

DRAFT

Hanford Advisory Board

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY v3

December 6-7, 2001

Radisson Hotel, Portland, Oregon

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<i>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</i>	2
<i>PANTEX BOARD DISBANDED</i>	5
<i>INTERNAL DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY MEMO</i>	6
<i>AD HOC TASK FORCE</i>	8
<i>TASK FORCE PURPOSE DISCUSSION</i>	10
<i>RIVER CORRIDOR CONTRACT UPDATE</i>	13
<i>RIVER CORRIDOR CONTRACT ADVICE</i>	15
<i>DOE BUDGET UPDATE</i>	17
<i>BALANCE OF MISSION TANK WASTE TREATMENT ADVICE</i>	19
<i>DOE-ORP RECOVERY PLAN</i>	20
<i>PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WHITE PAPER</i>	21
<i>REVIEW OF AGENCY RESPONSES TO HAB ADVICE</i>	24
<i>TRAVEL UPDATE</i>	24
<i>PROPOSED MEETING SCHEDULE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2002</i>	25
<i>TOPICS FOR NEXT BOARD MEETING</i>	25
<i>CONFERENCE CALLS</i>	25
<i>TANK WASTE CLOSURE WORKSHOP</i>	26
<i>COMMITTEE REPORTS AND UPDATES</i>	26
<i>MISCELLANEOUS</i>	27
<i>PUBLIC COMMENT</i>	27

DRAFT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Jessie Roberson Internal Memo

The Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) returned throughout the meeting to the issue of the memo (reported on by Todd Martin, Chair (Public-at-Large)) from Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, regarding possible major policy changes for waste cleanup. This memo caused great concern about the future of Hanford cleanup. The agencies are taking a wait-and-see attitude and proceeding with their work. They urged the HAB to stay engaged on the issues the agencies raised in September. Providing good information and valid numbers is the best way to protect the work being done at Hanford.

The HAB developed a piece of advice in response to the memo.

Ad Hoc Task Force

Gariann Gelston, Hanford Work Force (Non-Union, Non-Management), presented the work done so far by the task force along with a task statement and some suggestions for future work. There was discussion as to whether the task force has been properly constituted and whether a task force is appropriate. No agreement could be reached on a charter for the group or a plan forward. The HAB decided to have the workshop on January 8th and 9th be dedicated to looking at the proposed change package and coming to an agreement on the balance of the task force's mission. Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), will chair the task force for the next couple of months. Susan Leckband, Hanford Work Force (Non-Union, Non-Management), and Greg deBruler, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), will co-vice chair.

River Corridor Draft RFP

Beth Bilson, Department of Energy-Richland (DOE-RL), gave an overview of the draft RFP and the process. Changes have been made to the draft as a result of past Board input on contracts and input from the agencies and contractors. Jerry Pollet, Heart of American Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), reviewed the points in the advice given earlier in the year and presented new advice. The advice was adopted.

DOE Budget Update

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business Interests), reviewed budget numbers for 2002. No information is available about the 2003 budget. The proposed budget process between the agencies and the HAB has gone by the wayside because the agencies don't have information to share. It is close to time to start the 2004 budget process, but it will be a challenge. There was general concern over which current and future projects will be impacted by current proposed budgets.

DRAFT

Balance of Mission for Tank Waste Treatment Advice

The main concern of the HAB for the balance of mission is the use of outdated numbers in the out-year portion of the waste treatment complex project. Advice addressing this issue was adopted.

DOE-ORP Recovery Plan

Doug Huston explained the background of the request by Ecology that the Department of Energy (DOE) provide a plan to show that the delay of construction on the vitrification plant will not impact the 2007 hot commissioning date. Steve Wiegman said the plan looks good so far, but the required guaranty of funding was not complete because of a lack of information about the budget for 2002. There are elements of an old plan included in the plan submitted. Those need to be removed.

Public Involvement White Paper

Bill Kinsella, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), presented the white paper, which included criteria for judging the quality of public involvement. There was discussion about how to make information accessible to the public and how to attract the public to meetings. This discussion also included ideas on how to expand the public that is being reached.

The HAB recommended that the Public Involvement Committee look at the principles from the Openness Workshop from a few years ago and integrate those principles in the paper. They should formalize this paper and submit it to the agencies as a guideline. The Committee should work closely with the task force.

Travel Update

Gail McClure, Department of Energy-Richland Office (DOE-RL), said the HAB has done a good job of staying within their travel budget this year. If things stay the same, the travel budget will be adequate for next year.

Tank Closure Workshop

Todd Martin, Chair (Public-at-large), and Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government Interests), reported on the tank closure workshop. The most alarming thing they observed was an attempt to redefine high-level waste. Ken was disturbed by the lack of a national plan for high-level waste and the apparent lack of concern about that. Ken was pleased to see the use of technology around the complex. Savannah River and Idaho cites are using grout to close tanks.

DRAFT

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

Hanford Advisory Board December 6-7, 2001 Radisson Hotel, Portland, Oregon

Todd Martin, Chair (Public at Large), called the meeting of the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) to order. The meeting was open to the public and offered four public comment periods: two on Thursday and two on Friday.

Board members in attendance are listed in Attachment 1, as are members of the public. Six Board seats were not represented:

- City of Pasco (Local Government Interests), Charles Kilbury, primary member
- Central Washington Building Trades (Hanford Work Force), Richard Berglund, primary member;
- Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), Russell Jim, primary member;
- Government Accountability Project (Hanford Work Force), Tom Carpenter, primary member;
- Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society and Columbia River Conservation League (Local Environmental Interests), Victor Moore, primary member;

This is the fifth consecutive board meeting that the Central Washington Building Trades seat has been unrepresented.

WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), and Christy Baptist-Elk, Nez Perce Tribe (Tribal Governments), are officially board members though they are not new to the Board.

Charles Kilbury, City of Pasco (Local Government Interests), won re-election as mayor of Pasco.

Joy Turner, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), announced that she and the Department of Energy (DOE), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), have been working with the agency officials on talking to the public more often. They have agreed to go to the public regionally in the fall of the year to talk about the year's activities and upcoming issues. The agencies decided not to wait for next fall, but to have public meetings in January with Harry Boston, Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP); Keith Klein, Department of Energy, Richland Office (DOE-RL); Tom Fitzsimmons, (Ecology); and perhaps John Iani, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). They will be in Seattle on the 22nd, Portland on the 23rd, and the Tri-Cities on the 24th. Joy asked Board members to notify their constituencies and to distribute the

DRAFT

information she sends. Todd Martin, Chair (Public-at-Large) suggested that the Board look into piggybacking relevant issues onto those meetings.

Todd Martin, Chair (Public-at-Large), announced that the next Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) chair meeting is scheduled for April at the Fernald facility in Cincinnati. He and Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), attended last year. They would like to take one or two other Board members this year. Interested parties should let them know.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), introduced Ann Richardson from Representative Woo's office.

NOVEMBER MEETING SUMMARY

The summary from the November HAB meeting was accepted with changes.

PANTEX BOARD DISBANDED

Todd Martin announced that the advisory board for the Pantex site in Texas has been disbanded. There was a dispute between the board and DOE about their charter. Historically, defense materials -- the largest portion of Pantex materials -- have been a part of their scope. DOE recently advised them that they would be confined to environmental management (EM.) The Board voted to accept that change, but several weeks later the board was discontinued. DOE claimed the Board was not providing useful input.

The Fernald board has suggested that the SSAB chairs write a letter to DOE to ask for a reaffirmation of their commitment to public and stakeholder involvement and to express disappointment about this administration's movement away from that commitment. There will be a draft at some point for Todd to sign.

Susan Leckband, Hanford Work Force (Non-Union, Non-Management), pointed out that the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) that authorized advisory boards expires in May of 2002. The law has to be reaffirmed in order for the boards to continue. It is incumbent on the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) to fulfill its purpose and demonstrate its utility. Keith Smith, Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), and Gordon Rogers, Public-at-Large, pointed out some fundamental differences between how the Pantex Board and the Hanford Board function, but both agreed that the HAB must provide timely and useful input to the agencies.

Todd Martin sits on the Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB), the national advisory board to Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary for Environmental

DRAFT

Management. The EMAB received a fax from Jessie saying that she had not decided yet what to do with that board.

INTERNAL DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY MEMO

Todd Martin talked about a memo from Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, addressed to "Director, Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation, Chief Financial Officer," dated November 19, 2001. This memo outlined potential acceleration of cleanup, reduction of costs and proposed not vitrifying 75 percent of high-level waste and consolidating waste from all the sites quickly. It suggested opening Richland for receipt of out-of-state low-level mixed waste.

The following day, Jessie Roberson issued a letter outlining the delegation of authority to Harry Boston that appears to curtail local control. One of Todd's major concerns was that Harry Boston and Keith Klein don't appear to know that these policy changes are coming ahead of time. Headquarters appears to be making unilateral decisions without taking past commitments and values into account.

Jerry Pollet, Heart of American Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), said that this memo indicates a complete abandonment of the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA), Records of Decision, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This memo talks about burying waste at Hanford without an environmental impact statement (EIS.) Talking about exposure scenarios is meaningless in light of such a threat. We should be talking about how to enforce the current laws.

Bill Kinsella, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), wants to use the task force to build a broader coalition so that we have allies when the administration tries to undo the work that has been done at Hanford. He asked the Board to take a strong stand in opposition to the issues in the memo.

Dennis Faulk, U.S. Environmental Agency (EPA), said the site needs to continue on our path. Showing the Administration that we have good information and a good plan and that we are moving forward productively is the best defense.

Mike Wilson, WA Department of Ecology (Ecology), said this memo is the most troubling thing they have seen in a long time. It helps them understand what is happening. Ecology is moving ahead. They are continuing to explore new approaches, but they have not received any new proposals. The memo suggests not vitrifying 75 percent of high-level waste; Hanford has 75 percent of the total high-level waste, so Hanford would be significantly impacted. Ecology will not buy into that plan. Mike said the Board needs to continue to establish what the expectations are of the citizens of the Northwest in order to have a leg to stand on if these new approaches are seriously presented.

Steve Wiegman, Department of Energy-Richland (DOE-RL), said Harry Boston is still seeking clarification from Jessie Roberson about the intent of the memo. Harry made it

DRAFT

clear to Steve that this is no time for inaction on the part of the Board. The Board's presentation of the views of the Northwest need to be on record as the Administration develops its approach to cleanup issues.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Interests), said that it is clear that the administration doesn't understand how Congress makes a budget. The Northwest delegation has been very effective in working on the Hanford budget, and they have been strong advocates. The process we are about to engage in with the task force defines the expectations of the Northwest.

Beth Bilson, Department of Energy-Richland (DOE-RL), said that Jessie Roberson's management style relies heavily on delegation. Ms. Roberson has done an inventory of what each site operation office is authorized to do, and authorities have been realigned to fit the capabilities of the different offices. Keith Klein feels he has the authorities he needs.

Beth said that the underlying motives of the memo are compatible with our current focus -- addressing high-risk issues, getting cleanup done. The concerns from Headquarters are about getting sustained funding. They are working on a number of fronts to do that. Right now Headquarters is pushing to get things done in the 100 and 300 areas faster, so the question to us is, do we want it done faster.

Tim Takaro, University of Washington (University), said that question was a trap because we don't want to sacrifice values to get acceleration. He is concerned about the mentality that we are either for or against this Administration.

According to the memo, Savannah River would receive waste. Right now, they are in dispute over the loss of a receiving facility. Beth Bilson said this issue of moving waste quickly is a result of security issues resulting from the September 11th terrorist attack. A lot of money is being spent on security that could be going toward moving the waste.

Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, asked what milestones would be impacted by this change in priority.

The Board wrote a piece of advice in response to this memo. It will be sent to the usual recipients, Bob Card, the recipient of the memo, and other SSABs. This advice is written to address these issues complex wide. Norm Dyer, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), questioned the wisdom and authority of the Board to offer advice on things happening at other sites.

The Board considered sending past advice on a national dialog (Item No. 4 in the memo, which was omitted from the advice) under a new cover. It was decided to hold off and let the River and Plateau Committee take this up pending feedback from the advice. Ken Bracken, Benton County (Local Government Interests), thought the equity question covers a broader range of materials, and the Board might want to address this on a national level to see if other Boards are interested in it.

DRAFT

Ken told the Board about an article written by John Stang and Annette Carey in the Tri-City Herald about the things in the memo along with responses from Patty Murray (D. WA) and Maria Cantwell's (D. WA). He said this might do more for our cause than this advice. He read some excerpts.

AD HOC TASK FORCE

Gariann Gelston, Hanford Workforce (Non-Union, Non-Management), gave an update on what the task force has done so far. There were two organizational meetings after the November HAB meeting. She stressed the urgency of going forward with the work and said that not much has been accomplished so far. She asked for Board input on the direction for the task force over the next two months and whether the plan she laid out was the correct one. Her hope was that these issues would be discussed on the conference call December 12th, and at the end of the call, the January workshop would be designed.

The purpose of the task force is to respond to items on the list of issues the agencies gave the Board in September. At the November 8th meeting, the task force members discussed what their charter might be, what products might be, and the schedule. They are looking at past workshops to give them ideas for future workshops. They are looking at the goal of the 100 and 300 Area Agreement in Principle (AIP). She suggested that the public meetings by the agencies at the end of January could serve as targets for getting products ready.

Suggested products included public information/background materials as the Board did in 1995, a public involvement strategy, and land and resource use values related to exposure scenarios. Gariann thought the Board could go beyond just giving advice on the informational materials to actively participate in developing them. This ties in with the Public Involvement White Paper.

Gariann said that the products could include things other than advice. The Board and the public can benefit from background information. She handed out a question and answer document the Board did in 1995 as an example of a possible Board product. She gave an example of creative ways to present information.

Workshops are a possible vehicle, but the task force needs to discuss what to do and how to do it. The task force can suggest content for the public meetings and give a list of people that should be invited.

Dennis Faulk talked about past workshops that the agencies have done that were very successful. There were workshops in 1999 regarding remaining site RODs where a lot of energy developed about water exposure scenarios in the 100 Areas. They realized they had not done a good job of explaining what they were doing and why. Gordon Rogers, Gerry Pollet, and Greg de Bruler helped with the workshops. There were technical sessions in the morning and public dialog in the evening. There was a lot of energy

DRAFT

around the Model Toxics Control Act, and people felt the cleanup in the 100 Area was not meeting those standards. They spent a lot of time presenting information on that.

The agencies are doing site-specific modeling in the 100 and 300 Areas and will be doing it in the 200 Area. The input they received in those 1999 workshops gave them valuable information that they were able to use in the change package. Dennis hopes that future workshops can benefit from the same type of process.

Administrative support needs were outlined. Gariann introduced Mike Goddu of Goddu - Henderson - Jidson in Colorado. DOE has assigned Mike Goddu to facilitate the task force to make sure that it gets to its end products as well as to help design and facilitate workshops. Mike is also facilitating the Challenges and Constraints to Cleanup Team (C3T) process, so he will be a liaison between the two groups.

Gariann said that everyone has agreed that the task force needs to go beyond the HAB membership to include other organizations and stakeholders. Members were asked to submit proposals of people and organizations that should be included. If there are any additions or if members know of contact people at any of the organizations, please let the task force leadership know.

The task force discussion will not be about exposure scenarios, but the values to be used in creating them. Leon Swenson asked for a definition of "values." Gariann said there are many definitions of values, but the task force will confine itself to institutional control issues. A good starting place is to look at past HAB values. The 200 Area may need to be treated differently than the 100 and 300 Areas.

Gerry Pollet said the reason for two phases for this task force is that the 100 and 300 Areas are questions of TPA priorities that will be negotiated -- what will be cleaned up when. The 100 and 300 Area priorities should reflect values and risk. As long as things are deferred, there will be institutional controls restricting use. What values to be used in these decisions is a big driver for the task force. This is a little different than the question of long-term exposure scenarios for the Central Plateau.

When defining cleanup, they need to decide what portion will be cleaned up, how long use will be restricted, and what the final use of the Hanford Reach will be. Exposure during the cleanup process needs to be clear. Input has to be given to the agencies before they make their decisions. Ecological-risk assessment hasn't been done. What should be cleaned up first? They have to advise the agencies on how and when to do risk assessment and how to tie it into the remedy. This still needs to be defined and negotiated.

Public notice must be given on how the decisions being made effect values for ultimate use. The public involvement plan needs to include when and how public input will be used and how the public will be notified of impacts. There is no public involvement plan in place yet.

DRAFT

Gariann presented a "Task Statement" which summarized what the task force is going to do. She asked for endorsement of this statement in lieu of a charter because a charter takes much longer to develop and time is of the essence. She asked the Board to offer additions to the statement and to decide what they wanted to commit to. Once a commitment decision is made, leadership can be determined. (Further discussion of a "task statement" versus a charter follows.)

Susan Leckband endorsed the task statement. She wanted to define the products. She thinks the task force is an opportunity to build a broader coalition. Gariann said the task force could be a model for bringing a larger group together and can demonstrate proactive processes and products.

Todd gave an overview of the AIP. The AIP is to determine the scope and definition of completion of all 100 Area remedial actions. It includes remediation, decontamination and decommissioning (D & D), and interim safe storage. The agencies are coming back to the Board to ask if they have applied the values correctly. Part of the process is to define what is inside and what is outside the "fences," and initiate studies into the 618-10 and -11 sites. The AIP is due at the end of April. The change package is due at the end of this year. Groundwater is not included in these negotiations.

TASK FORCE PURPOSE DISCUSSION

There was extensive discussion about whether or not the task force was the best way to accomplish the things the agencies asked the Board to do and whether this task force as it exists now can be successful. Jerry Pollet and Greg deBruler, Columbia Riverkeeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), shared concerns about the charter process and inclusion of other organizations. Both felt a well-defined charter was essential in order to get the commitment of other organizations and that DOE should fund people from other organizations so that they can participate on equal footing with HAB members. Jerry asserted that Mike Goddu ought to be the one to do the chartering process. He felt that this task force has suffered from inadequate facilitation or the right kind of facilitation and that the chartering process must be thorough and complete before the task force could fulfill its purpose as he sees that purpose. Greg strongly believed that DOE should be willing to spend the money necessary to convene the kind of task force required to address risk scenarios the way he feels they should be addressed. Neither Jerry nor Greg could support a task force on the current basis.

Harold Heacock, TRIDEC (Local Business Interests), clarified that on the Hanford Reach Board, members of the HAB hold six of the thirteen seats, so there is coverage for that organization.

Jerry Pollet felt we aren't ready to talk about products today because of the reasons listed. He would advise outside organizations not to participate if they aren't given funding and an equal weight on the task force. This task force so far is failing. The only recommendation to come out of it should be that the agencies are not following their

DRAFT

requirements for public involvement. Greg thought reviewing the change package could be done in committee as a normal part of HAB work.

Jerry said the task force needs the kind of facilitation that will do a chartering process. There are people who do this kind of thing. He said the problems we are having with the task force result from a lack of proper facilitation. He suggested that the three agencies haven't come to a common understanding.

Beth Bilson responded that Mike Goddu is a facilitator, not a staff person. Gail McClure's office is available to help with staff work. At this point there are not funds to do more than what is being done. Neither Jerry nor Greg believed that obtaining funding was a real issue for the agency. Beth pointed out that the agencies asked for advice on specific issues, but did not ask for a task force.

Mike Goddu clarified that he has not been hired to do a chartering process. He pointed out that there is more work required in the task force than just commenting on issues. He thought that the points Jerry raised were a good starting place for the conference call next week. The agencies are planning some public involvement meetings in January. The task force can comment on how to do that properly. He suggested people come to the conference call prepared to design a workshop.

Doug Huston endorsed the things Jerry outlined as task force products. The task force can recommend to the agencies that they do the kind of things Jerry and Greg want to do. This is a two-step process. Discussing exposure scenarios is the second part, and we aren't there yet. Right now, the agencies have asked for HAB input. When we have done that, we can look at moving into the areas that Jerry and Greg want to.

Dennis Faulk agreed with Doug. He said the things that Greg has talked about are not what the agencies asked the Board to do. What Greg said makes sense, but isn't what the agencies need right now. They need help with the Central Plateau talking about end states, what institutional controls will be needed, what long-term stewardship will entail, how to do the risk scenarios. They need the task force to do this.

Greg said that there needs to be a discussion about exposure scenarios now because the Department will run out of money and if our values are not clear now, cleanup will not be completed before money runs out. He won't support a task force that isn't done correctly, and this one isn't.

Ken Bracken acknowledged that there might be better, more efficient ways to do what the agencies want to accomplish in terms of public involvement. But we can comment on that and tell them if they are not doing what they are required to do.

Dan Simpson, Public-at-Large, said the Board needs to define where we are trying to go and design a plan to get there. Until that is done, we can't progress. Dan offered a very short charter: To document the criteria and describe the conditions for the Hanford site

DRAFT

once cleanup is complete and the area is placed into long-term stewardship. There was good response to this charter.

Mike said the HAB has a decision to make. The Board has been asked for some short-term advice and some medium-term advice. Some of the Board is saying doing that requires thorough input. The Board needs to decide whether it can do what the agencies have asked. If they don't feel they can, the agencies need to respect that. Mike said he was not hired to do the kind of thing Jerry and Greg are recommending and he isn't the right person to do it.

Some members wanted to define the products first; others wanted a charter first. Others felt that there was no point doing anything until the issues in Jessie Roberson's memo were resolved.

Steve Wiegman reminded the Board that the things the agencies asked the Board to do run parallel to the C3T process, which the Board decided not to participate in actively. The time frame for addressing these issues has been shortened by Headquarters. He said the C3T group is struggling with the same issues that the Board is on the task force.

Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues (Contractor), observed that the word "charter" seems to mean different things to different people in this discussion. The proposed task statement could be considered the basis for a group work plan. She observed that the Board's discussion had two themes. First, there appear to be some level of agreement that the task statement reflects work the Board wants to do. She suggested that the task statement from the November task force meeting could be combined with Dan Simpson's suggested charter statement and the additional key questions that came out of the November 8th task force meeting. Second, the Board was having trouble settling on how to approach and actually do the work.

Beth Bilson said there is a time element to the things the agencies asked for. DOE needs quick feedback on the change package. She warned against trying to blend all the issues together and not responding to the time sensitive issues. Gariann said the first thing the task force should look at is whether the things in the change package are appropriate.

Max Power, WA Department of Ecology (Ecology), explained that the change package is just a road map. It doesn't make decisions, but lays out a timetable for making decisions. The agencies need to know if the timetable for making decisions is in the correct sequence and where the Board's concerns are going to be. They also need help in how to tell the public what the implications of this change package will be for long-term institutional controls and putting those implications in context. Doug Sherwood has been asking for this Board input for a long time, but the Board has not engaged on this topic. The Board has to decide whether it wants to be engaged on this topic. Max thought that Dan Simpson was on the right track. Dennis Faulk agreed.

Pam Brown said the task force has done a good job so far. Most of the Board members are ready to go forward.

DRAFT

Since no conclusions could be reached on the charter or specific direction for the task force, it was decided that the proposed workshop on January 8th and 9th will be used to negotiate the issues surrounding the task force including charter issues, products, and who will be involved. There will be an update at the February meeting. Part of the workshop will be used for input on the change package. Todd Martin will work with DOE and EnviroIssues to assess whether the additional facilitation desired for the task force can be accommodated within the scope of EnviroIssues' fixed price contract.

Doug Huston agreed to chair the task force for at least the next couple of months. Susan Leckband and Greg deBruler will co-vice chair. Shelly Cimon reminded everyone that committees had agreed to give up some committee time so that people can work on the task force.

RIVER CORRIDOR CONTRACT UPDATE

Harold Heacock said the draft request for proposal (RFP) has been out for public comment this fall. Bechtel's contract expires in October of 2002 and cannot be extended. Bechtel has been funded at \$130 million per year, with \$30 million of that going to 200 Area groundwater.

The River Corridor contract is in two phases. The first phase includes moving dirt along the river and waste sites and buildings in the 300 Area. The contract contains target prices for those things based on estimates from contractors and the Army Corps of Engineers. Bidders will base their bids on those target prices. There will be sliding scale for shared cost over- and under-runs. Phase 1 will take four to eight years.

The second phase includes cleanup, demolition, and clearance of the K and N Reactor sites. It is fixed price. This would come in about the sixth year of the eight-year contract at which time more characterization will have been done. This part of the contract is estimated at \$150 million to \$180 million per year. Bechtel has been funded at about \$130 million. \$100 million covers the things in this contract, and \$30 million has been used for 200 Area groundwater.

Environmental restoration in the 200 Area and groundwater work would be transferred to current contractors at Hanford at the time the contract takes effect. Many milestones for Phase 2 have not been established.

Bob Larson, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government Interests), said DOE has been working hard to explain this contract request for proposal (RFP) to everyone. They made a presentation at a committee meeting and answered questions. He suggested that people should think about a few things as they listened to Beth Bilson's presentation on the contract. Is there adequate competition in light of Bechtel's experience? What is happening to the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) goals? Will there be adequate funding for the contract? Can this be called a closure contract when groundwater is not included?

DRAFT

Beth Bilson said they are trying to replace Bechtel, who has performed very well. This contract is a compilation of Bechtel Hanford International (BHI) work and Fluor Hanford work along the river corridor. It is not the whole project, but it is a major portion of it. A piece of it will remain with Fluor. The final RFP is due out by the end of January. Proposals are due in early July. The transition period needs to be completed by the end of the fiscal year.

Beth's definition of the phases of the contract differed somewhat from Harold's. She said Phase 1 is a continuation of the work already being done and development of an understanding of what needs to be done in Phase 2. A lot of design work needs to be done on the N Reactor. That design work is in Phase 1. She said the two phases might not be back to back. As things are defined in Phase 1, Phase 2 can go forward in parallel. They have changed the way they are approaching Phase 2 bidding. It will not be part of the target price in the bid. The target price was determined by contractors, by the Corps of Engineers, and from pre-existing estimates in Records of Decision. They already have those for the remediation work.

DOE has worked hard to get competition by talking to the contractor community to see what would induce them to bid and talking to current subcontractors. They are trying to simplify the requirements and trying to summarize the government orders that apply to the work so that the contractor doesn't have to interpret them. Every time they answer a question from a contractor, they put the information on the website for everyone. That web site is www.hanford/ord.gov/procure/solicit/rcc/.

Beth said this is a closure contract more in the sense that the contract is complete when the work is accomplished. They are trying to remove ambiguous scope issues and allow this contractor to focus on one thing. This is a cost-plus contract. Incentives are based on them meeting the target price. This type of contract can only be used when you know what you need to do and how to do it. If the contractor is below the target price, they get a 70/30 split of the savings. If they exceed the target price, they lose 20 percent of the incentive fee. The contractor will provide two target costs based on various amounts of annual funding. At the end, the final cost would be recalculated based on the actual funding that the government has been able to provide on a per-year basis.

Pam Brown was pleased that feedback had been incorporated into the contract.

Keith Smith was concerned that incentives could promote safety shortcuts. He cited work force reductions to save costs, but the work still remained to be done, so it wasn't a true savings. Beth Bilson said she has been working on putting together a federal plan on how they will provide oversight. One of the primary vehicles they will have is to withhold fee. The current clause in the RFP is being changed to strengthen that capability.

Bob Larson asked how many firms are planning to bid on the contract. Beth said they really don't know, but they have had three or four serious questioners and a couple of

DRAFT

smaller contractors who may opt to become subcontractors. They have taken quite a few contractors out on bus tours of the site. There will be at least one bidder, if not more.

The advice was adopted. It will go to Keith Klein, the TPA agencies, the Congressional delegation, and Jessie Roberson.

RIVER CORRIDOR CONTRACT ADVICE

Jerry Pollet reminded members of the advice last year that outlined the principles that should be followed in contracts. That advice included the principle that fixed-price contracts should only be used for well-characterized work. He noted that this might be the first time Board advice has impacted a contract if Phase 2 is taken out of the target price bid.

Another principle was that soil and groundwater are linked. Also, if groundwater is still contaminated and exposure is above standard, it isn't a closure contract. The end points should conform to the TPA and regulatory definition of closure. Another principle is that you should not rob one area to address another area. Phase 1 is budgeted at \$150 million to \$210 million. Phase 2 is at \$400 million a year. What is impacted by that increased amount, and who sets those priorities? Is this contract being put ahead of TPA requirements?

The cost estimate is not based on well-understood factors. The burial grounds are not well characterized, so assigning 160 percent of baseline costs to cover the unknowns is arbitrary. The contractor has to build in a higher target cost if there are many unknowns. If the contractor then comes in under cost, he gets 30 percent of the savings. There is a total potential fee of 20 percent of the contract price. They have a guaranteed minimum fee, profit, and a large contingency fee. Jerry wants to be sure that there are clear measurable standards relative to loss of fee when it comes to compromising worker safety, for example.

Jerry said that it is typical for a no-risk contract under DOE's contract reform to have a fee below 5 percent. This contract allows up to one out of every five dollars to be appropriated. He didn't understand how we could look at Congress for continual funding when we make a contract like this.

Dennis Faulk said the EPA doesn't normally get involved in DOE contracting. They did look at the RFP because it impacts how they do their work, and they have passed on their concerns to DOE. The way the contract is currently written, it will be very difficult for anyone without an intimate knowledge to bid, so one-on-one meetings will be very important. It appears the hard work was all put off to the second phase. Some of it will have to be moved into Phase 1 to complete the work by 2012. The change package will not mesh with the way the contract is currently written. EPA felt that the contract does a poor job of letting people know what is involved in the work and what kind of work force will be needed. DOE is putting more detail into the contract.

DRAFT

John Price (Department of Ecology) said that a lot of the work done at Hanford is unique to this site and the DOE system. A lot of the work is suitable for commercial practices like at other hazardous waste sites around the country. The draft RFP talks about commercial practices. There are still a lot of DOE requirements that are not the same as commercial practices. There is a lot of money available if you can ever get to standard commercial practices. C3T Team No. 3 is looking at this issue. That money equates with faster cleanup. He hoped that DOE would work towards getting to standard commercial practices. Beth asked for a list. John said they are trying to do that. It is a lot of information to go through. She would like to talk with John further about this.

Keith Smith pointed out that sometimes using commercial practices at Hanford jeopardizes worker safety. He has had workers say that this is the first place they have worked where worker safety was a top priority.

Bill Kinsella recommended that contractors be fined 30 percent for not meeting worker safety standards. Beth said there are tradeoffs associated with that type of provision. Jerry Pollet said that it is very costly when workers are forced to exercise their stop-work prerogative. There needs to be clear definition of fee loss criteria in the contract.

The following points were included in the advice:

- End points should follow TPA requirements. Phase 2 is not consistent with the TPA approach.
- You cannot assume milestones will change. The public process involved in the TPA should not be lost.
- Don't call it a closure contract if groundwater is not included and closure standards of the TPA and the law are not complied with.
- Don't say you are preparing the 100 and 300 Areas for removal from Superfund if you won't be done with cleanup at the end of this contract.
- Integrate groundwater with soil cleanup since contractors are accustomed to that linkage.
- There may be conflicts between this contract and the TPA

Madeleine Brown, Washington League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), said the questions in the advice should be turned into recommendations.

Beth Bilson said that the response from the agency would be that they are waiting for the TPA negotiations to be complete in order to insert them into this contract. If there are further milestones established, they will be put into the contract.

Jerry asked Beth if the RFP had been changed so that the contractor will allow its employees to use the Hanford Joint Council for Employee Concerns. DOE and Fluor have subpoenaed the medical records of employees that they promised four years ago after the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) explosion they would never ask for. They were confidential under the charter of the Council. Beth said that they are requiring them to

DRAFT

follow the DOE Employee Concerns Order. They can do that however they choose. She said contractors only have to follow it if it is in their contract. She didn't think it is in any of the contracts. Jerry said a recent survey showed that 85 percent of the employees that went through Fluor's and DOE's Employee Concerns program had found that confidentiality was violated and they lack trust in the process. It would take millions of dollars to mitigate versus litigate. It should be specified that they use the Council, which Bechtel has refused to do. Todd said the advice should say that compliance with the order is not enough. They need to go further.

Abe Greenberg, City of Kennewick, (Local Government Interests), said that the contract is too big and complex and is premature. Not enough characterization has been done and there is not enough funding. He felt this contract would draw funds away from other projects. He wants answers to what will not be done because of this contract. Keith Smith and Harold Heacock agreed.

Tim Tacaro noted that the waste treatment plant is not using the Integrated Safety Management System that all the other contractors are using. They plan to have their own health and safety monitoring program. That is a dangerous precedent and erodes the credibility of the Integrated Safety Management System. This should be reflected in the advice.

In contrast with Gerry Pollet, Harold Heacock said the contractor has an 8 1/2 percent fee, which is normal for this kind of work. The rest is at risk.

The advice was adopted.

DOE BUDGET UPDATE

Hanford received \$1.456 billion in 2001. For 2002, the administration request was for \$1.4 billion with Congress appropriating \$1.818 billion. As near as can be determined now, the DOE planning number for the Environmental Management (EM) budget in 2002 is \$1.776 billion.

The total EM budget request from the administration for 2002 was \$5.913 billion. Congress appropriated \$6.716 dollars. Hanford is receiving between 25 and 30 percent of the total budget.

There have been some changes made in the appropriated funds. As the result of budget reconciliation, ORP has lost \$8 million, and RL has lost \$18 million. Headquarters took \$16 million from RL as a tax. It is currently projected that the tank farms will have an \$8 million reduction down to \$380 million. \$690 million was requested for the waste treatment plant.

DOE-RL originally requested \$762 million for full funding of the TPA. With the reductions, \$714 million is currently available.

DRAFT

The question is what will be left undone because of these reductions. There are rumors that Headquarters may withhold further funds. The Budget and Contracts Committee will be following this.

Bob Tibbits, DOE-RL, said included in the \$714 million is the supplemental funds of \$18.3 million. \$10 million went to spent fuel, \$5 million to PFP, and \$3.3 million to interim safe storage of the reactors associated with the F reactor. These funds were received at the end of August. Congress considered that supplemental, so those dollars carried over and are applied to current-year work scope.

Greg Jones, DOE-ORP, talked about the ORP budget. There was a supplement of \$35 million at the end of the year for ORP. The 2002 appropriation came in at \$1.035 million for a total of \$1.070 million. Within that there was a \$92 million general reduction for all of EM. ORP's share was \$8 million. There should be \$1.062 billion versus contractual requirements of \$1.07 billion. They feel that is close enough to meet their commitments. This is a positive situation.

All field offices in the EM complex were asked to justify the amount of money appropriated over what the President requested. That is \$211 million. They said they need the money.

It is getting close to time for the 2004 budget and we don't have any information about the 2003 budget. The request has been sent to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the pass-back has come back. The field has not had any information on it. This will make the budget process more problematic.

Senator Gordon Smith (Oregon) had a staff member at the meeting Wednesday night. He sent a letter to Mitch Daniels at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to request full funding. That kind of support is helpful.

Todd asked if there was any way for headquarters to take away money that has been appropriated by Congress. Bob Tibbits said they are supposed to release that money. They might be able to hold back money for other areas that are centrally funded for the complex. He has not heard of anything. They did put a hold on money in 1974. Congress could do that if there was a problem with the economy.

Ken Bracken asked DOE to keep a long view of things when looking at the lower funding and their commitment to funding the HAB. Steve Wiegman said he would carry that message to Harry Boston.

Mike Wilson said they have been assured by DOE-ORP that there is adequate funding in 2002 to cover the Director's Determination and the Director's letter asking for a recovery plan.

Harold talked about the budget process. The process outlined this year for the budget process was ideal. The plan was to go into workshops for the 2003 budget in February

DRAFT

and start talking about 2004 with the Budgets and Contracts Committee. In May we would get the final briefing on 2004. We now have the 2002 appropriation, but we haven't had any discussion with DOE on the 2003 budget. Until information comes down on the 2003 budget, we can't go ahead. Todd asked what would happen if the budget is substantially reduced. Harold said there would have to be involvement by all the committees because priorities would have to be set. If this happens, public involvement will be much more intense.

BALANCE OF MISSION TANK WASTE TREATMENT ADVICE

Steve Wiegman reported he asked Harry Boston what he needs from the HAB right now. The first thing is help with getting sustained funding. Don't do anything to jeopardize the resolve to get that funding. Secondly, he needs help getting a credible plan for finishing the cleanup job after the vitrification plant is built.

Doug Huston introduced a draft piece of advice addressing the outdated numbers being used in the Tank Waste Treatment baseline, which are inflated due to the plan at the time to move toward privatization.

Ken Bracken pointed out that taking out the privatization numbers alone might not make the baseline more realistic. There are also questions about timelines and available technology. We have made progress in characterization and safety issues, but we still don't know how to treat the waste. The 2018 retrieval deadline hasn't been proven to be achievable. The baseline is good up through the completion of the vitrification plant. After that, there are problems and questions.

Leon Swenson reminded everyone that we don't want to do anything to jeopardize the construction of the treatment facility. Leon said the agency was reluctant to spend money redoing the baseline when milestones haven't been negotiated yet. But this baseline is causing problems today with things we could be doing. It will have to be a phased process.

Madeleine Brown, League of Women Voters, wasn't sure this issue rose to the level of advice. Doug Huston said the policy issue is that we are being told the vitrification plant is too expensive and waste may be left in tanks. The reason it looks too expensive is because they are using outdated numbers. Madeleine Brown doesn't see that as a policy issue, but perhaps a public involvement issue. Doug says that these are the numbers Congress sees and bases their budget decisions on.

Harold Heacock said the purpose of this advice is to express frustration and to encourage DOE to come up with defensible numbers.

Paige asked Steve Wiegman if this message needs to go to Headquarters. He said that it would be valuable to have this message on record. The numbers in their computer models are the numbers in the baseline. They really need to have the baseline updated.

DRAFT

Gordon said the problem is that it will take time for the balance of mission to be adopted and approved by everyone, and getting realistic numbers can't be done until it is. Leon Swenson said we might need to make a distinction between formally revising the baseline and getting some more realistic cost estimates.

Todd suggested that we ask them to explore funding that will allow them to safely retrieve, vitrify and dispose of tank waste.

Joe Cruz, DOE-ORP, said they have done an update of costs of retrieval for the balance of mission based on engineering work they have done with the single-shell tank (SST) retrieval demonstrations. The estimate could go up for the second phase of the project. It shouldn't go up for the treatment baseline because of retaining the first plant. He thinks closure costs will increase. Under the privatized approach, the average cost was \$25 million per single-shell tank. He hopes that cost will go down, but he can't be sure of that. They have currently proposed an average of \$45 million. That adds \$3.3 billion to the project. The important thing is to get a baseline that reflects current commitments, scheduling, and scope. Their numbers have to be submitted to Headquarters for approval because of their size, so the numbers have to be valid. They have to submit an environmental liability estimate, which is the potential cost of cleanup for the site, so credible numbers are an important part of the budget process.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local & Regional Public Health), said we should remind the agencies that the money spent at Hanford has been cost effective.

Dave Johnson, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), said that the plan to shut down the first vitrification plant and build another is the least credible part of the baseline.

The advice was accepted. It will not be sent to the Congressional delegation.

DOE-ORP RECOVERY PLAN

Doug Huston gave a brief background. Last spring DOE-ORP submitted TPA change requests that asked Ecology to move the start of construction of the vitrification plant from July of 2001. Ecology denied the request and imposed fines of \$5,000 the first week and \$10,000 every subsequent week until start of construction or until DOE submitted a recovery plan that would show that the 2007 date for start of hot operation would not be affected by the delay. They also asked for assurances that funding was available to support the work plan. DOE has submitted the plan but has not given full assurance of funding. Ecology has been reviewing the recovery plan.

Steve Wiegman said the plan looks pretty good. They submitted the schedule that Bechtel is working to as the recovery plan. Ecology has submitted comments back to DOE, and they are in clarifying conversations right now. The process is fruitful enough that they expect to have the change package for public review sometime early next year.

DRAFT

Roger Stanley (Ecology) said the recovery plan was a requirement of Tom Fitzsimmons' determination at the end of July when the deadline was missed. They decided that they would not do a line-by-line edit of the plan. They identified a fairly short list of issues and asked DOE to supplement the plan in those areas. The plan says that they can meet the 2007 date, but there is very little text that supports that assertion. There were some remnants of the old British Nuclear Fuels Ltd. (BNFL) plan in this recovery plan that need to be cleaned up.

The funding assurances were incomplete because DOE didn't have the numbers for 2002 yet. One of the assumptions in the plan was that DOE would get the money all at once rather than incrementally. The latest indication is that they will be given the money all at once.

Ecology also offered comments on a separate request on an M-45 series milestone governing waste retrieval and the eventual closure of the tank farm. They are working with them to determine whether the parties should begin to develop schedules for retrieval of SST waste. Roger thought they would probably decouple that issue from the rest of the recovery plan.

The start of construction has been moved out to the end of 2002. Bechtel is trying to begin sooner. They would agree to move the TPA milestone from the end of 2009 to January of 2011 for the completion of hot commissioning. They would also move a couple of dates associated with the low-activity waste disposal facility to line up with the baseline. They are optimistic that these changes can go out for public comment in January.

Susan Leckband recommended caution on the funding for the vitrification plant. She reminded everyone that historically, even pouring concrete does not guarantee completion. One attempt to build the vitrification plant is now the canister storage building. We have to commit to staying on top of funding every year.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WHITE PAPER

Bill Kinsella presented the white paper on behalf of the Public Involvement Committee. He said when the Board restructured earlier this year; they began a thorough review of public involvement. He stressed the need to educate the public about Hanford. Agency people come and go, but the public remains. They are part of the institutional memory on Hanford.

Evidence of quality public involvement is when plans change in accordance with public suggestions. The public should have a say in how public involvement is conducted. An ongoing relationship fosters trust in the public.

Bill presented ten criteria for judging public involvement. Bill asked for Board input on these criteria and for direction on where the committee should go with this work.

DRAFT

Pam Brown pointed out that you can't present the same information to the public that knows very little about Hanford as you can to the people who are involved in it regularly. She said there is frustration with trying to have public meetings where the public is focused solely on the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) and the agencies are not able to get into other Hanford issues.

Paige Knight said the public doesn't need the level of detail that is used in HAB meetings. It is important to keep things simple. She referred to the success of the meeting the previous night. Bill Kinsella thought it was successful because Hanford Watch listened to the public in constructing that forum and were responsive to what works and what doesn't. He said that the demonstrations at public meetings are a sign of frustration among the public.

Gariann said making technical issues accessible is an area where the Board can help the agencies. This is the help the agencies have been asking for. The Public Involvement white paper is background for the task force.

Betty Tabbutt, WA League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), said she is always amazed at how someone unfamiliar with technical issues can cut to the core of an issue. She said the rage and frustration expressed by the public are indicators of how important these issues are in the region.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental & Public Interest Organizations), said the Community Relations Plan developed with Heart of America Northwest and Columbia Riverkeeper was successful and could serve as a pattern for ongoing public involvement.

There was some discussion and confusion as to whether the Board is supposed to actually do public education or just advise the agencies on how to do it.

Ken Bracken said that in addition to advising the agencies about their public involvement, some thought should be given to the relationship of the committee to the HAB itself. Ken Bracken wanted to see the Public Involvement Committee work on broadening the impact of the Board meetings by expanding the people who attend. In that regard, he discussed the possibility of holding HAB meetings in different locations and tying in college campuses and populations in problem solving.

Bill suggested having public involvement activities in conjunction with HAB meetings.

Harold Heacock pointed out that the question in the report about the HAB's proper role in public involvement is central and that we still don't have an answer about it. Committees should focus on answering that question. Bill suggested that HAB issues are only part of the issues that the public uses to make decisions about Hanford.

DRAFT

Norma Jean Germond, Public-at-Large, said that in addition to the elements of public involvement already discussed, physical access has to be considered. The location and transportation to it need to be accessible to people physically and financially.

Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland, said we shouldn't equate public involvement with meetings. There may be other elements to it. Education needs to precede meetings. Keith Smith added that there is a lot of misinformation among the public. Wanda Munn, Benton-Franklin Council of Governments (Local Government Interests), said that the Board should do the best it can to remove obstacles to public involvement realizing that you can't force people to get involved. We need to recognize our limitations.

Madeleine Brown said there are two types of public involvement: TPA-related, and the rest. She referred to someone who wrote a letter to DOE and didn't get a response for a year.

Norm Dyer said that before people can benefit from public involvement as the Board thinks of it, there needs to be a reaching out to the public and public education. Trying to do both in-depth public involvement and public education in the same meeting is unsuccessful. When the agencies interact with the public, they need to speak in very general terms and not get too technical.

Jim Trombold reminded members that all members could do a better job of communicating with their own constituencies. He suggested taking things like the Oregon Department of Energy Vision and making it available to public television. Public discussion should be a part of the media. HAB members might make themselves available to civic organizations.

Dennis Faulk said this was the most substantive discussion there has ever been on public involvement. He would like to see the Public Involvement Committee and the task force work together on the things in the white paper to give the agencies the help they have asked for. Todd suggested that Public Involvement Committee members should sign up for the task force.

Leon Swenson pointed out that it is the responsibility of the agencies to do public involvement, not the HAB. The HAB will help. He pointed out that for people to participate in the public involvement, they need to understand how the issues affect them. He suggested that the Public Involvement Committee should work with the task force closely.

Shelley Cimon cited an example of teaching nursing students about treating the effects of Hanford. This was one way of bring Hanford issues to a relevant level in people's lives in the course of everyday life. Jim Curdy told of experiences he has had in making issues relevant to the public.

DRAFT

Paige said people lose interest in Hanford when they don't see progress. She also stressed that the small number of people who consistently show up for meetings are very important and should not be ignored.

Amber Waldref said the one way to make meetings more effective would be to have mutually understood ground rules going into the meetings. This helps avoid disruption. They were hoping to have more concrete guidelines with the public relations plan.

Bill asked if the Board wants to pursue this public involvement work. The Board agreed that they did and that it should continue within the Public Involvement Committee. There was discussion about whether to formally adopt the white paper. Paige Knight wanted the agencies to have it as a formal document to refer to.

Madeleine suggested that the committee might review the document and bring it back to the Board to be endorsed. Bill Kinsella said they might do that for the February meeting.

Norma Jean Germond mentioned the principles developed in an Openness Workshop a few years ago regarding public involvement. She suggested that some of those are pertinent to this Public Involvement white paper and the committee should review those and possibly develop some advice. The Openness principles are on the Hanford Home Page.

Dennis Faulk said it is important for this white paper to come to the agencies as advice so that it gets into their system. Max Power said the agencies have asked the Board to evaluate the way they do their public involvement, and it would be helpful if the work done in the past could be drawn together into one set of criteria for evaluation public involvement.

REVIEW OF AGENCY RESPONSES TO HAB ADVICE

Doug Huston reported that the Board's advice regarding the Environmental Assessment (EA) to expand burial grounds was heeded. The advice suggested waiting for the Environmental Impact Statement to be concluded before doing expansion. Beth Bilson said they are going to hold off as long as they can and try to move the EIS along as fast as possible.

TRAVEL UPDATE

Gail McClure, Department of Energy-Richland (DOE-RL), updated the Board on what the travel expenses were for the year. Kristy Collins, Infomatics (Contractor) and Kim Ballinger, Critique (Contractor), have helped handle the travel accounting. They will be the Board contacts for travel until Gail's replacement is in place. Gail said the Board needs \$10,000 a month for travel. They haven't been using that much. Soon there won't be that much available. It is no longer possible to hold over unused funds. The Board has done a better job of turning in travel vouchers. Provided everything stays the same

DRAFT

next year, the budget will be sufficient. In addition to travel, there are expenses for lodging, copier machines at meetings, and audio/visual equipment at meetings.

Jerry Pollet said it looks as though there is money in the budget that could be used for travel for other organizations participating in the task force. Gail said that the money cannot be used to fund outside travel. Also, there will be additional meetings next year.

Ken Bracken asked Gail if she had any parting advice or observations for the Board. She suggested that the Board try to keep a more positive attitude.

PROPOSED MEETING SCHEDULE FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2002

February 6-7, Kennewick (West Coast Hotel.)

April 4-5, Tri-Cities

June 6-7, Hood River

July 11-12, Tri-Cities

September 5-6, Olympia

November 7-8, Tri-Cities

December 5-6, Portland

Harold Heacock was not enthusiastic about going to Hood River. The Oregon Hanford Waste Board has met there and was dissatisfied with it. There was discussion about the proposed locations. People mentioned La Grand, Oregon; Ellensburg, Washington; Spokane, Washington. Some noted that Seattle was omitted. Gail said that it has gotten difficult to get affordable facilities in Seattle. Portland and Seattle are the most expensive cities. La Grand is similar. Richland is the least expensive. Some members wanted to explore using university campuses or locating near a university. Todd will use his discretion to work on finalizing the locations.

TOPICS FOR NEXT BOARD MEETING

- Budget update
- Response to 100 and 300 Area change package
- Task force
- River Contract

Jim Trombold would like to hear from a security expert about Hanford security issues after September 11th. Beth suggested that might come through the Health and Safety Committee.

CONFERENCE CALLS

Tank Waste Committee, December 10, 3:00 p.m.

Budget and Contracts, December 11, 10:30 a.m.

Health and Safety, December 11, 2:00 p.m.

DRAFT

Task Force, December 12, 9:00 - 12:00

Executive Committee, December 12, 3:00 p.m.

There are no committee meetings in December.

TANK WASTE CLOSURE WORKSHOP

Todd Martin and Ken Bracken attended the last Tank Waste Closure Workshop. This is the fifth workshop where the tank waste sites come together to talk about progress on closing tanks over the last year. A major topic was the "loop-holing" approach to the definition of high-level waste and how that could affect closing tanks. Todd's impression is that Savannah River is cutting corners and that they are generally getting support from Headquarters for their approach. His concern is that Hanford will be pressured to cut the same corners.

Ken Bracken added that it is good to see the work going on across the complex and the technologies being used for tank cleaning. He said that Savannah River and Idaho are planning to use grout to close tanks. Savannah River has already grouted two tanks; Idaho will grout a tank in place in 2003. Ken said that the most troubling thing was to learn the definition of high-level waste, particularly where it has leaked into the ground. It isn't under the environmental part. It's under their jurisdiction over atomic energy produced and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, not under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 or the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (RCRA/CERCLA.)

Norma Jean Germond asked how the others received the Hanford report. Todd said they tended not to be well received because of the emphasis on not having a treatment plant yet. Joe Cruz did a good job of outlining demonstrations towards closure. We are less well received when asking probing questions about how plans on other sites fit with the regulations. These questions were aimed at the regulators of the other sites. Mike Wilson was there and did a good job in approaching those questions.

Todd did not find out how the material being grouted at Savannah River compares to the material in our tanks. There are similarities between the radionuclides in the tanks on the two sites, but not in the chemical constituencies and physical characteristics. Ours is more complex; theirs is more uniform.

Ken said the people who are asking questions about Hanford are beginning to understand the issues better. There is a lot of misunderstanding between DOE employees from different sites. They are very focused on their particular sites. DOE does not have a national level strategic plan for high-level waste. When Ken asked if they did have one, they were shown the September 1999 draft plan, and Ken was told he shouldn't have it because it hasn't gone out for public comment yet.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND UPDATES

DRAFT

Leon Swenson said the Tank Waste Committee has framed their work plan in terms of policy issues and associated policy questions to be dealt with. They have chosen four priority items to work on: River Protection Project (RPP) risks, tank closure, RPP baseline, and space and capacity issues. Remaining items will be delayed until the task force has done its work.

Dennis Faulk reported that Doug Sherwood had felt very encouraged by the November 5th meeting with Jessie Roberson. After receiving the memo, he was less optimistic. The Richland office was happy with the amount of time they were given by Ms. Roberson and Mr. Card. Max added that Bob Card had actually spent a couple of hours in the discussion, and Tom Fitzsimmons felt he had been educated about some of the particular concerns of tank waste. They also got a sense of the depth of Mr. Card's concern about the out year costs. There was increased understanding on both sides.

MISCELLANEOUS

Doug Huston noted that the advice that went through committees prior to the Board meeting was handled easily. The pieces that started with the Board were not. It was agreed that the need for expediency outweighs the process.

The self-evaluation forms were turned in. They will be given to the facilitation team to be compiled, forwarded to the agencies, and then will be published. The process was changed this year in response to feedback from the Board.

Leon Swenson asked if there was some mechanism for imposing self-control in our discussions at Board meetings to eliminate repetition and monopolizing. Todd said that one thing that would help is to be sure work has been done in committees before things come to the Board. The task force has complicated that process for the moment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marilyn Reeves said that one of the key things the HAB has going for it is tenacity. The memo from Jessie Roberson and the delegation of authority contradict each other. She remarked on the fact that Congress understands what the administration does not. This points to the high learning curve on Hanford issues. We have educated many, many people in different administrations. We are starting over again. She cited Congressman "Doc" Hastings who became a strong advocate after being educated on Hanford issues. She talked about the decision on the Board not to compete with other sites for money. She said the cultivation of the other Boards will stand this Board in good stead.

Doug Riggs represents the Hanford Information Network. He pointed out that there are elements of the Jessie Roberson memo that we agree with. That should be emphasized in whatever the response to the memo turns out to be. This memo is directed to all the sites. His visit with Bob Card last week in Washington, D.C. brought out that these people are concerned with finding cheaper ways of doing things. The HAB should not jump to the

DRAFT

conclusion that they are abandoning treatment. The Department is looking for ideas. It is better to keep the tone of this letter to asking for clarification.

George Ward has been a consulting engineer in Orlando. He chanced upon the meeting Wednesday night and was invited to attend the HAB meeting. He commended the group for having an open invitation to the public to attend. He felt more informed after being at the meeting and reminded the Board that they are among the most educated on Hanford issues. He suggested allocating some funds to public relations. One suggestion was having a delegate from local science classes from each high school where meetings are held. Make those delegates go back to their schools and spread information for the Board.

James R. Wilkinson lives in Pendleton, Oregon. He was asking for advice from the Board. He has been appointed to the Environmental Management Advisory Board Alternative Technology to Incineration Committee. They are going to be having a national forum and he wanted to let the Board know so they could coordinate efforts or participation. He will leave copies of written material. A blue ribbon panel from the EMAB established the Alternative Technology Committee as well as the national forum. Their recommendations can be found at <http://www.em.doe.gov/emab/atcomm.html>.

ATTACHMENT 1 – ATTENDEES

HAB Members and Alternates

Mark Beck, Member	Todd Martin, Member	Susan Hughs, Alternate
Ken Bracken, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	David Johnson, Alternate
Pam Brown, Member	Gordon Rogers, Member	William Kinsella, Alternate
Shelley Cimon, Member	Leon Swenson, Member	Debra McBaugh, Alternate
James Cochran, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate
Jim Curdy, Member	Betty Tabbutt, Member	Dennis Newland, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Tim Takaro, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Daniel Simpson, Alternate
Abe Greenberg, Member	Kristy Baptiste-Eke, Alternate	Keith Smith, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Madeleine Brown, Alternate	John Stanfill, Alternate
Doug Huston, Member	Dirk Dunning, Alternate	Stan Stave, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Norm Dyer, Alternate	Amber Waldref, Alternate
Robert Larson, Member	Gariann Gelston, Alternate	
Susan Leckband, Member	Jim Hagar, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Beth Bilson, DOE	Max Power, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique, Inc.
F. J. Cruz, DOE	Ron Skinnarland, Ecology	John Britton, Bechtel Nat.
Greg Jones, DOE	Roger Stanley, Ecology	Nancy Meyers, Bechtel/Hanford
Marla Marvin, DOE	Joy Turner, Ecology	Jeff Hertel, Fluor Hanford
Gail McClure, DOE	Mike Wilson, Ecology	Barbara Wise, Fluor Hanford
*****, DOE	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Peter Bengtson, PNNL/ORP

DRAFT

*****, DOE	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues	John Holbrook, PNNL
Steve Wiegman, DOE	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues	Kristy Collins, Informatics
Dennis Faulk EPA	Linda Grotefendt, EnviroIssues	Ann Richardson, Congressman David Wu
Laura Cusack, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues	Andy Martinez, IMC
John Price, Ecology	Jamie Wamsley, EnviroIssues	A.C. Etheridge, CHG
		James R. Wilkinson, WG Cons.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Les Davenport, Self	Merilyn Reeves, self	John Stang, Tri-Cities Herald
Mike Goddu, GHJ Consulting	Doug Riggs, HIN	George D. Ward, George D. Ward Assoc.