technology and how to allocate ARRA funds

TWC will meet on September 10 and discuss plans for the coming fiscal year. Larry said the TW&EM EIS is a big item for TWC and they are looking at acquiring outside support to help with the technical review. Larry is working with DOE-ORP to release a scope of work for bid by October 1.

HSEP

HSEP is and will continue working on the following:

- Tank vapors: HSEP would like to learn more about the tank vapor program being proposed as a way to protect workers. Keith said they are implementing ALARA and HSEP wants to learn more.
- Tracking DOE's response to HAB Advice #217 about beryllium disease prevention at Hanford. Mike is following a laser technology that could track beryllium in the environment. Keith said such a technology would be a huge step forward – the hardest part about beryllium is the inability to detect it.

- Mike added that DOE, the Department of Labor and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) decided to allow living claimants with beryllium disease follow the old criteria (new criteria is more restrictive)
- Uniform site-wide training and the use of the HAMMER training facility
- Systems for tracking worker concerns
- ISMS and support at tank farms

HSEP will have a conference call on September 14 and will meet in October.

National liaison/SSAB

Shelley will have more information in November. She is attending the International Waste Summit in Las Vegas next week and the EM-SSAB chairs meeting at the end of September in Idaho. Susan Leckband said DOE-HQ is supportive at the EM-SSAB meetings and they get a good overview of how Hanford fits into the national picture. Susan was asked to lead a discussion about how Hanford gets budget information out to the public, and how the HAB reviews and provides input about the annual budgets. Susan will pass long EM updates to the Board. She noted that the HAB is one of the more experienced boards on the EM-SSAB, partially because it is a board of organizations and does not require term limits.

PIC

Steve said PIC wants to be more proactive and respond to public involvement requests. PIC developed a proposal for the Board that changes how PIC operates so it can better meet its responsibilities to the Board and agencies. The proposal is:

- PIC role and function: Changes to the HAB Process Manual to more fully describe PIC role and function.
- Meeting frequency: The PIC meeting placeholder will alternate monthly between the Wednesday prior to Board meetings and during committee week (PIC currently does not meet during committee week).
- Relationship to the TPA Quarterly: PIC requests the TPA agencies to hold the TPA Quarterly on the Wednesday mornings before Board meetings, and suggests using a round-robin “sounding board” to solicit specific feedback, publicize the TPA Quarterly to encourage public attendance, and coordinate the TPA Quarterly agenda with the PIC meeting agenda to reduce redundancy.
- Committee membership: Continue the practice of allowing any HAB member to serve on PIC without encumbering their ability to be members of two other committees on the Board. If the practice of meeting alternating Wednesdays prior to Board meetings and committee week when necessary is adopted, this will not be a significant additional travel expense compared with the benefits to the HAB and TPA agencies.
- Developing advice: PIC will be more active in developing advice for Board consideration and action. While the focus will be at the policy level, there may be instances when the TPA agencies would benefit from more detailed advice.

Steve called attention to a recent publication produced by the Oregon Department of Energy (Oregon DOE) entitled “Hanford Cleanup: The First 20 Years.” Steve said it is a very well-written and informative document that the entire Board should read. It is available on the Oregon DOE website at <http://www.oregon.gov/ENERGY/NUCSAF/docs/HanfordFirst20years.pdf>.

PIC has also been working on State of the Site meeting planning and is planning a TPA Committee of the Whole (COTW) workshop on September 29 or 30. PIC will have a committee call on September 17 to plan the workshop, which will discuss what kind of public involvement and meeting models should be used to roll out the TPA changes to the public. PIC is also tracking the agencies’ work on revising the CRP.

Steve said PIC needs an issue manager for the TC&WM EIS. Steve also recommended that the Board read a letter that Ken Niles sent to Lynn Porter, Hanford Watch, concerning TPA milestone and schedule changes. He said it is available on the Hanford Yahoo Group.

Susan Hayman asked if anyone on the Board disagreed with the changes to the process manual. The Board considered it overnight and on Friday approved the changes.

Public comment

No public comment was provided.

Board business

Susan Leckband reminded the Board that the real work happens at the committee level and she charged all members to become more active in committees.

Dennis suggested that next year, the Board and agencies should plan on going to a Mariners game in honor of Jim Trombold.

Pam announced that an Energy Communities Alliance meeting was held at Hanford in August.

Nolan said Jane Hedges, Ecology, is on the mend after falling and injuring herself. John Price is the TPA section manager for Ecology, which allows Ecology to have a greater focus on the TPA. Sharon Braswell has moved on to employment with Mission Support Alliance, the MSC contractor. Nolan announced that his wife accepted a position at Savannah River and he will be leaving Hanford soon, possibly within a month or two. He said it has been a pleasure working with the Board and thanked them for their good work.

A proposed consent decree and TPA change package COTW workshop is tentatively scheduled for September 29.

The Board may want a workshop about the TC&WM EIS, which is currently scheduled for release in October.

The Board may want to have a half-day tour of specific places on the Hanford Site, such as MARS in the cold test facility, 200 West groundwater system and WTP. Susan said they could try to schedule this tour during committee week in October. Keith thought the Board should also tour HAMMER.

Process manual updates

Susan Hayman said the changes to the process manual that were accepted in June about advice and ground rules will be incorporated when PIC changes are made. EnviroIssues will email the latest version of the process manual when all changes are incorporated. Susan said they will post the process manual to the HAB website.

Adoption of Board 2009-2010 priorities

The Board saw the draft 2009-2010 priorities in June. The TPA agencies sent a letter identifying what they would like the Board to focus on; all the agency priorities have been included in the Board's priorities. Susan Leckband said the agencies' priorities are more overarching. The Board will perform a mid-year review to ensure it is staying on track. Susan Hayman noted the priorities came from and tie into committee work plans. EnviroIssues will continue to use the priorities as a guide as committees plan and modify their work plans.

Doug asked if he could put his name by issues of interest to him; Susan Leckband thought he could work on that through the committees.

The 2009-2010 Board priorities were adopted.

Proposed changes to the 2009-2010 Board calendar

Susan Leckband reviewed changes to the Board calendar. At the Leadership Retreat, Board and committee leaders concluded that:

- Instituting a COTW meeting placeholder during months when there is no Board meeting to allow the Board to address any big issues (e.g. TC&WM EIS)
- Restricting committee calls to Tuesday through Thursday (Monday conference calls are difficult to plan and are often rescheduled)

- Moving the January and September Board meeting back one week to avoid holidays (New Year and Labor Day)
- Instituting PIC meeting placeholders during committee week in the months other than when PIC meets the day before the Board meeting

The call schedule change will begin in October. The Board reviewed a color-coded calendar (EnviroIssues will correct the 2009 portion and send out a new version).

Bob Suyama thought it might be worthwhile to show the Leadership Retreat on the calendar so people can plan ahead. Susan Hayman said it usually is not scheduled this far ahead of time, but they could discuss it on the next Executive Issues Committee (EIC) call. The Board wants new leadership to start attending the retreat. Bob also asked that the calendar show when holidays are observed.

The Board adopted the calendar changes as recommended and revised.

2010 Board meeting schedule

The Board will meet in the Tri-Cities in February, June and November. It will meet in Portland in April and Seattle in September.

Committee meeting and conference call schedule

RAP: Meeting September 9
TWC: Meeting in October
BCC: Meeting on September 10 (no call)
HSEP: Call on September 14
PIC: Call on September 17

Attendees

HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

Gabriel Bohnee, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Member	Larry Lockrem, Alternate
Tom Carpenter, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Debra McBaugh, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Howard Putter, Member	Emmett Moore, Alternate
Earl Fordham, Member	Keith Smith, Member	Laura Mueller, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member	Nancy Murray, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member		Dave Rowland, Alternate
Julie Jones, Member	Tom Bailor, Alternate	Mecal Samkow, Alternate
Mike Keizer, Member	Karen Bowman, Alternate	Dick Smith, Alternate
Pam Larsen, Member	Shelley Cimon, Alternate	John Stanfill, Alternate
Susan Leckband, Member	Gerry Dagle, Alternate	Bob Suyama, Alternate
Jeff Luke, Member	Floyd Hodges, Alternate	Art Tackett, Alternate
Doug Mercer, Member	Steve Hudson, Alternate	Charlie Weems, Alternate
Ken Niles, Member	Mike Korenko, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate
	Wayne Lei, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Dave Brockman, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Jon Carter, CHPRC
Paula Call, DOE-RL (phone)	Jane Hedges, Ecology (phone)	John Lehew, CHPRC
Nick Ceto, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Janice Williams, CHPRC
	Polly Zehm, Ecology	Barb Wise, CHPRC
		Francisco Figueroa, MSA
		Ross Potter, MSA
Ben Harp, DOE-ORP		
Lori Gamache, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues
Shirley Olinger, DOE-ORP	Emy Laija, EPA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
		Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues
	Mary Sue Wilson, Office of the Attorney General (WA)	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
	Andy Fitz, Office of the Attorney General (WA)	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Beverly Penny, CTUIR	Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald (phone)	Churim Cholz, WA Physicians for Social Responsibility
----------------------	---------------------------------------	---