

HANFORD SITE-WIDE RISK REVIEW PROJECT: CHRONOLOGY OF PARTICIPATION OF REGULATORS, STAKEHOLDERS, AND THE PUBLIC

Execution Of Tasking Memorandum And Development Of Methodology Report (2014-2015)

1. **January 16, 2014:** Department of Energy (DOE) executes tasking memorandum requesting Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stakeholder Participation (CRESP) to lead an “independent site-wide evaluation of human health, nuclear safety, environmental and cultural resource risks” at Hanford.
2. **February - March 2014:** Core Team established to work with CRESP (PNNL to provide technical/research support); consists of senior executives from DOE-Headquarters (HQ), Richland (RL), Office of River Protection (ORP), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Washington State Departments of Ecology and Health. Throughout development of Methodology document and Interim Progress Report, Core Team meets quarterly and/or participates in monthly teleconferences and CRESP submits bi-weekly and quarterly progress summaries and brief summaries of meetings. Web page developed on CRESP’s website devoted to Risk Review Project. www.cresp.org/hanford
3. **March 2014:** First Core Team meeting held; agreement reached on initial set of principles and concepts to guide development of methodology and on selection of six pilot evaluation unit sites to test methodology).
4. **June 2014:** Briefings conducted on project scope with Hanford Advisory Board, Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC), Wanapum, Umatilla, Nez Perce, and Yakama Indian Tribes staff.
5. **August – September 2014:** Draft Methodology document reviewed by Core Team/staff; revisions made based on comments.
6. **September 4, 2014:** Draft Methodology document posted on CRESP’s website; 60-day comment period begins.
7. **September – October 2014:** Individual briefings conducted on Methodology document with the following: Wanapum, Umatilla, Nez Perce, and Yakama staff (on ecological and/or resource provisions); Hanford Advisory Board; Hanford Communities; TRIDEC; State of Oregon, DOE staff; and Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board staff. Other outreach efforts regarding details for commenting on methodology document include: (i) separate e-mails to those on CRESP’s contact list, who have requested to be notified of Risk Review project activities and (ii) a request to Core Team members that they forward information on the Risk Review Project and how to comment to those on their list serve they believe may be interested in providing input.
8. **September – October 2014:** Methodology document reviewed and commented on by two independent experts (who are asked to provide advice to CRESP on whether the methodologies contained in the draft document appropriate for achieving the stated risk review goals and objectives).
9. **October 2014 – February 2015:** Methodology document revised based on comments received from independent experts and stakeholder/general public and lessons learned from pilot testing of six evaluation units; summary of how comments to be addressed prepared; entities providing written input sent offer to schedule briefing of process followed and how revisions to be incorporated.
10. **February 2015:** Core Team briefed during February meeting on how Methodology document has been revised; a representative from the State of Oregon and three of the four tribes having historical and cultural ties to Hanford Site attended this portion of meeting and provided additional input. Local government (Hanford Communities) and Wanapum invited but did not attend. Core Team agrees that final Methodology document and Interim Progress Report containing results of risk evaluations conducted on first set of 25 evaluation units out of a total of 64 units to be submitted and posted on CRESP website at same time.
11. **February – August 2015:** Methodologies for each receptor in Methodology document further revised based on input received.
12. **August 31, 2015:** Updated, final Methodology document submitted to Core Team and posted on CRESP website.

Development Of Interim Progress Report And Final Report (2014-2017)

1. **March – June 2014: Sites where cleanup not completed as of October 1, 2015 identified by DOE; CRESP and PNNL divide sites into units that can be evaluated; Core Team agrees on 25 to be evaluated for Interim Progress Report, including six pilot sites, to test methodology.**
2. **March 2014 – February 2015:** Completion of evaluations on first set of 25 units using methodologies developed to rate risks and impacts to human health, the Columbia River and groundwater, and ecological resources (Cultural resources evaluated but not rated). Evaluation results to be included in the Interim Progress Report (25 units include revised evaluations of six pilot test sites).
3. **February 2015:** Core Team members briefed during meeting on results of evaluations, (e.g., risk ratings) and on major observations that emerged since inception of Risk Review Project.
4. **March – May 2015:** “Official use only” review conducted by DOE between March and April 2015. Core Team member agencies conduct factual accuracy review (FAR) of Interim Report between April 5 and May 6, 2015.
5. **May 2015:** DOE Deputy Under Secretary for Management and Performance briefed on results of evaluations in draft Interim Report and observations.
6. **May – August 2015:** Interim Progress Report updated based on comments received.
7. **July 2015:** During monthly teleconference, Core Team provided with overview of revisions made to Interim Progress Report since agency review completed in May timeframe.
8. **August 2015:** During August meeting, Core Team provides input on draft Interim Progress Report and advises that DOE-EM Assistant Secretary would review report and determine next steps. Further Core Team involvement suspended.
9. **August 31, 2015:** Interim Progress Report posted on CRESP website and 60-day comment period begins. CRESP’s contact list advised that comments are encouraged.
10. **September 2015:** Webinar hosted on project results. Public meeting conducted in Richland, Washington. Participants encouraged to submit comments. All written comments acknowledged, reviewed, and considered.
11. **November 2015:** Briefings conducted on Interim Progress Report with Hanford Advisory Board (River and Plateau Committee), TRIDEC, Hanford Communities, and Umatilla Tribe. The Yakama Nation declined invitation to meet and the Nez Perce Tribe never responded to invitation.
12. **November 2015 – March 2017:** CRESP asked to continue evaluations. Evaluations completed for remaining units identified in Risk Review Project (64 total). Evaluations based on data received as of January 2016; evaluations for Interim Progress Report based on data received as January 2015 and not updated except groundwater evaluations and certain others (e.g., Building 324 where updated data materially affected evaluations). Final Report drafted (contains evaluations of all units, results, and final observations).
13. **March - April 2017:** DOE – RL and ORP conduct “official use only” and technical (factual accuracy) reviews of draft Final Report. No technical comments sent.
14. **June –July 2017:** Draft Final Report peer reviewed by three outside experts.
15. **July – September 2017:** Draft Final Report updated based on comments received.
16. **October 2017:** Presentation of draft Final Report made to staff at DOE HQ and via teleconference to staff at DOE-RL and ORP.
17. **October 2017:** draft Final Report submitted to DOE for final agency review.
18. **August 2018: Final Report planned to be posted to CRESP website on August 31, 2018.**