



June 4, 1999

Mr. Richard T. French, Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of River Protection
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

Mr. Keith Klein, Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations
P.O. Box 550 (A7-50)
Richland, Washington 99352

Mr. James Owendoff, Assistant Secretary
Office of Environmental Management
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Ave. S.W.
Washington, DC 20585

Subject: Understanding ORP Relationships and Direction

Dear Messrs. French, Klein and Owendoff:

In June, the Hanford Advisory Board's (HAB) Waste Treatment Ad Hoc Committee met with the Manager of the Office of River Protection (ORP) to discuss the ORP "Big 5" initiatives. The Ad Hoc Committee was created to focus on success in treatment of the tank waste.

Following committee presentations, the Board frequently employs "sounding board" discussions to provide a forum to air any and all opinions, concerns and values represented by the various stakeholders. It has been particularly useful as a first step towards consensus on difficult or complex issues.

The Board sees the ORP "Big 5" initiatives, as currently presented, to be a basis for generating a significant amount of uncertainty in the program, on the Site, and in relationship with the regulators, public and tribes. At the same time, the program history indicates that a little disruption may be a benefit. However, this can only happen if the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) approaches the challenges in an integrated fashion with foresight, deliberation, and due diligence to achieving change.

Given the breadth and depth of the "Big 5's" proposed changes, the agencies should consider a meeting (similar to the St. Louis and Salt Lake City workout sessions) in which all involved parties (regulators, the Board, DOE-RL, ORP, DOE-HQ, Tribes, etc.) begin to understand the impacts of the creation of ORP.

The attached list of concerns, issues and questions is the result of the sounding board and Ad Hoc Committee processes. The questions, while not wholly comprehensive, do represent a start in defining the Board's concerns. The Board understands that answers to many of these questions may not currently exist. The Board looks forward to a continuing dialogue including answers to the following questions at the July meeting, welcoming additions and input from DOE-RL and ORP, and continuing to track these issues.

The following three questions apply to all questions and categories listed below:

A. How/when will decisions be made?

B. How will this support program progress?

C. The goal is to understand, not micro-manage the Office of River Protection.

I. Regulatory Issues

A. How will responsibility for ORP activities and the accountability for the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) be aligned? How would the TPA need to be changed to support this alignment?

B. Where/how will the Regulatory Unit operate?

C. How will Environmental, Safety, and Health (ES&H) activities be organized and conducted in ORP? For example, will the Integrated Safety Management System be implemented in ORP? How?

D. How will these initiatives better coordinate accountability and responsibility for the program and streamline the working relationship between the regulators and DOE?

II. Budget/Contract Authority

A. With the proposed separation of Richland (RL) and ORP budgets, how will the Integrated Priority List and budget process development be handled?

B. How will the Project Hanford Management Contract be altered if contract authority rests with the ORP manager?

III. Public, Stakeholder, and Tribal Relationships (including Government to Government)

A. How will the government-to-government relationship between tribes and the DOE be maintained under the new ORP structure?

B. How will ORP relate to the HAB?

C. Will funds for the HAB be included in the ORP budget?

D. How will ORP and DOE-RL integrate so that the HAB has a principal Federal Advisory Committee Act contact?

IV. Bureaucratic Structure

A. How will indirects, overheads, and site services (taxes and direct work) be paid for and controlled in ORP?

B. What changes need to be made to create an identity for ORP? (What will be the monetary and morale costs?)

C. How will interfaces between ORP and DOE-RL activities be identified and managed, e.g., where will Groundwater/Vadose Zone and ES&H responsibilities lie?

D. How will ORP and DOE-RL manage and distribute the cost of facilities whose current use is shared (e.g. 222-S Laboratory, 242-A Evaporator)?

Very truly yours,

Merilyn B. Reeves, Chair

Hanford Advisory Board

cc: Tom Fitzsimmons, Director
Chuck Clarke, Regional Administrator
Paul Kruger, Deputy Designated Federal
Official The Oregon and Washington
Congressional Delegations
Michael Gearheard, Environmental
Protection Agency
Dan Silver, Washington Department of
Ecology

Hanford Home Page | HAB | Correspondence Index

For questions or comments, please send [email](mailto:Hanford_Advisory_Board@rl.gov) to Hanford_Advisory_Board@rl.gov

URL: <http://www.hanford.gov/boards/hab/letters/99-012.html>

Last Updated: 01/26/2001 10:38:54