

DRAFT

Hanford Advisory Board

Draft Meeting Summary v1

February 7-8, 2002

West Coast Hotel, Kennewick, WA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY2

WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS4

100/300 AREA TPA DRAFT CHANGE PACKAGES5

FUNDING PROFILE FOR 100/300 AREA CLEANUP7

RESPONSE TO HAB ADVICE #12310

DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR CREATION OF EXPOSURE SCENARIO TASK FORCE10

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FY 2002 FUNDING12

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FY 2003 BUDGET PROPOSAL13

DRAFT LETTER ON OFF-SITE WASTE AND NATIONAL DIALOG16

DRAFT TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WHITE PAPER17

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ISSUE MANAGER UPDATES17

BOARD BUSINESS21

RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN22

PUBLIC COMMENT22

ATTENDEES23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

100/300 AREA TPA DRAFT CHANGE PACKAGES

Advice was adopted that included the following points:

- The milestones are good, but won't work without adequate funding.
- Remember groundwater.
- Remember worker, public, and environmental safety when declaring buildings surplus.
- Remember M-91 activities: remote-handled TRU waste.
- The River Corridor contract needs to be aligned with the TPA.

OVERVIEW OF CHANGE PACKAGES AND AGENCY PERSPECTIVES

Doug Sherwood, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) gave an overview of the four change packages.

- M-1600A sets the cleanup schedule for all source waste sites in the 100 Area.
- M-93 sets the schedule for interim safe storage of the reactors in the 100 Area. These have been accelerated.
- M-1600B completes cleanup in the 300 Area.
- M-91 milestones are new and cover development of a treatment facility for handling remote-handled TRU waste.

Existing milestones are unchanged. Spent fuel has not been completed for the K reactor. Design work has not been done for N reactor. It will be done over the next few years.

Cleanup work outside the fence in the 300 Area will be completed by 2012. The work on 618-10 and 11 should be done by 2018, but it needs to be coordinated with M-91 milestones.

There are 135 structures to be demolished in the 300 Area. Not all have been contaminated. All the characterization that can be done at this point has been done. The Board has recommended that buildings should be left and reused if possible.

The agencies and the Board are pleased with the change packages.

PRESENTATION ON FUNDING PROFILE FOR 100/300 AREA CLEANUP

Rich Holton, Department of Energy, Richland Office (DOE-RL), presented an overhead slide showing the funding profile. The information is about a year old and is based on the old baseline. Groundwater is not included because the contractors are not addressing groundwater. The funding is sufficient to cover the M-92 milestones now undergoing public comment.

Board members expressed concern over the out-dated information and the period of time covered in the profile. The agencies will work on an updated profile this summer.

DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR THE CREATION OF AN EXPOSURE SCENARIO TASK FORCE

DRAFT

The task force determined at their January meeting that the task force would be sponsored by the HAB, the participants will be Board members and a few highly affected stakeholders, and the products will not be Board products, although the HAB can adopt them. Committees can use the task force products to formulate Board advice.

A letter was drafted proposing the formation of the task force. The Board adopted the letter, and it is being sent to the agencies. The approval should be forthcoming before the end of February, but March is a more reasonable target for the next task force meeting.

HAB funds will not be used to pay for the participation of outside organizations. There should be no problem with funding task force meetings for Board members.

DOE FY 2002 FUNDING

Harold Heacock and Bob Tibbets, DOE-RL, discussed the DOE-RL budget for 2002. Bob said they are still analyzing it, but it looks like the basic activities in the 100 and 300 Areas consistent with the draft RFP will be funded as well as things that fall under achievable TPA milestones.

DOE-ORP thinks they will have enough funds this year.

There is a hope that money held out by Headquarters could come back to the site on some level.

FY 2003 Budget Proposal

The proposed budget for 2003 is \$262 million short of level funding. It is up to \$350 million short of full compliance funding. There is an \$800 million separate fund set aside for sites who have signed agreements that accelerate cleanup and reduce costs.

Keith Klein, DOE-RL, warned the Board against knee-jerk reactions to this budget proposal. The agencies see it as a floor. He commended the administration for reviewing inefficiencies and demanding accountability. He said the Hanford site is in a good position to meet all the requirements for receiving additional funding.

The top-to-bottom review and the budget proposal are integrally linked. The Budget and Contracts Committee will examine the top-to-bottom review and bring advice to the April meeting.

Advice was drafted and adopted on the budget proposal.

DRAFT LETTER ON OFF-SITE WASTE AND NATIONAL DIALOGUE

At the December meeting, the Board decided to send old advice under a new cover letter on this subject. The Board reviewed the advice and determined that it was not relevant and did not call for a fully vetted national dialog. They decided not to send the advice.

RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN ADVICE

Amber Waldref reviewed the response and talked about what Board advice was taken and what was not. She wondered how the Committee could monitor the implementation of the plan. Dennis Faulk, (EPA) said he would like to see more discussion in the Committee on the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA).

Draft Meeting Summary

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

Draft Meeting Summary

February 7-8, 2002

Kennewick, Washington

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 three public comment periods: two on Thursday and one on Friday.

Board members in attendance are listed in Attachment 1, as are members of the public. Three board seats were not represented: Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation (CTUIR) (Ex-Officio), Michael Farrow, primary member; Nez Perce (Tribal Government), Patrick Sobotta, primary member; and Yakama Nation (Tribal Government), Russell Jim, primary member.

WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

No new members were introduced. Todd Martin announced that Victor Moore, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Local Environmental Interests), has resigned his seat leaving a vacancy.

Mike Gearheard, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), reviewed the rotation for filling Doug Sherwood's (EPA) position until his replacement is found, a process that will take several months. There will be a nationwide search. If Board members have input, they may contact the EPA office.

The Department of Energy, Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP) will have a meeting Thursday evening at 5:30 to discuss permitting issues concerning the vitrification plant.

Todd Martin announced that the Paducah Advisory Board invited him to their operational retreat the first week in March to talk about how the Hanford Advisory Board works because they have been impressed with this Board's operation.

Mary Ann Wuennecke, Department of Ecology (Ecology) announced that the public comment period on the first phase of dangerous waste permits for the vitrification plant runs from March 11th through April 24th.

Peter Bengston, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), announced another public comment period starting March 11th for the change package for the vitrification plant recovery plan. The plan has been submitted to Ecology to negotiate new milestones covering new construction for the vitrification plant.

A letter from Gail McClure was read. She expressed appreciation for her retirement party in December in Portland.

MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting summary of the December HAB meeting was approved with minor corrections.

CHAIR'S OVERVIEW

Todd Martin stressed the importance of this Board meeting because of the large number of policy issues requiring attention. Unified effort will be required to prioritize and accomplish the work before the Board. He said the field offices are somewhat shackled, and the Board is in a unique position to provide guidance. Keith Klein, Department of Energy - Richland Office (DOR-RL), and Harry Boston, Department of Energy - Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP), will hold a meeting Friday afternoon for the public and the Board to discuss the FY 2003 budget proposal. Therefore, the Board work has to be done in less time than normal.

100/300 AREA TPA DRAFT CHANGE PACKAGES

Doug Huston, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), presented advice written at the January 24th meeting of the task force. This task force was charged with two things at the December Board meeting: to develop advice on the proposed change packages and to put together a proposal to the agencies to establish the task force.

The basic points covered in the advice are:

- These are good milestones
- These milestones won't work without adequate funding
- Don't forget about groundwater
- Remember worker, public, and environmental safety when declaring buildings surplus
- Don't forget M-91 activities: remote-handled TRU waste
- The River Corridor contract needs to be aligned with the TPA

After discussion of the FY 2003 budget proposal, the portion of the advice referring to the budget was removed. Richard Berglund, Central WA Building Trades Council (Hanford Work Force), thought something might need to be added on groundwater monitoring off site. Susan Leckband, Non-Union, Non-Management (Hanford Work Force), wanted clarification on the meaning of "unrestricted use." Doug Huston said it is a legally defined term, which includes a safe environment for free access to people.

The advice was adopted.

Overview of Change Packages and Agency Perspectives

Doug Sherwood gave a presentation on the tentative agreement on the River Corridor contract change packages and the Agreements in Principle (AIPs) on which the negotiations were based.

Two change packages are on the 100 Area: M-1600A and M-93. M-1600A sets the cleanup schedule for completing all clean up of all source waste sites in the 100 Area. M-93 sets the schedule for the interim safe storage (ISS) of the reactors in the 100 Area. Existing milestones are unchanged, but new milestones are set for initiating and completing the cleanup in each major area. M-93 milestones for the reactors have been accelerated.

The main issues for cleanup of waste sites and ISS of reactors is finishing the K reactor where they are waiting for spent fuel to be complete, and N reactor areas. The design work has not been

done yet for N reactor. It cannot be done the same way as the C reactor and other single-pass reactors. The engineering will be done over the next few years.

Other things addressed are small waste sites around the Hanford town site and White Bluff town site, and a small arms range where lead has to be removed.

The second set of change packages is 1600B, which completes cleanup of the 300 Area. These milestones are in three separate parts. One deals with 12 waste sites outside the fence to be completed by 2012. Work needs to be done on 618-10 and -11 by 2018, but that work needs to be coordinated with the M-91 milestones for developing a treatment facility for handling remote-handled TRU waste.

Within the 300 Area Complex are a number of waste sites and 135 structures that DOE plans to take down. An overhead was shown of the building locations and priority for demolition.

The change package allows for taking down all the buildings. The Board has advised that the buildings be evaluated to see if any can be left and reused. EPA is attempting to put together a schedule for doing that evaluation. Those determinations for the 300 Area should be done in 2007. This part of the work falls under a new M-94 milestone series. Cleanup along the river is scheduled for completion in 2018 with the major waste sites done by 2012.

Tim Takaro, University (University of Washington), asked about hazards other than radiological. Dave Evans, EPA, said everything that can be done so far has been done. Gerry Pollet, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interests), said the cost would be higher than indicated because the cost to suit up workers for beryllium contamination is greater. Dave Evans didn't think that beryllium was a consistent issue for all of the buildings. Gerry said about 63 percent of the buildings on the suspected Beryllium list are in this area. A survey needs to be done to reassess the costs.

Maynard Plahuta, City of Richland (Local Government Interests), asked how well the buildings have been characterized. He was concerned about things like the 316 and 314 buildings that had problems with their ventilation systems. Dave Evans said there have been a series of reviews, and they are as close as they can be right now. Rich Holton said some of the buildings have never been contaminated.

Tony Brooks, University (Washington State University), suggested it would be helpful to the public to have a list showing which buildings have been shown to have radioactive contamination and which have never been contaminated. The Tri Party Agreement (TPA) does not directly deal with that, and DOE has not identified the status of many of the buildings. Todd said that there had been frustration in getting DOE-Headquarters (HQ) to say who owns the buildings. Tony said that DOE gave building 436 to Washington State once they determined it wasn't contaminated.

Paige Knight, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interest Organizations), recommended using Doug Sherwood's slide as a visual aid for the public. She said that the task force offered a lot of advice on changing the mailer that is going to the public, and their advice was taken seriously. Doug Huston commended Paige for her work in that area.

Gordon Rogers, Public-at-Large, asked what the Record of Decision (ROD) was for cleanup for the 12 sites outside the fence in the 300 Area. That standard is for industrial use.

DRAFT

Gordon asked why it is not consistent with the unrestricted use standard for other areas that have been cleaned up in the 100 Area. Doug Sherwood said it is consistent with the 300 Area FF-1 cleanup decision. Most of these sites are in industrial areas. He believes that in some cases, the burial grounds will be cleaned up to unrestricted use standards. The exception is uranium in FF-1, because there is a very low background concentration level of uranium at Hanford. The other contaminants were cleaned to below Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) Level B residential standards. Currently, the standard for uranium cleanup is to clean the groundwater to industrial use levels. It doesn't make sense to clean up beyond the background level of uranium throughout most of Washington State.

Susan Leckband asked about the confidence level that technology will be developed to reduce the risk in 618-10 and -11 and get it cleaned up by 2018. This is not part of this change package, and risk to groundwater is not being remediated in that area.

Doug Sherwood said that they had a lot of debate on groundwater during this process. The 300 Area FF-5 covers the groundwater operable units in the 300 Area. The monitoring plan for that operable unit has been substantially changed and approved this year. DOE has put in additional monitoring wells around 618-11. 618-10 is not affected by much contamination, although there is a uranium problem from an adjacent crib (316-4), a liquid waste disposal site. It is on the early list to be cleaned up by 2012. That is the highest tritium concentration on site. There aren't many tritium remediations available. In the absence of other contaminants, we should stay the course.

Amber Waldref, Heart of America Northwest (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interests), asked to have a visual aid for the public that shows the cleanup standards at the specific sites. She said this is a requirement for any area that will have less than unrestricted use. Dennis Faulk, EPA, said that because they were unable to use color in the brochure, trying to include that information made the brochure too confusing. John Price said this is not a cleanup decision, but just a schedule, so that information is not necessary on this piece.

Amber asked if public comment received would be used in the decision-making process. Marla Marvin, (DOE-RL) said those comments have been captured, and they can make sure those questions are addressed.

Tim Takaro asked about the impact of the 200 Area groundwater plume on the 100 Area cleanup. Doug Sherwood said the groundwater contamination in the 100 Area is not associated with the 200 Area. Past problems with migration of contaminants through Gable Gap have been taken care of by draining a holding pond. Groundwater migration has been restored to pre-contamination patterns. Stopping the contamination from the PUREX plant has helped.

Tim said the Integration Project Expert Panel (Expert Panel) that monitors groundwater has not been funded and is likely to be disbanded. Shelley Cimon, Oregon Hanford Waste Board (State of Oregon), expressed concern over the possible disbanding of that panel which has reassured citizens of oversight of groundwater issues. Dennis Faulk said that the Expert Panel will probably be reconstituted under a different format.

Rick Leaumont, Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society (Local Environmental Interests), asked if any consideration has been given to the potential impacts of the proposed Black Rock Reservoir on these plumes. Doug Sherwood didn't know the exact location of it. Depending on where it is, it has the potential to elevate the water table in areas of concern. It should be looked at carefully. We have made an effort to see the contaminated water doesn't get to the ground, and

the water table is receding. If the water table goes back up in the affected areas, there could be a problem.

Wade Riggsbee, City of Richland (Local Government Interests), said there were some studies that looked at the potential for surface flooding of the old Columbia River channel that borders Rattlesnake and comes up to the edge of the 200 Area. Doug said they looked at the possibility that the upgraded irrigation practices would raise the water table. EPA commissioned United States Geological Survey (USGS), their consultant on groundwater issues, to look at it and found it would not have a significant impact. But it was a limited study.

Agency Perspective

John Price, Ecology, said this change package lays out cleanup in a logical manner with a good schedule for reactor cleanup. There are solid dates for the K and N reactor milestones. Most hazardous sites in the 300 Area have target dates for early cleanup. There are additional commitments in the change packages that the regulators will put into the remedial design/remedial work plan so they become enforceable DOE commitments. Some of those include a schedule for final remedial investigation and feasibility studies. The logical sequence for the 100 Area is to complete the reactor areas every couple of years starting with B/C and then K and N and setting up a schedule to see if further cleanup needs to be done. There is a schedule for determining the final configuration for the B reactor. In order to incorporate B reactor in planning, its role in long-term stewardship needs to be figured out early.

Finally, there is a schedule for engineering on the river pipelines. John noted the absence of groundwater issues in this package. He said pump and treat systems at K, N, D, and H reactors are not affected by this package. Groundwater will be considered independently for each reactor site as it is cleaned up.

One additional commitment the regulators are asking for is the K area where the tritium concentrations in groundwater are increasing. Ecology will ask DOE for early removal of waste at the 118 K-1 burial ground and a condensate crib, both of which may be potential sources of that contamination. This package continues the effort to take care of sources of contamination.

Dave Evans, Department of Energy - Richland Office (DOE-RL), agreed that the change packages are good. The comment period goes through March 14th. There will be a meeting in Hood River, Oregon on March 6th.

Leon Swenson, Public-at-Large, asked how this change package fits with demonstrating to Headquarters that the Hanford site is moving forward consistent with the values laid out in the top-to-bottom review. Dave Evans said it matches up very well. However, Doug Sherwood pointed out that the budget proposal does not match up well with the stated goals of the change packages.

Jim Trombold, Physicians for Social Responsibility (Local and Regional Public Health), asked what happens to contaminated groundwater after the sources have been taken care of. Doug Sherwood said there are different answers for different areas. In F and B/C areas, the concentrations of chromium are not sufficient to impel groundwater action. The actions in place today are for chromium (K, D, and H areas) and are focused on protecting salmon spawning areas of the Columbia. The concentration is about one-fifth of the drinking water standard. Stopping the sources of contamination will result in continually cleaner water. The Strontium 90 in the N

reactor area will be problematic for a very long time. It is unlikely to be cleaned up by 2018. Chromium and other major contaminants in the hundred areas can be complete by 2018.

Tony Brooks, Washington State University (University), asked for clarification on Strontium 90. Doug Sherwood said it would not be cleaned up to drinking water standards for the area beneath and down gradient for 1301 and 1325 N. It is already reaching the river. John Price said Ecology is asking for an ecological risk assessment for it in 2004. Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health (Ex-Officio Representatives), said that a study on strontium 90 in the 100 Area was passed out several years ago. It included a lot of analysis from people using the river. It said that the drinking water does not go over the limits for public use.

Todd summarized by saying that people generally agree that these are good change packages. The only question is the funding.

PRESENTATION ON FUNDING PROFILE FOR 100/300 AREA CLEANUP

Rich Holton (DOE-RL) distributed a handout on the funding profile for the 100 and 300 Area cleanup. Wade Ballard (DOE-RL) said the data used is about a year old and is based on the 2012 plan and the baseline currently in use. Groundwater is not included because the River Corridor contractors are not being asked to address groundwater. The cost of the pump and treat facilities and other upgrades are not included. The 2012 plan assumed that they would finish the 300 Area in 2012, so the numbers on the chart are sufficient to cover the milestones just negotiated for M-92, which is out for public review now.

Gerry Pollet said the portion for the cleanup of the 100 Area appears to be about \$60 million a year for the next few years. He wanted to know what the 100 Area and scheduled 300 Area FF2 portions would be. Rich said some of the Environmental Restoration Disposal Facility (ERDF) funds have to be applied as well. The 300 Area includes more than soil sites. Deactivating structures (such as 324 and 327) and safely maintaining facilities represents roughly \$35-39 million. Another \$10 million may be needed to deactivate buildings included in later milestones.

Gerry asked if adding risk assessments within a year of finishing the reactor area, having a milestone for beginning the groundwater risk assessment, is less than the cost that is being deferred from the 300 Area. Rich assumed so. Gerry asked about the costs if 300 FF2 and soil units in the 300 Area in the first years are cleaned up to unrestricted instead of industrial levels. Rich said that analysis hasn't been done.

Leon Swenson expressed concern over this scope of work based on the apparent reduction in funding reflected in the budget proposal and the values of the top-to-bottom review. Rich put it into perspective by saying that this profile is only for the River Corridor. As some areas require less funding, those funds can be applied to other projects. The site needs to be looked at as a whole.

Paige Knight suggested that this chart is difficult to understand and should be replaced with something clearer for the public.

Gerry asked why the area closest to the river is not being remediated by 2012 given that it has a big impact on public access. Doug Sherwood said the priorities were assigned in response to input from the Board. Everything being done by 2012 is outside the fence, along the street, and by Energy Northwest. Everything but 618-10 and 11 is being cleaned up by 2012. Rich said that most of the buildings by the river are office buildings that will likely remain because they are in

good condition. Doug said there are very few waste sites in the area, and a bike path could be placed there if so desired. We have access up to the high water mark right now.

Greg deBruler, Columbia River Keeper (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interests), was concerned with the accuracy of the profile for the time period it covers. It doesn't reflect costs out to 2012. Rich said you could subtract \$10-40 million a year from the dark area of the chart per year. The 300 Area cleanup is less, and the 100 Area cleanup should be close. The ERDF cost won't change much. The 324 and 327 buildings are still included in the TPA package and are the major drivers for the 300 Area. Dave Evans said that about 2004 and 2005, the level of building demolition activity would pick up. All 135 buildings are in the profile. Some buildings will remain up to 2018, so there needs to be a new profile. Rich said they will work on the new profile this summer.

RESPONSE TO HAB ADVICE #123 AND UPDATE ON STATUS

The response to Advice #123, River Corridor Cleanup Contract, characterized the advice into ten areas. Each item was addressed in terms of areas of agreement and disagreement. Clark Gibbs (DOE-RL) addressed each of the points in the response.

Bob Larson, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interests), commended DOE-RL on asking for and listening to the Board's advice, for communicating their intentions, and for making their response specific and clear. He expressed continuing concerns on some of the points of disagreement. Clark said some of the points are subjective and open to different opinions.

Gerry Pollet said the reason for some of the Board's concerns about retaliation against workers who have health and safety concerns comes out of the record of the current contractor in this area. Clark reaffirmed DOE's confidence in the contract provision for penalties for such conduct and said the views on the subject are subjective.

DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR THE CREATION OF AN EXPOSURE SCENARIO TASK FORCE

Doug Huston said the DOE provided the services of Mike Goddu as an independent facilitator for the task force. The next business of the task force is to give the agencies input on the exposure scenarios.

Doug reported that the January 24th meeting was very productive. There was a large proportion of the Board membership represented (18 to 20 people), the agenda was well focused, and people did their homework in advance.

The second day of the workshop was used to formulate the proposal for the task force. To create the proposal, the task force asked these questions:

- What is the task force's relationship to the HAB?
- What will the products be?
- Who will be on the task force?

They determined:

- This will be a HAB-sponsored task force.
- Participants will be members of the HAB and a few other highly affected stakeholders.

- The products will not be Board products, but the HAB can adopt the products.
- Committees interested in particular areas can use task force products to form Board advice.

The task force then wrote a proposal letter, they got agency input, and that letter was handed out for Board review. The proposal was altered to reflect the agencies' request for input on the 200 Area first. There is a four- to six-month life expectancy for the task force.

Agency Response

Dennis Faulk (EPA) approved the formation of the task force as a way to provide needed input to the agencies on the defined issues. He liked the proposal. Max Power (Ecology) agreed. Steve Wiegman (DOE-RL) reminded the Board that in the spectrum of issues being looked at this year, the ones being covered by the task force are one group. He will still need the participation of the Tanks Committee for other issues. Marla Marvin (DOE-RL) said that they are mindful of limited resources, both financial and time.

Discussion

Jim Trombold, Local and Regional Public Health (Physicians for Social Responsibility), asked how quickly the agencies could authorize this task force. Dennis Faulk thought that three weeks would be possible. He reiterated that they had requested advice on the 200 Area exposure scenarios by the April Board meeting. He wants to do whatever is needed to make that happen.

Todd Martin pointed out the full slate of committee issues laid out for February. It is going to take some time for the agencies to be ready to present issues to the task force. A March target date would be more appropriate.

Gordon Rogers again expressed his strong reservation on the creation of a task force to do work that should be done in committee. He pointed to the lost time spent on process to date. Doug Huston said that what they learned from the meeting in January was that having a task force focused on a limited set of issues and having people who did their work ahead of time made the task force concept successful.

In the end, Gordon acknowledged that most of the Board wanted the task force, that he would not stand in the way, and that he might even participate. Todd agreed that having well-defined products was key to making the task force work.

Dan Simpson noted that the HAB already includes a broad range of regional interests. He was concerned that some of the things being asked of the task force actually fall under the responsibilities of the project management.

Jeff Luke expressed concern over spending additional money on HAB meetings when layoffs are taking place across the site. He considers it a contradiction to refer in the proposal to a limited number of affected parties and also to assuring a broad, open process.

Max Power (Ecology) said that given the large number of issues the Board has to deal with at the moment, having a task force focused on a very limited set of issues is an advantage. Doug Sherwood said using the committees fragments the effort too much. Each committee has a special interest. A task force gives the agencies one point of contact. The committees have their own regular work to do. Working through committees gives the agencies piecemeal advice. Having a task force allows broader participation. Marla Marvin said the advantage of the task

DRAFT

force is getting a wide range of viewpoints. In advice, inside the HAB structure, there has to be consensus. In a task force, all opinions can be included in the product.

Dennis Faulk said it is up to the agencies to invite participation. There was a sign-up sheet for people who are interested. It was hoped that many members would sign up.

Mike Goddu explained that the discussions of the task force could be far ranging and inclusive. After hearing those discussions, it may be that Board members from various committees will want to get together afterwards and write advice together based on what they have heard.

Some general concerns and the answers to them follow:

How does the task force impact committee meetings? The Board has previously agreed that the committees would give place to some extent to allow committee members to participate on the task force. Time will still be needed for committee work.

The task force needs to have balanced representation.

The task force is one element of public involvement, not the whole of it. The input from the task force will be used to formulate outreach by the agencies to the general public.

HAB money should not be used to fund travel and participation by outside organizations. DOE will consider the requests by other organizations for financial support on a case-by-case basis. There is no foreseeable problem with funding the necessary meetings within the current HAB budget. No HAB money will be used for other organizations per the law.

The agencies restated that the task force will define the values that will be used when developing risk scenarios just as the Future Land Use Group did.

Jamie Zeisloft, DOE-RL, is DOE's representative on the Hanford Natural Resource Trustee Council. That group is interested in the task force because they are dealing with some of the same issues. They are taking a wait-and-see attitude with the task force.

Todd noted that the Board has already addressed several of the items on the list we were given by the agencies in September. Todd insisted that the Board products be well defined with target dates.

Products for the April Board meeting from the task force will be advice on the risk assessment scenario and the Central Area change package.

The Board approved the proposal and a sign-up sheet was posted for interested Board members.

Doug Huston and Greg deBruler will continue to lead the task force.

DOE FY 2002 FUNDING

Harold Heacock, Tri-City Industrial Development Council (TRIDEC) (Local Business Interests), talked about the 2002 funding and the meeting that the Budgets and Contracts Committee held on Wednesday night to discuss the FY 2003 budget proposal. He introduced Bob Tibbets, DOE-RL.

Bob handed out a chart that showed the relationship of 2002 funding to 2001. The original proposal was less than what Congress allocated.

	2001	2002
Initial allocation	\$717 million	\$730 million
General reduction	\$10 million	\$92 million
Headquarter reduction	\$6 million	\$16.5 million

The initial allocation in 2001 was \$708 million. In 2002, it is \$695.5 million. The details have been discussed with the Budgets and Contracts Committee. Last year some adjustments were made to reflect a \$1 million loan that was paid back to the Albuquerque office.

Harold asked how this compares to the 2002 request and what won't get done. Bob said that \$762 million was needed to support the 2012 plan, and they are still processing what can be done. The minimum safe activities, the high-risk activities (spent fuel, Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)), the achievable TPA milestones, the basic things and the remediation activities in the 100 and 300 Areas consistent with the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) are funded.

For DOE-ORP, Steve Wiegman said the President's 2002 request was \$814 million. The congressional plus up was \$221 million, which brought appropriation up to \$1.035 billion. There was a Congressional general reduction that brought it to \$1.027 billion. There was a plus up at the end of the year of \$35 million. The end result was funding of \$1.052 billion, which was close to the baseline. He doesn't think performance in 2002 will be affected.

Pam Brown, City of Richland (Local Government Interests), mentioned the heavy Headquarters' tax this year. She had the impression they were holding back money to use for the top-to-bottom review. She asked if there was any indication that any of that money would be returned. Bob Tibbets said he hopes we stand a chance of getting some of it back, but he doesn't know any details.

Bob Tibbets named some activities that take place at Headquarters every year that benefit the whole complex such as the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCA). His understanding is that \$16.5 million may be held back for a safety assessment.

FY 2003

Harold talked about the change in the new budgeting approach for the Environmental Management (EM) program. Funding for 2002 remained level. For 2003, there is an \$800 million incentive pool, which will be allocated to sites that have signed agreements that accelerate work and reduce costs.

At the Budgets and Contracts Committee meeting Wednesday night, the committee made a list of 20 questions on the budget, how it is going to work, and its impact. That list was passed out to the Board and was given to DOE in advance of the Friday afternoon meeting with them.

Todd suggested that this list could form the basis of an agenda for the Budgets and Contracts Committee meeting next week.

Gerry Pollet presented overhead slides of the numbers. This budget proposal is linked to the top-to-bottom review. In summary, the budget is \$262 million short of level funding and possibly up to \$350 million less than full compliance funding. Last year the HAB was told that the

compliance budget for DOE-RL was \$803 million. No justification for the cuts has been given. The Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) program received no funding at all. While asking for faster cleanup (which produces more risk), less money is being allocated. Even if Hanford gets its typical share (25%) of the \$800 million, it probably won't be enough to make up the difference.

Gerry said that the top-to-bottom review calls for not vitrifying 75% of high-level waste, reclassifying transuranic (TRU) waste, leaving five times greater concentrations of TRU waste in soil, burying cesium in the soil, and expanding the use of burial grounds. The implication is that waste will be grouted in place.

Agency Response

Keith Klein (DOE-RL) spoke briefly saying that the Board needs to give this budget a chance. He is concerned about knee-jerk reactions to this new approach. He views this budget request as a floor and believes the allocation will be above the proposed amount. The extra amount will be determined by how well we align with the stated goals of the top-to-bottom review in our contracts, our understanding with the regulators, and our ability to articulate how we are dealing with risks.

The top-to-bottom review reflects the fundamental problems the new administration sees with the EM complex. Before DOE resumes business as usual, they want to see how the sites are addressing these issues. That is responsible management, and he thinks we have done a good job of addressing these issues.

Secretary Abraham has said that the \$800 million fund can be expanded later if it is needed. Sites that have participated in the new approach will get more money than in previous years. This process is leading to a system for predictable funding levels across multiple years. This is one of the things we have all been asking for.

Keith doesn't read having signed agreements to mean changing the TPA. He thinks the \$800 million will be used to allow sites to pursue and implement new efforts that will require new understandings with state and federal regulators, as well as fundamental changes in the way DOE does business.

Keith pointed out that the numbers on these pages are not the final numbers in the budget request. He said that the Hanford site can make a good case on all the points being required. We are being asked to come forward and justify how we will use the money we get, how we plan to accelerate work, and then we will be given the money we need to do it.

Discussion

Greg deBruler asked why Gerry hadn't specifically included the compliance gap. Gerry said he was just using DOE's numbers because we had a big debate last year on what the compliance gap actually was. Greg wants to see that number so we know how far out of compliance we are.

Paige Knight thinks a lot of the changes being suggested by Headquarters can only be made by Congress. If we are asked to follow some of these changes, we will be breaking the law. It takes time for Congress to change laws. She feels there is little basis for trust with the new administrators who may prove to be transient.

Keith Smith feels that the decision on who will get money from the \$800 million will be political.

Tim Takaro was concerned about the types of changes in agreements being required and how explicit Headquarters is being about those requirements. Gerry said that the term "Cleanup Agreement" is a legally defined term.

Pam Brown commended the concept of "faster and cheaper" and the improvement in the request from 2002 to 2003. However, determining what is faster and cheaper and safe for this region is a slow process. The regulators need to go through a public review process. It is overly optimistic to expect that process to happen in time to take advantage of this \$800 million fund. The concept of offering incentives to sites to find better ways of doing things is a good one for the long term. In the Constraints and Challenges to Cleanup Team (C3T) process she has seen some promising technologies that can save money in the long run. However, some money has to be spent now to take advantage of future savings. She was glad that our Northwest congressional delegation is staying involved with this.

Pam noticed in the top-to-bottom review that it says EM program wastes will be classified according to total curie count. She asked if that was appropriate and what it means, whether only high-curie content waste will be vitrified. Todd answered that it means waste will be grouted. Pam said that 75% of our waste would not be considered long-lived high-curie isotopes. Steve Wiegman said that the statement as it is written is very broad. The intent is to classify the waste based on its content rather than its origin. A lot of work would have to be done to quantify what it means. All the tank waste today is managed as high-level waste.

Susan Leckband said that we are often told that we should model Hanford on Rocky Flats. She pointed out the huge difference is size of the two sites.

Gerry encouraged the Board to speak out on this budget proposal quickly to support our Congressional delegation in their efforts to get proper funding for Hanford.

Leon Swenson pointed out a sentence in the top-to-bottom review that asserted an expectation that most of the changes recommended can be implemented within 90 days. He is concerned that the \$800 million is going to be tied up indefinitely while milestones go unmet for lack of funding.

Betty Tabbutt, WA League of Women Voters (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interests), has a concern about the good faith of the department. She questioned why agencies would negotiate new agreements when the receipt of a portion of the \$800 million is basically a lottery. We don't know if we will get funds from it.

Advice

A group of board members drafted a piece of advice overnight. The advice represented a compromise in order to keep it short and simple.

Gerry didn't feel it captured what the Board had agreed to say. He talked about receiving phone calls from agency people telling him that speaking out too strongly would jeopardize funding for Hanford. That is inappropriate in a democracy.

Dennis Faulk reminded the Board that it is early in the process and Hanford is moving in the direction specified in the top-to-bottom review. He encouraged the board to be more strategic

DRAFT

and recognize the things we do support in the plan. We should include advice to the agencies to perform their enforcement responsibilities.

Gerry strongly agreed with Dennis' point that we should add a sentence that instructs the EPA to do its regulatory duty in ensuring that TPA milestones are met and permits meet the risks.

Max Power (Ecology) said that Mike Wilson is in Washington, D.C. talking to people in Congress. Max said not to expend too much effort on the \$800 million because it has little chance of surviving. He agreed with Dennis about the tone of the advice. He also pointed out that the Board needed to decide if they were writing advice on the budget or the top-to-bottom review.

Leon Swenson said that this advice should contain itself to the budget and another piece of advice should address the top-to-bottom review. The only reason to mention the top-to-bottom review in this advice is that the budget is predicated on it.

Betty Tabbutt wanted to make a strong statement regarding the assertion that the TPA is not risk-based. Betty Tabbutt wanted to say that DOE should not be basing its budget request on the top-to-bottom review, which has not completed a public review process.

Harold said this is just a preliminary piece of advice. There will be opportunities to comment further later in the process.

Keith Smith wanted to address the lack of funding for HAMMER in this advice, but decided there would be another, better time for that.

Rick Leaumont, Local Environmental Interests (Lower Columbia Basin Audubon Society & Columbia River Conservation League), brought out the point that this advice omits the past philosophy of the Board that cleanup decisions should be made on the best available technology and science. The process of the \$800 million slush fund abuses that process.

Max said there was an article in the Seattle Times Friday morning addressing the budget. It echoed this piece of Board advice. Max pointed out that we have changed the TPA in the past and are happy to do so if it gets cleanup that meets standards, accomplishes our goals, and is consistent with the overall intent. But you really can't get all three goals of the top-to-bottom review -- better, faster, and cheaper -- all at the same time. He said the Board might want to acknowledge at some point that the Board's advice was followed in making changes to the contracts.

Keith Smith noted that faster is often cheaper when it comes to Hanford cleanup. Delays cost money.

Marla Marvin was concerned about the fact that the overall number is better than last year's request. She suggested acknowledging that and using a more positive tone. She said that the TPA is about to be revised as a result of the C3T process, and she suggested acknowledging that in the advice. Gerry thought they were counting the \$800 million in their total request to make it look the same.

The advice was adopted.

DRAFT LETTER ON OFF-SITE WASTE AND NATIONAL DIALOGUE

At the December meeting, Tim Takaro suggested that we send a piece of past advice on off-site waste and the need for a national dialogue with a new cover letter to the new management at DOE-HQ. When they looked at advice, there were actually 27 such letters. They were looking for one that Marilyn Reeves had taken to the planning committee. By they time they found it; it was almost time for this HAB meeting.

The letter was passed out for people to review and see if it is pertinent and something that we should send. After discussion, it was decided that the letter did not represent our desire to have a fully vetted national dialogue. Some of the points may be too tangential, the political climate may not fit, and we are in the process of responding to some of these issues in other advice. It was decided not to send the old letter.

DRAFT TRANSMITTAL LETTER FOR THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT WHITE PAPER

Bill Kinsella, Hanford Watch (Regional Citizen, Environmental, and Public Interests), presented a letter that the Public Involvement Committee drafted for a cover for the White Paper they presented at the December meeting. They will send the White Paper to the agencies to use as a guideline for their future public involvement work.

The letter was quickly accepted with very minor changes.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND ISSUE MANAGER UPDATES

State of the Site Meetings

The four heads of DOE-RL, DOE-ORP, EPA and Ecology went to Portland, Seattle and Pasco and had discussions with the public about the state of the Hanford site. Todd did a basic presentation about Hanford. Joy Turner said that the people involved felt it was a good set of meetings.

Constraints and Challenges to Cleanup Team (C3T)

Todd Martin, Susan Leckband, and Gerry Pollet observed the last C3T meeting. Pam Brown and Doug Huston also attended. The agencies are looking at what work can be expedited. One thing they are looking at is the cesium and strontium capsules in the Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF). They will vitrify them in the second phase, and they are considering different ways to manage them to save money on the books.

They discussed demonstrations of tank closure ideas that have been around for a long time. DOE and Ecology have always appeared to be at odds on whether they are a good idea, but it seems that Ecology has been relatively receptive to Harry Boston's overture on closing tanks early as a learning opportunity for both retrieval equipment and how to close tanks and tank farms.

Groundwater is being looked at. The agencies are working on an agreed-upon monitoring plan and the need for a comprehensive strategy, which the Board has highlighted in the past.

Harry Boston has talked to C3T about making Phase I vitrification more productive and eliminating the need for Phase II facilities.

The Central Plateau strategy is something everyone is trying to comprehend

In summary, the C3T process is producing some very nice products. The maps of the 200 Area that were developed from that process were displayed on the walls during the Board meeting.

Pam Brown added that she appreciated the openness and cooperation at the C3T meeting. It has gotten the attention of DOE-Headquarters. It puts us in a good position to compete for funding nationally. Each of the issues being discussed in the process has key people in charge of them with deadlines to meet. The HAB members who attend the meetings are taking the information back to their committees. The tank closure demonstrations will be discussed at the next Tank Committee meeting. The Department of Ecology will be talking to the River and Plateau Committee in March if there is a meeting.

Susan Leckband echoed Pam's comments. She has been giving copies of the handouts from the C3T meetings to Tammie Holm (EnviroIssues), who will make them available to Board members who would like them.

Tim Takaro asked about the life span of the C3T process. Mike Goddu said it has a one-year operating term, which goes about through June at which point there should be a vision for a path forward on a number of key issues. There is a desire to institutionalize this dialog. He said having HAB members there has made a huge difference. The issues Todd cited are only a few of the 40 or 50 topics being covered. Tom Fitzsimmons with the State is interested in expediting work, but he is not compromising on RCRA cleanup requirements. He is focusing on quality and clear definitions of cleanup.

Steve Wiegman said it is very useful to have the HAB represented at the meetings, but he wanted to encourage a closer relationship over time if possible. At a minimum, the committees should be better informed of what is happening in the process because it will be important to show that the values of the full range of stakeholders are represented. He doesn't believe a passive relationship will be sufficient.

Savannah River Groundwater Workshop

Gordon Rogers attended the workshop in Augusta, Georgia along with Greg deBruler, Dirk Dunning, Oregon Office of Energy (State of Oregon), and John Morris, who is the manager of the groundwater integration project. Dennis Faulk represented the Department of Ecology. They were given an all-day tour of the Savannah River facility. The workshop was patterned after other recent workshops such as the one on long-term stewardship.

Gordon saw a number of interesting remediation techniques including steam heating the vadose zone to volatilize the organic waste. They pumped tritium-contaminated water and used it to irrigate. The trees absorb the tritium and release it into the atmosphere in a quantity well below the regulatory standard.

Gordon presented a group of statements formulated at the meeting and asked for Board approval for Todd to sign them when they are sent to him. The Board agreed that Todd could sign them.

Dennis Faulk encouraged members to attend future workshops and said that Board interaction with the Department of Ecology does not seem to be typical at other sites.

Tank Waste Committee

Leon Swenson reported that the Tank Waste Committee met with the Budgets and Contracts Committee. They got a lot of good information, but also raised a lot of questions. The Tanks Committee will meet on February 12th. The items on the agenda will require advance homework.

River and Plateau Committee

Pam Brown reported that several members were concerned about the bankruptcy of Allied Technology Group (ATG). The bank has appointed a trustee. The company will either re-form or be sold. The facility is located in North Richland directly across the road from Hanford. Waste has been sent to ATG from around the country for treatment and packaging and return. Since they are not currently doing the treatment, there is concern about what will happen to the material currently there.

The Committee had excellent presentations from Ecology and EPA about this issue. They are monitoring the facility. The Committee has identified four questions that they will provide to the regulators in writing asking them to keep the Committee informed about developments on this issue. As of now, there doesn't seem to be any intent to dispose of the material at Hanford, but temporary storage at Hanford is a possibility.

The four questions are:

- What is going to happen to DOE waste from non-Hanford sites now at ATG?
- What is the possible impact on the M-91 milestones due December 31st, 2002?
- What will happen to the money DOE-RL paid to ATG for treatment of waste? (Fluor has placed a lien against the ATG facility, but Fluor is not an agency.)
- Who is responsible for compliance with Ecology and Washington Department of Health permits?

Public Involvement

The White Paper has been completed and is being sent out. The Committee is focusing on the Community Relations Plan now.

Health, Safety, and Environmental Protection Committee

Dan Simpson said the Committee's primary focus right now is the Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS).

Tim Takaro said the committee was pleased to see from Jessie Roberson's memo that ISMS is a top priority for her.

The committee is concerned about the site-wide consistency of Response to Medical Surveillance Exams. Employee Job Task Analyses (EJTA) and Job Hazard Analyses (JHA) primarily identify hazards on the job. The EJTA is the individual report of a worker's exposure over the previous year. This is the only time when an individual has their hazard assessed, and they are assigned to medical surveillance based on those hazards. This allows a determination of whether the controls are adequate to protect the workers from disease. If not, changes can be made based on this information. The other purpose of these exams is to determine who is on site and what hazards they are being exposed to; to determine that there is proper monitoring, and to be sure they are fit for duty.

It has come to the attention of the Committee that Bechtel National is no longer participating in the site-wide ISMS EJTA system. They have their own system. The problem with that is BNI's information is not getting into the site system. There is no way to know if those workers are being adequately protected, and it sets a precedent for other contractors coming to the site to opt out of the program

Keith Smith said DOE wrote the RFP in such a way as to cause a contractor to do its own program and he wondered why. Tim speculated that it might be a cost issue.

Susan Leckband asked if Bechtel was cooperating with attempts to get answers about this issue. Tim said they are. Bechtel National believes its program adequately protects its workers. The Committee is looking at the possibility of merging Bechtel data with the rest of the ISMS data. They don't believe it will be possible.

Pam Brown stated that Bechtel is not working with the same contamination as the rest of the contractors and wondered if that was why they weren't following the same standards. Tim said that is one of their main arguments, but the Committee has pointed out that the site is not completely characterized, so it is possible for workers to run into unexpected contamination. Bechtel's response is that they will cross that bridge when they come to it.

Peter Knollmeyer, DOE-RL, said Ron Naventi, the lead person on this for BNI, met with Tim and Keith Smith and made a good attempt to share information with them. Peter said Al Hawkins from ORP pointed out that Bechtel is not out of compliance. They are just using a different reporting system. BNI made a commitment to getting the information to the committee even if it is in a different form. They want to protect the privacy of individual employees.

Norm Buske asked if BNI is in compliance on the work being done on the river cleanup. Tim said they are under the site umbrella on that work.

There is a verification technique for ISMS. BNI will have one in April, and Peter's points will be answered at that time with an independent verification. The Committee's concerns are that the separate reporting system, medical surveillance system, and medical contractor can perhaps meet all the check boxes in ISMS, but the committee wants to be sure it equally protects the workers.

Keith Smith said that one concern of the Committee was that Bechtel National had decided against using the railroad instead of trucks to transport materials during construction, because the roads are not able to handle the estimated 50,000 truckloads per year that will be needed. That much road traffic would raise accidents to unacceptable levels. Keith had encouraged them to reconsider the use of trains. Ron Naventi told Keith they have revived interest in using trains for construction and transporting material to canister storage facilities. RL is looking at putting money into reactivating the railroad system, but someone will have to find the money for the spur that will be required.

Marla Marvin talked about concern over the recent setbacks for the Freedom of Information Act. Because of the September 11th attacks, information has been taken off of government web sites due to national security concerns. Many people consider this a serious setback for groups concerned with the environment and health and safety issues. At the next meeting she will report on what DOE is doing in this regard.

Budgets and Contracts Committee

Harold Heacock said the committee will meet next Wednesday. There will be continued discussion on the 2003 budget. No information on the 2004 budget development is available yet.

Todd asked if the committee would analyze the top-to-bottom review since it is so closely linked to the budget. Harold agreed.

Request for Budget Scenario Related to Groundwater Treatment

Gerry gave an overview of the budget scenario based on groundwater treatment. The Board adopted a process where the Budgets and Contracts Committee would check back in with the Board about a proposal to run a baseline scenario that RL has given us the opportunity to do. At the meeting, they discussed four potential long-term scenarios that might be requested:

Adding to the budget to have an exact date for bringing the groundwater-monitoring program into compliance.

Accelerating the retrieval of transuranic waste and doing the technology development for the burial grounds sooner.

Looking at the cost of unrestricted cleanup in the 300 Area.

Begin the 100 Area groundwater cleanup one year after each reactor area soil is cleaned up.

The Committee chose the last one for Board feedback. The Committee wants to know how feasible is it to finish groundwater cleanup by 2018 if that is done.

BOARD BUSINESS

Annual HAB Self-Evaluation

Todd summarized the self-evaluation as saying that we do well when we do our homework, but not when we don't. No further discussion took place.

Committee Operations and Leadership Selection

Leon Swenson suggested that since we are in the midst of a complex budget process, changing committee chairs at this time would be unnecessarily disruptive. He recommended moving leadership selection to the June meeting. The Board agreed.

Leon brought up the need for committee chairs and vice chairs to communicate with their committees on meeting scheduling and cancellations. There have been some problems with people not being notified.

Major Topics for April HAB Meeting

River Plateau Committee, 200 Area change package

Budget

Top-to-bottom Review

Update on C3T meeting scheduled for April 1st.

Advice from the Budgets and Contracts Committee on the top-to-bottom review

Update from the task force on risk assessments, exposure scenarios, and what Hanford will look like when cleanup is done.

DRAFT

Dennis Faulk clarified what products are needed from the task force and committees. Currently, major efforts in the Environmental Restoration (ER) program include negotiations for the Central Plateau for four different milestones: M-13, submittal or work plans; M-15, schedules to do the work; M-16, the cleanup; and M-20, Resource Conservation Recovery Act; Treatment, Storage, and Disposal (RCRA-TSD) Facilities. Those change packages are finished and are being signed off. It will be taken to the River and Plateau Committee next week for detailed discussion, and, hopefully, they will issue advice.

The risk scenario advice needs to come from the task force at the April meeting.

RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY RELATIONS PLAN ADVICE

Amber Waldref went over the response to the Community Relations Plan Advice. She reviewed the results of each item of the advice. The advice asked for a change to the name of the plan, and that advice was taken. The advice to expand the annual evaluation of effectiveness of public involvement and to insert the HAB charter in the back of the plan was also taken. The agency declined to act on some of the other suggestions such as including the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) in the plan in order to integrate some of the public relations processes. She wanted to know how the Board or Committee could monitor the implementation of aspects of the plan.

Dennis Faulk said he would like to see more discussion about NEPA between the committee and EPA.

RECOGNITION OF DOUG SHERWOOD

A portion of the meeting was set aside to recognize Doug Sherwood for his contributions to the Hanford site. He is leaving the agency to pursue other activities. Speeches were made and gifts were presented. Letters to Doug from the agencies were read.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

DRAFT

ATTACHMENT 1 - ATTENDEES

HAB Members and Alternates

Mark Beck, Member	Jeffrey Luke, Member	William Kinsella, Alternate
Richard Berglund, Member	Todd Martin, Member	Rick Leaumont, Alternate
Pam Brown, Member	Jerry Peltier, Member	Wanda Munn, Alternate
Shelley Cimon, Member	Gerald Pollet, Member	Ken, Niles, Alternate
James Cochran, Member	Gordon Rogers, Member	Maynard Plahuta, Alternate
Jim Curdy, Member	Leon Swenson, Member	Wade Riggsbee, Alternate
Greg deBruler, Member	Margery Swint, Member	Daniel Simpson, Alternate
Norma Jean Germond, Member	Elizabeth Tabbutt, Member	Keith Smith, Alternate
Abe Greenberg, Member	Tim Takaro, Member	John Stanfill, Alternate
Harold Heacock, Member	Jim Trombold, Member	Stan Stave, Alternate
Doug Huston, Member	Antone Brooks, Alternate	Amber Waldref, Alternate
Charles Kilbury, Member	Madeleine Brown, Alternate	Dave Watrous, Alternate
Paige Knight, Member	Norm Buske, Alternate	Charles Weems, Alternate
Robert Larson, Member	Jim Hagar, Alternate	
Susan Leckband, Member	David Johnson, Alternate	

AGENCY, CONTRACTOR, AND SUPPORT STAFF

Kevin Brazzell, DOE	Mike Goldsten, EPA	Barbara Wise, Fluor Hanford
Mary Burandt, DOE	Doug Sherwood, EPA	Nancy Myers, Bechtel Hanford
Dave Evans, DOE	Rick Bond, Ecology	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
Ellen Mattlin, DOE	Melinda Brown, Ecology	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues
Marla Marvin, DOE	Laura Cusack, Ecology	Linda Grotefendt, EnviroIssues
Jim Rasmussen, DOE	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Tammie Holm, EnviroIssues
Chris Smith, DOE	Fred Jamison, Ecology	Mike Goddu, GHJ
Alex Teimorri, DOE	John Price, Ecology	Peter Bengston, PNNL
Bob Tibbatts, DOE	Max Power, Ecology	Jul Holbrook, PNNL/ORP
Steve Wiegman, DOE	R. Shmit, Ecology	Kristi Branch, PNNL
Craig Cameron, EPA	Roger Stanley, Ecology	Chris Chamberlain, Nuvotec
Dennis Faulk, EPA	Joy Turner, Ecology	Kristi Collins, Informatics
Larry Gadbois, EPA	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Bryan Kidder, CHG
Mike Gearheard, EPA		Jamie Zeisloff, DOE-RL

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Gina Piper	John Stang, Tri-City Herald	Wayne Kinney, Sen. Ron Wyden
Allyn Boldt		