

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**

November 4-5, 2015

Richland, WA

**Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Executive Summary ..... 1

Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements ..... 3

Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Project Interim Report..... 4

Plutonium Finishing Plant Demolition Video..... 7

Tri-Party Agreement Agency Program Reports..... 9

Overview: Tri-Party Agreement Central Plateau Milestone Series Change Package..... 17

Board and Committee Reports..... 21

Public Comment..... 24

Board Business..... 24

Attachments ..... 30

Attendees: ..... 31

*This is only a summary of issues and actions presented at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

**Executive Summary**

**Hanford Advisory Board Business**

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) approved two letters. The first letter concerned worker safety and communication restrictions, and the second letter was a U.S. Department of Energy—Office of Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board chairs’ recommendation requesting the U.S. Department of Energy consider Supplemental Environmental Projects in lieu of fines and penalties issued by regulators. The Board adopted the HAB Fiscal Year 2016 Work Plan as well as revisions to the HAB Process Manual. Board members received a tutorial on using the HAB’s updated SharePoint Site and identified potential meeting topics for the February 2016 Board meeting.

**Presentations and Updates**

The Board received presentations on:

- The Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Interim Report
- Planned Demolition strategies for the Plutonium Finishing Plant
- Tri-Party Agreement Agency Updates
- The Tri-Party Agreement Central Plateau Milestone Series Change Package
- Board Committee Reports

**Public comment**

One public comment was provided.

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
*November 4-5, 2015 Richland, WA*

Steve Hudson, Hanford Watch and Board chair, called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) to order. The meeting was open to members of the public and offered opportunities for public comment.

The Board meeting was audio-recorded.

**Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements**

Steve welcomed everyone to the meeting, and he formally introduced nine new Board members and alternates.

Jon Peschong, U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) and co-Deputy Designated Federal Officer for the HAB noted that the Board is meeting in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues Facilitator, reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives. Cathy confirmed the adoption of the September 2015 Board meeting summary, following the incorporation of minor edits received within the FACA stipulated 45-day time period.

Steve recognized that there would be a Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agency public meeting in Richland following the November 4 Board meeting. Steve noted that the meeting would cover updates to the Central Plateau TPA milestone series, and he stated that the meeting would be the first in a series of regional meetings that would take place during the open public comment period on the milestone series change package. Steve encouraged HAB members to attend, provide feedback, and publicize upcoming meetings to their constituents.

Shelley Cimon, Columbia Riverkeeper and HAB National Liaison, noted that the River and Plateau Committee (RAP) would discuss the TPA milestone series change package in greater depth at the December 8, 2015 RAP meeting. Shelley encouraged Board members to attend the regional public meetings and provide her with impressions and questions that would help RAP frame committee discussion and inform potential HAB action.

Kristen Holmes, DOE-RL, noted that DOE-RL would record the upcoming TPA milestone series change package meetings and transcribe public comments from the meetings in a timely manner. Kristin offered to provide Central Plateau issue managers with these comments as they became available.

Cathy recognized that the Board adopted new public comment guidelines at the September 2015 meeting, and she noted that these revised guidelines were available in the back of the meeting room. Cathy also encouraged Board members to sign up for a Microsoft Live account during Board meeting breaks; members would use this account to access the Board's updated SharePoint Site. EnviroIssues provided

laptop stations that members could use to set up accounts, and EnviroIssues staff would be available to assist members with the process as needed.

### **Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Project Interim Report**

David Kosson, Principle Investigator for the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) Hanford Risk Review Project, noted that the Hanford Risk Review aimed to analyze the overall contamination remaining at the Hanford Site and worked to prioritize remaining cleanup efforts based on the risks that contamination posed to human health and the environment. David clarified that the Hanford Risk Review project was a separate endeavor from the Omnibus Risk Review. David stated that the Omnibus Report was directed by the U.S. Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Action, 2014 (H.R 3547) and coordinated by CRESP, however, it was national in scope and not specific to the Hanford Site.

David provided Board members with a presentation (Attachment 1),. Key takeaways from David's presentation included:

- The Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Project has two objectives: (1) to provide a catalog of information about the range of challenges present at the Hanford Site, and (2) to look at the potential impacts, risks, and hazards that environmental contamination at the Hanford Site currently presents and allow risks to be compared against one another. The Hanford Risk Review Project is not intended to substitute or preempt legal cleanup requirements imposed under laws, treaties, or agreements or analyze completed cleanup actions.
- The Hanford Risk Review Project does not suggest that certain waste sites at Hanford not be cleaned up. The report notes that there are risks associated with not cleaning up some sites quickly enough. Conversely, there are risks associated with cleaning up some sites too early (e.g. before certain radionuclides have had the opportunity to decay). The Hanford Risk Review Project works to illustrate these risks and serve as a reference for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) as the agency works to balance and prioritize cleanup efforts.
- The CRESP process incorporates opportunities for stakeholder review and participation. CRESP members solicited public comment throughout the process and use the gathered perspectives to update and strengthen subsequent iterations of the Report
- Comments that CRESP has received thus far include three major critiques:
  - That the results included within the Interim report have been cherry picked and shared out of context
  - That the Interim Report is lacking necessary information
  - That the interim report does not adequately address tribal resources at the Hanford Site

- Following the initial public comment period, the CRESP team took all 800 submitted comments and used them to make substantial changes to the report methodology. CRESP is working to address these critiques of the report in the next iteration of the Risk Review and strengthen the overall report.
- Data gathered during the creation of the Hanford Risk Review has suggested several Hanford Cleanup sites that warrant increased scrutiny. These include:
  - The timber-constructed tunnels surrounding the Plutonium-Uranium Extraction Plant that. The tunnels are approaching the end of their design life, and they are susceptible to fire and contaminant dispersion
  - Specific tank farm tanks should be addressed differently
  - The Central Plateau East groundwater plume is the greatest groundwater threat on-site that is not currently being addressed
  - Selected interim actions that may reduce risk (e.g. at the 324 Building or at 618-11)
  - That accumulation of waste inventory at interim storage points
  - Risks stemming from mercury, especially mercury vapor
- The scope of the Interim Report covered all nine tank waste and tank farm Evaluation Units (EUs), all five groundwater EUs, three of nine Deactivation and Decommissioning EUs, four of twenty-one Legacy Source Site EUs, and four of sixteen Operating Facility EUs.
- 618-11 is very near the Energy Northwest Generating station. The site currently has a gravel cover over the contaminated Vertical Pipe Units (VPU). This gravel cover encourages infiltration and a less permeable cover could discourage the spread of contamination. However, 618-11's proximity to the generating station could potentially pose additional risk relating to retrieval efforts.
- The primary risk posed by the 324 Building black cell liner leak is the potential spread of contamination from water infiltration (likely from a water main rupture) and worker exposure during remediation.
- Groundwater at the Hanford Site is both a protected resource and a potential hazard, as it may transport contamination to the Columbia River. The Hanford Risk Review includes a groundwater threat metric, which quantifies contamination at the saturated zone at water quality standards.

*Board questions and response*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

Q. The governors of Oregon and Washington disputed some of the information that was included within the report. To what information did they take issue?

R. [CRESP] The governors disputed the findings of the Omnibus Risk Report, not the Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review.

Q. In the CRESF site model, there is discussion of vapor inhalation, but there is no discussion of particulate inhalation. Most radionuclides are found as particulate, not vapor.

R. [CRESP] The CRESF report looked at atmospheric transport of both vapor and particulate contamination, it may not have been made clear enough. The CRESF team did not conduct a thorough analysis of mercury vapor.

C. Iodine-129 has such a specific activity, and there is so much of it in the environment, that it is almost impossible to get enough iodine-129 into a thyroid gland to cause ill effects.

Q. Why are facilities like the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) not highlighted in the interim report? DOE-RL's own documentation notes that seismic events within the design basis would result in a release of radionuclides from the facility. The CRESF report does not consider this.

*R. [CRESP] The CRESF team looked at design events as well as those that were beyond the design basis. The CRESF report also considered cascading events (e.g. regional loss of power). For this reason, we developed the table included on slide #15 (Unmitigated Dose to Co-located person [rem] as Human Health Metric). For WESF specifically, the Risk Review looked at risk posed by the cesium and strontium capsules, but also from the inventory remaining in the ventilation ducts. The report tried to make this clear.*

Q. How did CRESF choose to suggest interim measures for facilities, because it appears the interim report did not do this for all analyzed facilities?

*R. [CRESP] The report focused on interim measures where there were clear (from the perspective of the CRESF team) urgent risks that were not currently being addressed. The gravel cover facilitating infiltration at 618-11 is an example of this, potential new sources of water at the 324 Building is another. In other cases, the Report notes situations that rely on active controls. In those circumstances, controls become vulnerable in natural disaster scenarios or extended power outages. Several Hanford tanks rely on active controls are at risk in this way.*

Q. The Interim Report is currently out for public review. What are the next steps in the CRESF process?

*R. [CRESP] The CRESF team has been soliciting input and working to determine whether DOE would like to complete a final report incorporating the remaining waste sites. CRESF will continue to gather public comment on strategies for honing the report methodology. CRESF*

would release a final report in June—August 2016, and the report would go out for public comment one more time before finalization.

Q. What is the CRESPP vision for how DOE will use the Hanford Risk Review?

R. [CRESPP] CRESPP would like to see the Report used as part of a suite of tools that informs and prioritizes cleanup decisions across the Hanford Site.

Q. The Umatilla Tribe negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding with DOE to access foods, medicines, and sacred sites found within the boundaries of the Hanford Site. The Umatilla Tribe has been working with DOE to ensure that these foods and medicines are safe for our consumption. The Hanford Risk Review Report needs to take tribes and tribal access into account when calculating risk to human health. The Risk Review should also look at the risk that contamination poses to Columbia River salmon.

R. [CRESPP] The Umatilla Tribe is engaging in controlled access of the Hanford Site in this scenario. There are areas on the Hanford Site where Umatilla Tribespeople would likely not go on the site, which is reasonable. Risk assessments are an important component of human health, but biomonitoring is also an important component for safety. The Risk Review does not look at the fish; rather it looks at the riparian and the benthic zones of the Columbia River, as these areas were found to be more sensitive indicators of risk.

### **Plutonium Finishing Plant Demolition Video**

Pam Larsen, City of Richland and RAP chair, noted that the Board has received a number of updates in the past two years regarding decommission and deconstruction efforts and the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP). She noted that work on the PFP is nearing completion, and CH2M Hill had put together a very informative video highlighting the upcoming demolition efforts at the plant.

Jon Peschong underscored the magnitude of PFP demolition efforts, and he noted that the facility presented a high degree of risk to workers. Jon noted that DOE-RL expects that PFP demolition will start by March 2016 and be completed in calendar year 2016.

The video (Attachment 2) may be accessed [online](#).

#### *Board questions and response*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

C. Workers facilitating the demolition of the PFP are doing an exceptional job. The work is very difficult and highly technical.

Q. Will there be weather restrictions that will limit demolition work in the upcoming winter months?

R. [DOE-RL] There will be work restrictions if there are high winds.

Q. The video appears to demonstrate that workers will saw off and cap piping that extends underground, away from the PFP building's footprint. What will happen to this piping? Will contamination remain inside of it?

*R. [DOE-RL] Piping left under the concrete will not be addressed for the time being. Any waste within pipes will be characterized and remediated at a later time.*

Q. What is the total maximum amount of radiation that DOE-RL allows each PFP worker to be exposed to?

*R. [DOE-RL] Maximum radiation exposure in the field is 500 millirems per year.*

Q. When in the demolition process will the PFP stack come down?

*R. [DOE-RL] The stack will be one of the final PFP structures to be demolished, as it will likely require the use of explosives.*

Q. What are the next steps for the PFP following demolition? What is the process for passing the site from DOE to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)?

*R. [EPA] The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been coordinating tradeoff details with DOE-RL and Ecology. EPA is providing DOE-RL with three additional months to incorporate the surrounding PFP sites and the below-grade structures into the WA-1 Work Plan. There will also be the expectation that DOE-RL will develop a sampling and analysis plan for those surrounding sites. EPA is hopeful that there will be no transuranic (TRU) waste left on site.*

Q. Is EPA willing to take TRU waste if it found to be present?

*R. [EPA] If TRU waste is present, it will need to be packaged and sent to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). EPA's hope is that only low-level waste will remain at the PFP site.*

Q. During the upcoming demolition process, will demolition workers with little understanding of the PFP site replace more familiar, experienced PFP operators? From a safety standpoint, it does not make sense to use individuals who are unfamiliar with the risks associated with this very hazardous site.

*R. [DOE-RL] There are two major factors at play here: workers familiarity with the hazards presented by PFP and worker familiarity with the hazards associated with demolition and deconstruction. As the work proceeds from demolition preparation to actual demolition, the contractor will pair worker skills to work being performed.*

Q. Will the PFP be incorporated into the 200-WA Operable Unit Work Plan? Is the 200-WA Work Plan finished and available?

*R. [EPA] No, the Work Plan is not yet available. EPA currently has a draft of the 200-WA Work Plan, but it is not yet finalized. The PFP waste sites are not yet incorporated into the current version.*

Q. Will there be a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) for the soils underneath the PFP complex?

*R. [EPA] Yes. There are a number of waste sites as well as below-grade structures that need to be investigated as part of the WA-1 Work Plan. In the next three to four months, DOE-RL will identify these sites and commit to creating a sampling and analysis plan.*

Q. Is it realistic to believe that all subsurface contamination and waste sites at the PFP will be cleaned up by 2019?

*R. [EPA] The 2019 schedule is not to complete cleanup of the waste sites at the PFP; it is only to complete the investigation. The cleanup of WA-1 will take a number of years.*

Q. How much is PFP demolition costing this year?

*R. [DOE-RL] PFP demolition efforts will cost approximately \$120 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2016.*

### **Tri-Party Agreement Agency Program Reports**

#### *Washington Department of Ecology*

Jane Hedges, Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), announced that she would be retiring at the end of February. She noted that the Director and Deputy Director of Ecology would begin looking for her replacement soon, and she noted that the search committee might engage the HAB during the search process. She encouraged Board members to think about the attributes and characteristics that they would like to see in an Ecology Nuclear Waste Program Manager and convey them to Ecology.

Jane noted that an internal group recently recognized a team within the Nuclear Waste Program for the exceptional work that they did with DOE-RL and contractors associated with taking over full configuration control of the Rev. 8C Hanford Facility Dangerous Waste (Site-Wide) Permit. Jane recognized that this was a huge accomplishment.

#### *U.S. Department of Energy – Richland Operations*

Stacy Charboneau, DOE-RL, provided Board members with a presentation (Attachment 3) detailing DOE-RL accomplishments and planned next steps. Stacy noted the following key points in her agency update:

- DOE-RL recently held a celebration closing out the Office's 2015 Vision. The 2015 Vision has been a tremendously successful set of goals that DOE-RL has been working towards throughout the past decade. There is still additional work to do in the River Corridor, and the PFP is slated for slab-on-grade by 2016, but many of the most pressing cleanup needs have been addressed.

- In FY 2015, DOE-RL continued with remediation of the 618-10 Burial Ground. DOE-RL had initially anticipated that the trench held approximately 600-800 drums. New estimates place the total number of drums in the trench at approximately 1,700. There have been other surprises at the burial ground such as an in-tact hot cell from the 300 Area. Washington Closure Hanford (WCH) has done a fantastic job managing waste buried within this trench.
- There are 94 VPUs buried near the 618-10 Burial Ground, and these generally contain highly radioactive waste. WCH worked to hammer overcasings around the VPUs, and crews used large augers to grind the VPUs within the overcasing and then grout the resulting mixture. WCH just completed augering the eighth VPU, and work will continue on the remaining VPUs. Waste retrieval will commence once all VPUs are augered.
- In April 2015, crews entered the H Reactor for a five-year inspection to ensure that the cocooned reactor was stable. The inspection went very well, and DOE-RL is considering lengthening the amount of time between reactor entries.
- Construction on the sludge annex in the 100 Area is completed. DOE-RL will transition sludge retrieval equipment into the K West Basin, and workers will begin cold commissioning the sludge retrieval system before it is installed into the K West Basin and the sludge annex.
- Hazardous deconstruction and demolition work is ongoing at the PFP. This work is the most hazardous that has ever been done at the Hanford Site, and it is continuing safely. Workers recently removed the last of the high-hazard gloveboxes, prepared the last tank from the Americium Recovery Facility (also known as the McCluskey Room), and prepared the last pencil tanks from the Plutonium Reclamation Facility. Workers are preparing for a final four to five month push of high-hazard work that includes removal of ductwork, piping system, and the last of the plutonium gloveboxes. Large-scale PFP demolition will likely start in spring 2016. DOE-RL plans to have the PFP facility reduced to slab-on-grade by late 2016. PFP demolition workers continue to do incredible work.
- DOE-RL operates five pump and treat facilities along the River Corridor, as well as the 200 West Pump and Treat system in the Central Plateau. In 2015, DOE-RL exceeded a key performance goal and treated 2.4 billion gallons of contaminated groundwater. Uranium treatment capabilities were recently added to the 200 West Pump and Treat facility.
- DOE-RL continues to do well in the budget space. In FY 2016, DOE-RL received \$914 million in the President's Budget, and it is anticipated that the 2016 congressional allocation will be close to \$1 billion. There is currently a Continuing Resolution (CR) in place until December 11, 2015, but DOE-RL is hopeful that the U.S. Congress will pass a budget act before the CR expires.
- DOE-RL has been negotiating the remaining TPA milestones with regulators. DOE-RL missed sludge milestones in the K Area, and EPA worked with DOE-RL to renegotiate these milestones.
- Potential updates to the M-091 milestone series look to retain focus on packaging retrieved Hanford Site TRU waste before additional TRU waste is recovered from Hanford burial grounds.

DOE-RL anticipates shipping waste to WIPP around 2022. EPA and Ecology agreed that it did not make sense to continue retrieving buried TRU waste without accounting for delays in WIPP shipments.

- DOE-RL issued proposed changes to milestone series for much of the remaining Central Plateau cleanup work. Public comment on this change package began on October 26, 2015, and regional public meetings will occur in November 2015. When renegotiating these milestone series, DOE-RL considered a realistic yearly scope of work assuming approximately \$1 billion in cleanup appropriations.
- DOE-RL completed a huge land conveyance push in September 2015. This conveyance incorporated intense coordination with regulators and tribes, and DOE-RL transferred 1,641 acres to the Tri-Cities Development Council.
- DOE-RL and the National Park Service (NPS) coordinated on the creation of the Manhattan National Historical Park at the Hanford Site. In November 2015, DOE and the NPS will have a signing ceremony that will officially dedicate the new park. DOE-RL will continue ownership of the park facilities and focus on preserving facilities and maintaining safe public access; the NPS will interpret the Manhattan Project Story and operate visitor services.
- DOE-RL recently unveiled a new vision to replace the completed 2015 Vision. The updated DOE-RL Vision stretches to 2028. The 2028 Vision is oriented around four major tenants: (1) continuing cleanup efforts, (2) protecting and remediating groundwater near the Columbia River, (3) providing the infrastructure necessary for continued Hanford Site cleanup, and (4) restoring the lands for public access and use.
- Many Hanford contracts for cleanup and infrastructure support will expire in 2018 and 2019. To ensure the successful development of these contracts, DOE-RL recently established the Office of Hanford Acquisitions. The new Office will gather input and ideas for future contracts through meetings and conversations with interested parties in the coming months.
- Hanford recently hosted several important visitors, including Dr. Monica Regalbuto, DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, and Dr. Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall, Deputy Secretary of Energy, John MacWilliams, Associate Deputy Secretary of Energy, and Paul Bosco, Director of Project Management Oversight and Assessment. Each of these visitors were impressed by the incredible scope of work that has been completed on the Hanford Site in the past two decades.

*U.S. Department of Energy – Office of River Protection*

Rob Hastings, U.S. Department of Energy—Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), provided Board members with a presentation (Attachment 4) detailing DOE-ORP accomplishments and planned next steps. Rob noted the following key points in his agency update:

- DOE-ORP recently added a new contractor, Wastren Advantage, Inc. (WAI), which is the prime contractor for managing the analytical activities at the 222-S Laboratory. WAI is taking over for Advanced Technologies and Laboratories (ATL). DOE-ORP's contract with WAI is a fixed, \$45 million contract over two years, with an optional one-year to follow. Transition from ATL to WAI is currently ongoing, and the transition is scheduled to be complete by the end of November 2015. Washington River Protection Solutions (WRPS) operates the 222-S Laboratory facility; WAI manages the analytical activities at the Laboratory.
- Dave Olson, WRPS, retired at the end of September 2015. His chief operating officer, Mark Lindholm, succeeded him as WRPS President and Project Manager. Mark is very field-oriented, and he keeps safety as a high priority for staff.
- The 242-A Evaporator, which evaporates the liquids out of tank farm wastes and creates additional tank space, was recently upgraded. Since fall 2014, the evaporator has run four campaigns and it has created nearly 1.9 million gallons of waste storage space within tanks. DOE-ORP will continue with evaporator campaigns into the foreseeable future.
- DOE-ORP is preparing to pump liquids out of double-shell tank (DST) AY-102, which has leaked tank waste into its secondary tank. Pumping of AY-102 is expected to begin in March 2016; removed liquids will likely be sent to tank AZ-102.
- DOE-ORP directed the installation of a portable exhauster into single-shell tank (SST) T-111, a known leaker, and approximately 2,400 gallons of liquids have been evaporated from the tank (approximately 30 gallons per day).
- DOE-ORP is continuing retrieval activities at C-Farm. Two tanks remain, and efforts are currently focusing on SST C-111. The emptying of C-Farm will be a substantial plus for the environment and the overall DOE-ORP mission.
- At the Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant (WTP), DOE-ORP is currently focusing efforts on Direct Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW). DOE-ORP is also working to balance the facilities and associated activities to begin turning low-activity waste (LAW) into glass. The overall WTP complex is approximately 80% complete in terms of procurement and construction. DOE-ORP is also beginning to initiate startup planning. DOE-ORP is tracking at approximately 7% complete on these startup activities.
  - The LAW Facility is approximately 90% complete in terms of construction and procurement.
  - The Analytical Laboratory is nominally complete in terms of design construction to support LAW activities. DOE-ORP is approximately 10% complete on the start of activities for Analytical Laboratory activities associated with LAW treatment.
  - The High-Level Waste (HLW) Facility is still actively under civilian construction. The facility is approximately 62% complete in terms of construction and procurement, and

DOE-ORP will provide a briefing on the status of the HLW Facility at the December 9, 2015 Tank Waste Committee (TWC) meeting.

- The Balance of Facilities is approximately 80% complete in terms of procurement and construction and approximately 14% complete in terms of startup activity planning.
  - The Pretreatment Facility is still on hold pending the resolution of eight identified technical issues (hydrogen criticality, erosion, corrosion, mixing in tanks, ventilation issues, etc.). DOE-ORP is actively working to resolve technical issues before additional construction on the Pretreatment Facility begins.
- DOE-ORP is currently working under a CR. For FY 2016, the President's Budget is approximately \$1.4 billion. \$74 million of this budget allocation will go to the Low-Activity Waste Pretreatment Facility (LAWPS); this planned construction is an important facility that will support DOE-ORP's DFLAW program.

#### *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), provided Board members with an update on recent EPA work at the Hanford Site. Dennis noted that:

- He recently provided a presentation to representatives from the Idaho National Lab, and he covered the success of 200 West Pump and Treat at the Hanford Site. Attendees were excited by the success of pump and treat operations at Hanford.
- Emy Laija, EPA, was EPA's lead negotiator for the Central Plateau milestone series change package. The milestone delays are not good news; however, there is no way that the current TPA schedules are practical. K-Basin sludge, 618-11, and the 324 Building are all important cleanup efforts that EPA worked to balance when negotiating milestone series updates.
- The Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) waiver that that the HAB provided advice in support of in November 2014 was approved by EPA headquarters. Very few public comments were received on the waiver, and in-trench macroencapsulation should be in practice by early 2016.
- EPA just issued an Explanation of Significant Difference to allow leachate from ERDF to go to the 200 West Pump and Treat Facility. This will allow for more efficient operation, as leachate currently goes to the Effluent Treatment Facility.
- The Superfund program is turning 35 years old, and EPA is highlighting 35 of the top Superfund projects around the nation. The Hanford Site is one of the projects that is being showcased. To date, DOE-RL has remediated over 900 waste sites along the Columbia River.
- DOE-RL should release the Proposed Plan for 100 -D/H by early in 2016. EPA is currently working with the state to review the document. Public comment on the Proposed Plan should be ongoing during the February 2016 Board meeting.

*Board questions and response*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

Q. The DOE-RL agency update noted that the Mission Support Alliance (MSA) contract would close in 2018; however, there is talk that MSA is currently in the process of restructuring their contract with DOE. Is this true?

*R. [DOE-RL] MSA is likely examining their operations and restructuring their sub-contractors. MSA is not currently restructuring their contract with DOE.*

Q. If too much liquid is removed from tank waste, it may begin to solidify. Is DOE-ORP concerned that evaporating tank waste is creating future safety and technical issues?

*R. [DOE-ORP] This issue comes down to chemical control of the materials inside of tanks. Hydrogen sometimes builds up, and DOE-ORP has gone through full-scale testing over the years to ensure that the potential buildup and release of hydrogen gas is not an issue. These tests have identified that tanks may handle more evaporation than previously thought. DOE-ORP will continue monitoring tank waste consistency and chemistry and evaporator campaigns continue.*

Q. How much liquid is DOE-ORP actively adding into tanks to cool them?

*R. [DOE-ROP] DOE-ORP is not currently adding any water to tanks as a cooling mechanism.*

Q. The DOE-ORP presentation noted that several WTP Facilities are relatively far along in startup planning. However, once components of the WTP system are completed, there will be many additional operational and procedural efforts that DOE-ORP will need to coordinate. For example, there will be staffing and training considerations, and equipment will likely need to be slowly brought online. How can DOE-ORP consider startup planning to be advancing when there is still so much work that needs to be done?

*R. [DOE-ORP] Startup is not a short or an easy process. LAW treatment, for example, will require that the facility itself is completed, that the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system is operational, that staff are ready and trained to work in hoods, etc. DOE-ORP will need to hire operators to write procedures and complete all safety checks. Each of these many activities will need to be carefully coordinated with the others as start of operations approaches, and, therefore, DOE-ORP must advance startup planning well in advance of active treatment.*

Q. DOE-ORP provided the Board with a presentation on the One System Integrated Project Team. Is One System going to dictate the startup procedures and timeline related to the Analytical Laboratory and other WTP facilities?

*R. [DOE-ORP] These topics are not directly related. One System is a group composed of contractors from WRPS (manages tank farms) and Bechtel National, Inc. (BNI, manages WTP construction). DOE-ORP needs to make sure that these two contractors are working together*

*closely, and that they have consistent waste acceptance and delivery criteria. The One System group is an interface mechanism to facilitate this coordination. BNI is scheduled to start up the Analytical Laboratory and demonstrate operability of the facility for a period of time, then it will be transferred to an additional contractor under DOE-ORP.*

Q. When the new contractor takes over, will there be two laboratories operating on the Hanford Site?

*R. [DOE-ORP] The 222-S Laboratory operates in a support role for tank farm operations. The new Analytical Laboratory under construction at the WTP complex is designed to specifically support WTP operations. Once the WTP Analytical Laboratory comes online, there will be two labs on site.*

*C. Members of the Board would be interested in hearing additional details about the Hanford Site Laboratories at an upcoming TWC meeting.*

Q. Does DOE-ORP have a contractor for the LAW Facility yet?

*R. [DOE-ORP] BNI is the contractor between facility engineering and hot conditioning. It is BNI's responsibility to demonstrate to DOE-ORP that the facility will work as expected, then DOE-ORP will turn operations over to a new contractor.*

*C. The new contractor should be brought on as soon as possible to provide them with the opportunity to effectively transition.*

Q. DOE-ORP is planning to have the LAW Facility done in two to four years. However, LAWPS is still in the design phase, which means that DOE-ORP is likely four to six years away from beginning construction on LAWPS. How can the LAW Facility come online before LAWPS?

*R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP is currently working on the DFLAW program. Part of the pretreatment activities will include LAWPS, which falls under the tank farms operations contract. DOE-ORP is initiating the project activities to build this facility. Construction on LAWPS is coordinated with other LAW treatment facilities.*

Q. Does DOE-ORP anticipate any solution to the identified HLW pre-treatment technical issues in the near term?

*R. [DOE-ORP] Yes, but no further detail is available at this time. A briefing on HLW treatment is scheduled for the December 9, 2015 TWC meeting.*

Q. DOE-ORP's agency update noted that T-111 incorporates an exhauster to assist in evaporating water out of the tank. How does the exhauster work? What happens to the liquid that is removed from the tank?

*R. [DOE-ORP] The unit is a portable exhauster from C Farm. It is a 3,000 cubic feet per minute exhauster, and it is equipped with a High Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filter. The exhauster sucks air from the tank and evaporates moisture from the tank waste.*

Q. How is the HEPA filter on the T-111 exhauster disposed of?

*R. [DOE-ORP] The filters are designed to capture any particulate matter, and WRPS monitors differential pressure across the filter. If the filter becomes loaded, the HEPA filter is replaced and the used filter is packaged and treated as radioactive waste.*

Q. How does DOE-ORP deal with the organic vapors that may be present in exhaust from T-111? Are there charcoal filters in place to mitigate these? More detail on this is needed, as worker safety is very important.

*R. [Ecology] Whenever DOE-ORP is going to do something different with air emissions; they send a Notice of Construction to Ecology. Ecology, in conjunction with the Washington Department of Health, examines the potential contaminants that DOE-ORP identified through characterization efforts. Ecology issues an Approval Order based on the Notice of Construction that sets certain limits on emissions. Depending on what is happening with volatile organic chemicals, Ecology may request a more detailed analysis of exhaust.*

*R. [DOE-ORP] If the Board is interested in more detailed information on this topic, it can be brought forward at a future TWC meeting.*

Q. There is approximately 500,000 gallons of sludge in T-111. What is in this sludge?

*R. [DOE-ORP] There are approximately 450,000 gallons of waste from reprocessing spent fuel from T-Plant. However, waste has migrated from tank to tank over the years, and there are now other wastes in T-111 as well.*

Q. Are there volatiles in T-111 that the exhauster may mobilized? Has DOE-ORP characterized the waste in T-111?

*R. [DOE-ORP] DOE-ORP characterized the tank waste and is well aware of the radioactive and chemical waste within the tank. DOE-ORP's primary goal with T-111, a known leaker, is to stop liquid waste from migrating out of the tank.*

Q. Is there an approximate amount of money in FY 2016 that DOE-ORP is planning to spend on managing tank vapor issues?

*R. [DOE-ORP] That number is not known at this time.*

C. The site visits that RAP and TWC members were recently able to go on were very informative. Thanks to DOE-RL and DOE-ORP for coordinating them. RAP members had the opportunity to look at work that DOE-RL is planning to conduct at K Basin. It is being managed well and it is very encouraging to see.

Q. How is the VPU augering at 618-10 progressing?

*R. [DOE-RL] Augering is proceeding ahead of schedule. Eight of the VPUs have currently been augered; this is twice the number of VPUs that WCH expected to have done by this time.*

## **Overview: Tri-Party Agreement Central Plateau Milestone Series Change Package**

Shelley Cimon provided members with a brief overview of the Central Plateau milestone series change package, noting that the Board has a longtime interest in Central Plateau cleanup. Shelley referenced the recent HAB Advice #283, Central Plateau Inner Area Guidelines, and she highlighted major HAB recommendations from this advice.

### *Tri-Party Agreement Agency Presentation*

Jon Peschong provided committee members with a presentation (Attachment 5) and a TPA Fact Sheet (Attachment #6) highlighting proposed changes to Hanford Central Plateau cleanup work and schedules. Key ideas presented included:

- Milestone updates are necessary because of gaps between compliance budget requests (\$1.6-1.8 billion needed each year) and actual appropriations received by DOE (\$1 billion received each year) in recent years. In addition, the planned technical approaches associated with many milestones did not make sense anymore. These two factors led TPA agencies to the conclusion that a major renegotiation of Central Plateau milestones was necessary.
- The TPA agencies agreed to pursue changes to the Central Plateau milestone series due to funding shortfalls, the prioritization of cleanup along the Columbia River at the expense of Central Plateau work, and resource considerations.
- A total of 64 milestones were considered for change.
- The milestone series to be updated include:
  - **M-015:** Complete investigative process of waste sites and cleanup decisions within the Central Plateau. This milestone series deals with Remedial Investigations, Feasibility Studies, and Records of Decisions (ROD).
  - **M-016:** Implement the cleanup decisions, based on the investigations required by M-015. This milestone series deals with Remedial Design/Remedial Action Work Plans and Sampling and Analysis Plans.
  - **M-037:** Complete treatment, storage, and disposal closure requirements. This milestone series deals with the cleanup of treatment, storage, and disposal (TSD) units as required by DOE's hazardous waste permit for the Hanford Site.
  - **M-085:** Complete canyon facilities response actions, including characterization. This milestone series deals with Removal Action Work Plans, Canyon RI/FS Work Plans, and Canyon RODs.
  - **M-094:** Complete 300 Area cleanup. This milestone series deals with cleaning up all 300 Area surplus facilities with the exception of the 324 Building, 300-296, and 618-11.

- Slide #10 demonstrates the affected work that falls under each milestone, as well as the old deadlines and the proposed scheduled updates.
- Of the 64 milestones considered for update, the TPA proposed change package includes nine milestone extensions and six milestone modifications. The proposed change package also includes 19 new milestones.

Jon encouraged Board members to attend one of four upcoming regional public meetings. He noted that the public comment period would be open until December 11, 2015.

*Board questions and response*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

Q. On slide #12, do the numbers denote major or interim milestones?

*R. [DOE-RL] The chart shows a mixture of major and interim milestones.*

*R. [EPA] There is one major milestone for each of the five milestone series. All other noted milestones would be interim.*

Q. The Board heard public comment coming from a policy standpoint, noting that the regional public meetings were not occurring at a time of year that was conducive to reaching members of the public. How should the Board weigh in on these change packages before the close of the public comment period?

*R. [EPA] The TPA agencies anticipate that there will be an extension on the comment period.*

*C. The Board may provide advice on the milestone series change packages. Central Plateau issue managers and the RAP committee will gather feedback in the coming weeks and determine potential Board action and next steps.*

Q. If the TPA agencies anticipate that the comment period will extend into 2016, why were regional public meetings scheduled on short notice for mid-November 2015? The agencies should hold additional regional public meetings in order to reach more audiences and provide them with adequate time to prepare.

*R. [EPA] The TPA agencies worked very hard to get information out to the public as soon as possible. The agencies are always open to holding additional public meetings; however, the initial set of public meetings has not yet occurred. Agency representatives are not stating that additional public meetings are not possible, but it is important to hold the first set and listen to public concerns.*

*R. [EPA] The reason that regional public meetings for the Central Plateau milestone series change package are being held in November 2015 is because the TPA agencies anticipate that the 100-D/H Proposed Plan will be out for public comment in early 2016.*

Q. Work on PFP will wrap up in 2016. This will free up approximately \$120 million in DOE-RL cleanup funds. However, instead of the funding from PFP moving to support the soil sites and TSD sites on the Central Plateau, DOE-RL is citing a lack of needed funding as a way to push back cleanup milestones. Where is the money from PFP closure going?

*R. [DOE-RL] The PFP funds will primarily be distributed to two efforts: characterization on the Central Plateau and finishing the 324 Building and 618-11 cleanup. In the 2020 timeframe, funds begins to support remote handling capabilities for TRU waste. More specific information on the migration of PFP funds is available if there is Board interest.*

C. If they are not already available, there should be public documents that cover each milestone change that describe why each milestone is being changed (e.g. budget shortfalls, labor, updated technology). In addition, TPA agencies should create a public document that covers the work package that notes the rationale that went into the planning for these changes. This document should include budgets, dates and sub-dates. This would establish a baseline for the milestone changes.

C. It is dangerous to set optimistic dates that presuppose cleanup remedies. This often looks good on paper, but it is the wrong way to approach Hanford Cleanup.

C. Thinking about the milestone series change packages through the lens of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit—how does the M-015 series integrate with the M-037 series? Hanford pipelines, for example, fall under M-015 and they relate to the closure of the RCRA TSDs. How can the same date be attributed to both milestones on Slide #10?

C. If the RCRA permit is not released within the next three years, there will not be enough time to meet the M-037 milestone series. At that point, the RCRA permit will be nearly 20 years overdue.

C. In the M-15-93B, which talks about SW-2 Burial Ground, which contains TRU waste, there is a noted deadline of 2023. TRU waste requires disposal at the WIPP site, and WIPP is scheduled to operate and accept waste until 2030. Will there be enough time to get this TRU waste into the queue for WIPP disposal before WIPP closes?

*R. [DOE-RL] U.S. Department of Energy—Office of Environmental Management (DOE-EM) set a WIPP restart date and missed it, and the new restart date is not yet known. DOE-EM is struggling to figure out how to best manage WIPP's intended 2030 closure date. This type of comment would be very useful to submit during the open public comment period.*

*C. The 2030 date for WIPP closure is not a concern. The United States will continue to produce TRU waste beyond 2030 (the Hanford Site Canyon buildings alone will generate TRU waste beyond 2030), and the nation will need a disposition pathway. If WIPP does close in 2030 as currently scheduled, then TRU waste from Hanford will need to move to another designated repository.*

Q. From an agency perspective, do the milestone changes look at the funding schedule? Are the milestone schedule updates simply making milestones line up with funding expectations?

*R. [EPA] Making milestones more practical to budget realities is a large part of the change package. TPA agencies constructed the milestone change package on an expectation of \$1.2 billion for DOE-RL each year.*

*R. [Ecology] Ecology does not like to use available funding in negotiations such as these. DOE-RL and DOE-ORP requested their 2017 budget already. Ecology understands that the budget is set until 2017 at this point. However, Ecology does not want budget shortfalls to be a constraint on cleanup efforts. Ecology believes that a reasonable scope of work is more than \$1 billion per year.*

Q. What would be most helpful to DOE and regulators during this comment period? Should members of the public accept a budget-driven cleanup schedule, or should they refuse that premise to encourage the U.S. Congress to appropriate the needed amount of money to meet milestones?

*R.[DOE-RL] TPA agencies worked very hard to lay out the change package in such a way that the work is technically sensible. DOE-RL does not want peaks and valleys in its yearly budget allocations, as this is detrimental to cleanup resources and work efficiency.*

C. If the Board decides to weigh in on the Central Plateau milestone series change package, issue managers could explore resequencing milestones to better fit established HAB values.

Q. What units are being covered under these milestone series? The public needs to understand the relationship between the milestone series and waste stored at the Central Waste Complex (CWC). Will waste be removed from the CWC or added to the CWC because of these updates? Is there a schedule in the TPA that directs the removal of waste from CWC?

*R. [Ecology] The date for closing some units at the CWC is driven by the milestone dates in the M-091 package. There are more than 8,000 containers in storage at the CWC, and there are another 12,000 containers that are still left to be retrieved (covered by M-091, above ground storage units). Waste needs to be removed from units before they can be closed. Waste retrieved from the M-037 milestones will likely not be stored above ground. It will probably not be TRU waste; therefore, it will likely go to ERDF. If waste meets acceptance criteria for ERDF, it will move directly there for disposal.*

*R. [EPA] PW-1, 3, and 6 Waste Sites contain Plutonium. EPA would prefer to direct ship waste from these sites to WIPP once it re-opens; therefore, WIPP will really set the schedule for cleanup of these waste sites. That is a very large waste stream that could impact waste storage at the Hanford Site if direct shipment to WIPP is not possible.*

## **Board and Committee Reports**

### *National Liaison*

Shelley Cimon noted that a handout was available in the back of the meeting room that highlighted several notable current event articles relating to the DOE-EM complex work and nuclear cleanup. Shelley encouraged Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) members to review an item detailing low-dose radiation exposure and cancer risk, and she encouraged Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) members to review an article about the Nevada Test Site's public involvement campaign, geared towards teaching about the challenges associated with nuclear cleanup. Finally, Shelley encouraged all Board members to review a recent Wall Street Journal article detailing budget shortfalls across the DOE-EM sites.

### *Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee*

Richard Bloom, Grant and Franklin Counties (Local Government) and HSEP vice chair, noted that the HSEP focuses on topics of human and environmental health, including worker protection and environmental exposure. He encouraged interested HAB members to attend HSEP's upcoming committee meeting on December 10, 2015.

### *Budgets and Contracts Committee*

Jerry Peltier, City of West Richland (Local Government) and Budgets and Contract Committee (BCC) chair, said that the BCC would likely begin meeting again in early 2016 as DOE begins releasing budget information and as DOE-RL updates Central Plateau milestone series, noting that any milestone schedule changes will necessitate updates to the Hanford Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report. Jerry also noted that BCC might potentially play a role in coordinating with the Office of Hanford Acquisitions referenced in DOE-RL's Agency Update.

### *Public Involvement and Communications Committee*

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge (Regional Environmental/Citizen) and PIC chair, reminded Board members that the PIC is open to all Board members. Liz provided committee members with a brief outline of recent PIC conversations, noting that members brainstormed potential updates to the TPA Quarterly Planning meeting approach, received a briefing from John Price, Ecology, on the framework of the TPA and milestones, discussed the WTP communication approach with the TWC, and discussed potential Hanford public involvement principles moving forward.

Liz noted that PIC is planning to hold a committee call in December 2015 and a committee meeting in February 2016. The committee plans to discuss ongoing topics as well as the potential for providing the Board with a TPA/milestone/Consent Decree tutorial at an upcoming Board meeting. Liz encouraged members interested in PIC topics to contact her.

### *Tank Waste Committee*

Bob Suyama, Benton County (Local Government) and TWC chair, noted that the TWC has recently been working with DOE-ORP on topics related to DFLAW, including LAWPS and LAW cesium management strategies, as well as tank waste management. In addition, TWC has also been working with PIC members to define and create an initial draft of the WTP communications approach, and members have recently engaged in a discussion regarding the definition of safety culture. Bob noted that the TWC will hold a meeting on December 9, 2015, and topics will include presentations from DOE-ORP on the pumping plan for DST AY-102 and the planned treatment of HLW.

Bob thanked DOE-ORP for organizing a site visit for TWC members in October 2015, noting that the tour provided excellent visual detail to the complex topics that the committee discusses. Bob extended a special thanks to Steve Pfaff, DOE-ORP, for the excellent explanations that he provided throughout the site visit.

### *Executive Issues Committee*

Steve Hudson noted that the Executive Issues Committee (EIC) is comprised of committee leadership and the national liaison. The EIC meets on a regular basis to address a range of overarching Board concerns and serves as a venue for assessing HAB interests, directing HAB resources, and finalizing committee meeting schedules. The committee also works to evaluate Board effectiveness, draft calendars and work plans, and discusses how to involve the public in HAB meetings and events. Steve noted that recent EIC efforts involved updating the HAB Process Manual, discussing the WTP communications approach, debriefing recent committee meetings and tours, and discussing the new DOE Office of Acquisitions. Steve encouraged Board members to approach EIC members with any questions or concerns that they have.

### *Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board*

Steve recognized that there will be an upcoming U.S. Department of Energy—Office of Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chairs' meeting in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, on April 21 and 22, 2016. Steve stated that chairs are always interested to hear about topics of concerns at other sites within the DOE-EM complex, and he noted that a portion of the April chairs' meeting would be allotted for identifying and raising new items and issues. Steve encouraged HAB members to submit questions, comments, and concerns to either himself or Susan Leckband in advance of the April meeting. Steve noted that committees could potentially discuss this opportunity to elevate Hanford Site topics of concern at upcoming committee meetings and the Board could clarify any identified opportunities at the February 2016 Board meeting.

### *River and Plateau Committee*

Gary Garnant, Grant & Franklin Counties (Local Government) and RAP vice chair, noted that RAP has been involved with framing the Board's CRESF Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Interim Report presentation, and he noted that RAP members would continue to track the Interim Report in the coming months as the final interim report is finalized and released. Gary also noted that RAP committee members

discussed the TPA agency response to HAB Advice #283, Central Plateau Inner Area Guidelines, in September 2015 and determined that the Board did not need to take any immediate follow-up action. Gary stated that RAP would meet on December 8, 2015.

Gary thanked DOE-RL for organizing a site visit for RAP members in October 2015, and he noted that it was a wonderful opportunity for committee members to see ongoing work in the 300 Area, at the 618-10 mock-up, and at the 200 West uranium pump and treat facility.

### *Board discussion*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

The following key points were noted during the Board discussion following committee reports:

- Jerry Peltier noted that he was interested in beginning conversations with DOE's new Office of Hanford Acquisitions as soon as possible, and he noted that BCC and HAB involvement prior to contracts going out for bid would be ideal. Jerry recognized that many Hanford Site contracts would expire in 2018, and constructing contractual framework would likely begin within FY 2016.
- Susan mentioned that she and Steve had the opportunity to meet with representatives from the Office of Hanford Acquisitions, and she stated that they were interested in hearing Board input regarding important contract attributes. Susan encouraged the BCC to request a meeting with the Office of Acquisitions.
- Mike Korenko, Grant & Franklin Counties, said several years ago, the Hanford Medical Support contract was constructed and sent out for bid very quickly. He stated that HSEP was very interested in providing input, but the schedule did not provide the Board with time to draft advice for DOE as the agency created contract parameters. Mike stated that, HSEP developed draft advice during a committee meeting while DOE contract representatives listened to the advice discussion. Mike said that he then submitted comments as a private citizen. Mike noted that this strategy was a way to ensure that legal requirements were not violated, while still providing public input into the contract set-up process.
- Dirk Dunning, Oregon Department of Energy, requested clarification on the structure of the Hanford Office of Acquisitions. Dirk noted that the Hanford DOE presence was initially structured as DOE-RL and the U.S. Department of Energy—Office of Science (the governing office of the Pacific Northwest National Lab). Dirk highlighted concern that the Board only provided advice to DOE-RL (and the now separate DOE-ORP), and he was curious how the Office of Hanford Acquisitions fit into the existing structure.
- Jon Peschong remarked that the Office of Hanford Acquisitions was created approximately four months ago, and he said that there are currently approximately eight DOE employees that were reassigned to begin work within the Office. Jon noted that these employees were involved in the

very early stages of planning for the scope and future work of the Office. Jon clarified that the Office of Hanford Acquisitions will report to the DOE-RL Manger, and DOE-ORP's participation in the Office of Hanford Acquisitions' work would be at the discretion of the DOE-ORP Manager, and he underscored that it will not be independent of existing DOE Hanford Offices.

### **Public Comment**

Gerald Pollet, Heart of America Northwest, provided public comment noting concerns with the scheduling and public notification process for upcoming public meetings related to the Central Plateau TPA milestone series change package. Gerry noted that many of the TPA agency proposed changes are substantial, and residents in Seattle, Washington, Portland, Oregon, and Hood River, Oregon only had between 20-25 days' notice prior to the public meetings. Gerry was concerned that this was less time than the TPA Hanford Public Involvement Plan stipulates, and he did not believe that citizen groups such as his own would have the opportunity to prepare information for their members. Gerry requested that the TPA agencies extend the comment period for the TPA milestone series change package and that they hold additional regional public meetings that included additional notification time.

### **Board Business**

#### *Letter on Worker Safety and Communication Restrictions*

Steve commented that the draft letter on Worker Safety and Communication Restrictions had gone through multiple drafts, and he noted that it has a very clear message and tone. Steve said that the letter served as an observation from the Board that worker safety is of paramount importance and that communication restrictions are a concern of many Board members. Steve noted that the letter was consistent with established HAB values.

Cathy reminded HAB members that each Board seat provides a yes or no vote on the tenor of the letters as written. She stated that the letter would move forward if a majority of Board members approved its message.

#### *Board Discussion*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

C. The ideas that are presented within the letter are very important. As written, this letter serves as a good introduction of HAB values regarding worker safety.

Q. There are parts of this letter that read very much like advice. Why was this product conceptualized as a letter instead of Board advice?

*R. The Board is not expecting a response to this statement. EIC members conceptualized this letter as more of a Board tenant as opposed to advice that the Board expects agency response to. It is important that the Board, the TPA agencies, our constituents, and the public understand that the Board will continue to track issues of public safety.*

*R. The Board often produces advice, but this letter is an exceptional example of a different type of Board product. Alternative Board deliverables are often very useful to the public.*

Board members from Hanford Challenge recused themselves from voting on the draft letter. The Board approved the letter, and Steve noted that it would be sent to Kevin Smith, DOE-ORP Manager.

#### *Hanford Advisory Board Fiscal Year 2016 Work Plan*

Steve provided an overview of the HAB FY 2016 Work Plan, noting that no updates were made to the document since Board members last saw it at the September 2015 HAB meeting where it was provisionally adopted. Steve reminded Board members that the HAB Work Plan serves to guide Board work and products throughout the coming FY.

Steve reiterated the HAB process for creating the Work Plan. He stated that the initial work plan draft is a collaborative effort between HAB Leadership and TPA agency liaisons at the HAB Leadership Workshop in May. Steve stated that individual HAB committees then have the opportunity to review the draft work plan and propose additions and changes to HAB leadership and agency liaisons. A nearly complete HAB Work Plan is compiled by the EIC and the TPA agency liaisons in August for final review and presentation to the full Board in September. Steve recognized that the process of creating the 2016 Work Plan worked well, but he identified the placement of the tank vapor topic in the holding bin as an item of Board concern at the September 2015 HAB meeting that complicated the process of adopting the Work Plan.

Steve noted that the tank vapor topic, as well as any other holding bin items, might be elevated to the work plan through collaborative processes if there is Board and TPA agency interest. Steve stated that the Board needed to adopt the FY 2016 Work Plan to facilitate and guide Board efforts in the coming months, and he was hopeful that members would adopt the work plan.

#### *Board Discussion*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

Q. Does Work Plan Topic #12, Cesium Management, include cesium currently stored at the WESF? If not, could that be added?

*R. Any additions, changes, or clarifications to the adopted work plan should be taken to committee leadership. Committees can elevate topics in the holding bin or clarify topics with committee consensus and TPA agency support.*

C. There is concern that DOE will not be flexible enough on some important topics, and the agency may not provide agency staff or information to support the Board.

*R. Any topics that are included on the HAB Work Plan are available for discussion. With that being noted, HAB committees need to be mindful of scheduling difficulties that TPA agencies often encounter, and HAB members should have realistic expectations about the level of support that agencies can provide.*

C. It is troubling that neither WESF (the facility has degrading concrete storage pools as well as degrading HEPA filters) nor SST T-111 (a known leaker) are included as topics on the current work plan.

*R. Committees may propose to add these topics onto the Work Plan following its adoption.*

*R. [DOE-RL] DOE-RL is planning to deliver an Analysis of Alternatives on WESF in 2017. Therefore, the WESF topic may be more appropriate on the HAB's FY 2017 Work Plan*

C. The Work Plan is a great document. It is excellent that committee leadership has the ability to revisit the topics as issues arise, and it is important that a complex document such as this be living and malleable.

Bob Suyama noted that he has drafted a process flow chart highlighting the procedures for adding topics, updating topics, and elevating holding bin items to the HAB Work Plan. Bob stated that the Board would look into this process at the February 2016 Board meeting.

Board members adopted the HAB FY 2016 Work Plan.

#### *Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board Chairs' Recommendation*

Steve introduced the EM SSAB Chairs' Recommendation that DOE consider Supplemental Environmental Projects in lieu of penalty fines issued by regulators. Steve provided additional background on the letter, noting that its genesis relates to the State of New Mexico's recent fines against WIPP. Steve noted that the letter recommends that fines levied against DOE-EM sites for missed milestones, etc. could be put towards infrastructure or public health projects that directly benefit the communities impacted by cleanup. Steve noted that he would provide the EM SSAB chairs with grammar and wording suggestions, but he requested that HAB members highlight any questions or concerns with the overall subject matter, tenor, or goal of the letter. Steve recognized that he would approve of the letter at the EM SSAB meeting if a majority of Board members approved of the letter's content and sentiment.

#### *Board Discussion*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

Q. Are regulator fines levied against the DOE office or against the contractor performing the work?

*R. [DOE-RL] In an example from DOE-RL, all sludge was supposed to be moved away from the River Corridor by 2016. EPA fined DOE-RL approximately \$100,000, and the fine came out of*

*cleanup funds. In some cases, this money would be removed from DOE; in other cases, it could come out of the contractor's budget. Where the funds come from is assessed on a case-by-case basis. If a contractor performed illegally, any levied fines would come out of the contractor fee.*

Q. Are fines always levied by EPA, or can states levy fines as well?

*R. [EPA] Either regulating agency may assess the fine.*

Q. Can regulators apply fines back to cleanup?

*R. No. Fines may not be reapplied to rectify the situation that led to the fine being issued.*

C. This letter could potentially have very positive effects at the Hanford Site. As the HAB is different from many other EM SSABs, the Board has the ability to send this letter to Ecology and EPA as well as local DOE offices. The Board can use this letter to encourage regulators to use fines for local improvements.

Q. What infrastructure or public health projects would be chosen? Who would get to make that decision?

*R. [EPA] That could be decided later on, once a fine has been issued. All TPA agencies prefer that funding go to cleanup, and regulators avoid fines whenever possible.*

*R. [Ecology] EPA cannot maintain a list of projects that DOE could or should do, as that would look like EPA directing DOE's work. A regulatory agency may not direct work.*

The Board approved the letter. Steve noted that he would sign the letter at the April EM SSAB meeting, and he thanked Board members for lending their support. Steve recognized that other EM SSAB chairs would be very pleased with the HAB's endorsement.

#### *Update on Hanford Advisory Board Process Manual*

Steve noted that a group of issue managers and TPA agency representatives recently reviewed the HAB's Process Manual and proposed changes and updates where needed. Steve noted that the Process Manual review was very thorough. Steve said that the HAB Process Manual is not a rulebook, but rather a set of guidelines that reflect how the Board works.

#### *Board Discussion*

*Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.*

Q. On pages 3-4, why are safety and risk not noted as major policy issues?

*R. Issue managers envisioned safety and risk as a component of all other identified policy areas.*

*R. It would be a good idea to add these items in as distinct policy issues, especially highlighting worker safety since that is a core component of most of the Board's work.*

C. The updated HAB Process Manual clearly outlines how HAB procedures may be updated. It is important to view this as a living document.

C. The HAB Process Manual incorporates the contact information for each of the TPA agency public involvement leads. It is important that HAB members commit to coordinating with these individuals and not through other channels. This helps to ensure transparency and efficiency in the Board's requests for information.

*R. [EPA] Please follow HAB procedures and only reach out to those individuals who are identified. It is difficult for TPA agencies to respond to HAB needs and requests whenever Board members do not follow established practices. Move requests, questions, or concerns through committee leadership or through the facilitation team.*

C. The HAB white paper detailing Board values should be incorporated into the Process Manual as an appendix.

Cathy thanked Board members for the discussion and the perspectives. She encouraged HAB members to review the document, and she noted that the facilitation team would track noted changes and upload the document to the HAB's SharePoint Site.

#### *Hanford Advisory Board SharePoint Tutorial*

Cathy noted that the facilitation team sent a technology survey to HAB members in summer 2015 as a way to gauge Board technology use and potential technology opportunities. Thirty-three Board members took the survey. Results demonstrated that Board members used the HAB's SharePoint site, but it also highlighted login concerns and interest in enhancing several SharePoint features (such as exploring opportunities for collaborative editing and enhancing the library of available documents).

Cathy noted that the results of the technology use survey, coupled with other considerations such as increased security, decreased cost, streamlined login and user interface, and enhanced search capacity led the facilitation team to propose updating the HAB SharePoint site from the 2010 version of the Microsoft SharePoint platform to the 2013 version.

Cathy encouraged Board members to sign up for a Microsoft Live account before the end of the meeting. She recognized that, while collaborative editing features are available in the 2013 version of SharePoint, it would likely be at least six months before the Board would explore any collaborative advice-writing trials. Cathy reminded Board members that they would be responsible for creating and maintaining their login information for the 2013 SharePoint Site and that the facilitation team would not keep records of Board member usernames and passwords.

Cathy noted that a step-by-step guide for creating an account was included in the November 2015 Board packet, and these instructions would also be linked to in the weekly Events-at-a-Glance email. She encouraged Board members to reach out to the facilitation team if they had any questions or if they identified any concerns.

*Preliminary February Board meeting topics*

Cathy reviewed the following tentative meeting topics for the February 2016 Board meeting:

- Discussion on potential advice regarding the Central Plateau milestone series change package
- Discussion on the WTP communications approach white paper
- TPA briefing from John Price, including information on milestones and the Consent Decree
- Safety culture sounding board
- Agency updates
- Committee reports
- Discussion on HAB Work Plan Process

*Closing Remarks*

Steve thanked Board members for their attendance, thoughts, and decisions. The meeting was adjourned.

## **Attachments**

**Attachment 1:** The Hanford Site-Wide Risk Review Project Interim Report Overview (CRESP presentation)

**Attachment 2:** [PFP Demolition Animation](#) (CH2M Hill video)

**Attachment 3:** Hanford Advisory Board Agency Update for the Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL presentation)

**Attachment 4:** Hanford Advisory Board Agency Update for the Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP presentation)

**Attachment 5:** Proposed changes to Hanford Central Plateau Cleanup Work and Schedule (joint DOE-RL, EPA, and Ecology presentation)

**Attachment 6:** Proposed Changes to Hanford Central Plateau Cleanup Work and Schedule (fact sheet)

**Attachment 7:** Hanford Advisory Board draft letter on Worker Safety and Communications Restrictions

**Attachment 8:** Environmental Management Site-Specific Advisory Board Draft Chairs' Recommendation letter

**Attachment 9:** Hanford Advisory Board Fiscal Year 2016 Work Plan

**Attachment 10:** Hanford Advisory Board Process Manual (revised)

**Attendees:**

**HAB MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**

Gabe Bohnee, Member	Earl Fordham, Member	Melanie Myers-Magnuson, Member
Antone Brooks, Member	Tom Galioto, Member	Jerry Peltier, Member
Don Bouchey, Member	Gary Garnant, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member
Janice Catrell, Member	John Howieson, Member	Bob Suyama, Member
Shelley Cimon, Member	Steve Hudson, Member	Gene Van Liew, Member
Alissa Cordner, Member	Pam Larsen, Member	Dawn Wellman, Member
Sam Dechter, Member	Susan Leckband, Member	
Robert Davis, Member	Liz Mattson, Member	
David Bernhard, Alternate	Jeff Hunter, Alternate	Emmett Moore, Alternate
Richard Bloom, Alternate	Alex Klementiev, Alternate	Edward Pacheco, Alternate
Amoret Bunn, Alternate	Mike Korenko, Alternate	Vince Panesko, Alternate
Gary Busselman, Alternate	Bob Legard, Alternate	Emily Peterson, Alternate
Shannon Cram, Alternate	Larry Lockrem, Alternate	Richard Smith, Alternate
Dirk Dunning, Alternate	Kristen McNall, Alternate	Jean Vanni, Alternate
Dale Engstrom, Alternate (phone)	Rudy Mendoza, Alternate	Steve White, Alternate

**AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF**

Stacy Charboneau, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	David Kosson, CRESP
Doug Hoffman, DOE-RL	Emy Laija, EPA	Jennifer Salisbury, CRESP
Kristen Holmes, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrman, Ecology	Tammie Gilley, EnviroIssues
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Cathy McCague, EnviroIssues
Jon Peschong, DOE-RL	John Price, Ecology	Brett Watson, EnviroIssues
Alex Teimouri, DOE-RL	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology (phone)	Jennifer Colborn MSA
Ben Vannah, DOE-RL	Tom Rogers, WDOH	Jennifer Copeland, MSA
JD Dowell, DOE-ORP		Sharon Braswell, North Wind/DOE-ORP
Joanne Grindstaff, DOE-ORP		Peter Bengtson, WCH
Rob Hastings, DOE-ORP		
Yvonne Levardi, DOE-ORP		

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Rachel Baren, HoANW	Abigail Cermak, Columbia Riverkeeper	Hannah Vogel, KEPR-TV
Katherine Bittinger	Sarah Freeman, Hanford Challenge	Steve Weil
Lisa Bliss	Gerald Pollet, HoANW	
Annette Cary, Tri-City Herald	Kelsey Shank, SN3	