HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION COMMITTEE
Summary of Meeting
13 April 1995 10-3 PM
Department of Ecology, Kennewick, WA

Chairperson. Ralph Patt called the meeting to order, and initiated introductions. Those present were: Committee members, Denny Condotta, Greg deBruler, and Ralph Patt; ex-officio member John Erickson, Department of Health; contractor representative, Greg Eidam, Bill Stillwell, Bechtel; Agency representatives Randy Brich, Amoret Bunn, Gene Higgens, Steve Hwang, Bob Stewart, Mike Thompson, Nancy Werdel, DOE; Jack Donnelly, Dib Goswami, Dave Holland, Douglas Palenshus, Wayne Soper, Jerry Yokel, Ecology; Dennis Faulk, EPA; Unofficial members Shelly Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board, Gordon Rogers, Tri-Cities Technical Council; Guests, Fred Zwiesler, Washington Department of Health; William Sanderson, WHC; and facilitator Naseem Rakha, Confluence Northwest

TOPIC: RISK DATA SHEETS AT HANFORD
Steve Hwang, Department of Energy, Planning and Integration Office, and Bill Stillwell, PNL, gave a presentation on the Risk Data Sheets (RDSs) being prepared for a June report to Congress. The sheets were developed by Jim Kautzky, DOE, developed the RDSs to evaluate current and future risk at Hanford. 102 RDSs have been completed for the Hanford site. Steve went through several charts and explained the process the DOE risk team underwent to develop the RDSs (appendix A). Bill Stillwell indicated interest in receiving input from the ER Committee regarding their interpretation of the RDSs mechanism.

Mr. Stillwell noted that perhaps on of the difficult aspects of the RDSs as well as other risk assessment processes is cross site consistency. Stillwell indicated that there is no sure mechanism to compare risk cross sites. He believed that a preferred approach would be for each site to develop their own assumptions and get consistency at the site level.

Mr. Hwang noted that the risk process was similar to EPA guidance and Risk Principles.

Stillwell indicated that the "jury was still out" on how the risk process will be affected by budget cuts.

Mr. Stillwell is a member of the Risk Team organized by the Office of Integrated Risk Management, DOE Headquarters. The team is largely composed of Program Managers. The team is working towards a method for prioritizing risk assessment. The Risk Team will meet April 25-26 to discuss where to go from here.

The ER Committee commented that the RDSs process is suspect. Ralph Patt specifically was interested in knowing: how the Board would know they are getting an objective evaluation; who will make decisions; how biases will be overcome?

Dennis Faulk noted that regulators have not been apart of the RDS process. Faulk and Greg deBruler also stressed that they believe that mush of the risk assessment and prioritization has already accomplished at Hanford through the mechanism of the Tri-Party Agreement. Additionally, Risk Assessments have already been completed for the 100 Area Operable Units, using the National Environmental Policy Act in the process. Mr. Faulk thought that the major risks at Hanford were already well understood, and questioned the need for yet another risk assessment procedure.

DEC 1995
RECEIVED
EDMC

Bill Stillwell concurred that the high risks at Hanford were not the issues, and that they were identified and prioritized. Rather, it is those risks that fall in the "cutline" area. Stillwell maintains that there is currently not the quality of data necessary to evaluate and prioritized those risks that fall in this uncertain area.

Faulk agreed, but stated that those decisions should be done at the TPA level.

Shelly Cimone noted that there doesn't seem to be the acknowledgment within the DOE that a template for Risk Assessment may not exist.

Greg deBruler felt that the process was once again an example of a "fish bowl". In that those outside the bowl can have no significant impact on what happens or is decided within the bowl. It is specifically because the TPA was not created in this context that makes it an effective tool and mechanism for the examination of priorities and risk.

Mr. Stillwell said he understood that the TPA is indeed a risk based document, and that it did have very important stakeholder buy-in, the question, he felt, was how does DOE-RL demonstrate this to Congress? He went on to comment that at least 17% of complex wide RDSs from ADSs were in the low category for risk, but high in the compliance variable. Stillwell felt this type of assessment is "scary stuff" because it challenges the use of compliance as a tool for prioritization.

Greg deBruler noted that the data could be looked at that 83% of the RDSs were in a high risk category. He was also interested in knowing what of that 17% referred specifically to Hanford.

Gene Higgins asked that the ER Committee be skeptical of such numbers as the 17% figure. When processes like this are first started, he noted, the numbers are loose.

Stillwell asked that the group not get lost in the figure, but instead think about how DOE-RL can make a case for how the TPA is a sound document.

Gordon Rogers felt that the Committee needed to be more realistic about the budget demands faced by Congress.

Gene Higgins suggested that the ER Committee review Grumbly's Risk Initiative Report due to come out April 17. (NOTE: latest word is that it will not be released until 4/28) This report will be sent to the ER Committee for review and comment. Jim Kautzky Gene Higgins and Steve Hwang will come to the Committee's May 5 meeting to discuss the report.

The Committee also asked that the list of global assumptions be sent to each committee member. Mr. Higgins noted that it would be valuable to get ER comments on these assumptions. The assumptions will also include ER Hanford Site assumptions used for each program.

Gene Higgins asked that Ralph Patt let him know how things are progressing with the Boards Risk Presentation set for June 1.

Gene suggested that his team draft up a time line to out line commitments to the ER Committee.

DECISIONS:
The Planning and Integration Division will fax a timeline to Naseem Rakha for her to distribute to the ER Committee for a Tuesday, April 18 conference call. The Planning and Integration Division will also send copies of the global and site assumptions used for the RDSs and the

RDS matrix. The Division will also send a copy of Grumbly's Risk Invite once released by headquarters. The ER Committee will meet with members of DOE's Planning and Integration Team on Friday May 5.

TOPIC: CERE
Mr. Hwang updated the Committee on the status of the CERE report. His understanding was that they would accept comments on CERE, but because many of the original contractors on CERE are no longer with the project, the report would not be updated. It was commented that the CERE report would not likely have a significant impact on EM-6.

Because the CERE process appears to be off track, and because other risk initiatives seem to be taking priority, Ralph Patt questioned the purpose of the ER Committee developing a thorough review of the process. Committee members felt, however, inaccuracies within the report should not go unchallenged.

Denny Condotta volunteered to draft a letter to Carol Henry providing general comments about the CERE report and concerns that the Board has with the process and product.

Bill Stillwell notified the Committee that a new risk consortium is being launched (the CRISP Consortium) the purpose of this consortium will be to do a cross site risk assessment. Gill Omen from the University of Washington will be a part of this consortium. Tim Takaro may know more about this process.

DECISIONS:
Denny Condotta will draft a letter for Carol Henry and congress to be reviewed by the ER Committee and the Board. The ER Committee will check with Tim Takaro and Gill Omen regarding the CRISP Risk Assessment.

TOPIC: CHROMIUM SAMPLING
Mike Thompson, DOE-RL, gave a presentation about the Chromium sampling results near 100-H in the Columbia River. A report, Preliminary determination of chromium concentration within Pore Water and Embryonic Chinook Salmon at Hanford Reach Spawning Area in Proximity to 100-HR-3 Operable Unit is the document that describes the scope of work. The results will be published in June, 1995.

Seventeen transects were sampled. Three samples (of approximately 30) were higher than Ambient Water Quality Criteria (AWQC = 11ppb chromium +6). Two samples, from the first transect, were 100 and 130 ppb; however, these samples were located in habitat unsuitable for salmon redds. One sample (70 ppb) was located in suitable spawning habitat. The seventeen transects are located where the 100-H Cr plume is projected to upwell into the Columbia River.

DOE plans to resume sampling at known areas of chromium upwelling this summer/fall. Inland Cr levels at 100-D are known to be higher than Cr levels at 100-H. Test plans will be developed with input from the Tribes, stakeholders and regulators.

DOE also plans to perform further evaluation of the 100-D treatability test to assess impact to reducing Cr levels in the aquifer. DOE is also evaluating the benefits of testing alternative treatment technologies.

The response to Chromium is highly variable by species, water temperature, pH, and age of species.

DECISION:

Mike Thompson will get a copy of the test plan to ER Committee members. And will keep the ER Committee updated on future studies and how study results effect pump and treat programs.

TOPIC: COLUMBIA RIVER IMPACT STUDY
Mike Thompson informed the Committee that the DOE is currently short on nominations for the study's technical panel. A letter went to tribes to select peer reviewer, but no action has been taken as of yet.

John Erickson informed Mr. Thompson that the Washington State Department of Health would submit several nominations by April 14.

Mike Thompson invited the ER Committee to attend a June 14 workshop to review the scope of work for the Study. Mike passed out a tentative agenda and asked for comment. There will be an evening as well as a daytime session. In response to J.R. Wilkenson's (Umatilla Tribe) question regarding access to classified documents, Mr. Thompson asked that the Tribe prioritize their needs. Mr. Thompson said the DOE would try to release those identified documents. Mr. Thompson also indicated that the DOE is interested and willing to meet with any stakeholder groups interested in commenting on the study.

DECISION:
None taken.

TOPIC: 100 AREA
Nancy Werdel told the Committee that DOE-RL and Regulators were about a week away from finalizing proposed plans. They hope to be at public comment period by mid May.

Dennis Faulk indicated he would speak about the SAFER Concept - Streamlined Environmental investigation 100 Area demonstration project, at the May Board meeting.

The DOE and Regulators asked the Committee is they felt a public comment period was necessary. Because the plans are IRM (intermediate remedial actions) rather than final proposed plans, the regulators are not required by law to hold public comment periods.

Mr. Patt asked Shelly Cimone, member of the Public Involvement Committee to speak with Betty Tabott, chair of the Public Involvement Committee for their recommendation on 100 Area public comment process.

DECISIONS:
Nancy Werdel will fax any information that must be distributed to the Board prior to the 100 Area presentation in May to Rosemary Guse. Shelly Cimone will speak with Betty Tabott about the 100 Area Public Comment Process.